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ABSTRACT

Conversations between children and their carers are considered to have a major impact on how children learn to speak and to understand the speech of others. Such conversations can be problematic for prelingually deaf children and their carers, affecting the language learning/teaching process. This study concerned the investigation of spoken interactions between deaf children and their carers, at home, where the first language is Sylheti (a dialect of Bengali), and English is the second language.

Interactions were recorded between eight pairs of children and their carers. These were 7-year old prelingually deaf children, from Sylheti families and from English families; and normally hearing children (7 year olds, and younger) from Sylheti families and from English families. Selected sets of the data were analysed using the procedures of Conversation Analysis (Drew (1990); Clayman and Maynard (1995)). Broad comparisons of the data sets were made with respect to factors such as the age and language ability of the children; whether they were deaf or normally hearing; whether English was their first or their second language and whether or not the participants in the talk spoke the same language.

Included in the findings are descriptions of the question-answer sequences which characterised the talk, showing that irrespective of which language was spoken in the interaction, there were similarities between all the deaf children and the younger normally hearing children, but not between the deaf children and the same age normally hearing children. A striking finding was the fact that all of the children and their carers spoke the same language in the interactions, except for conversations between Sylheti deaf children and their mothers, where the deaf children spoke English while their mothers spoke Sylheti. The analysis indicated that in these conversations, potential problem areas, such as misunderstandings not being resolved, were evident. Unresolved misunderstandings were not observed to the same extent in conversations between any of the other dyads. The implication of this finding is that in these crucial interactions, important opportunities for language teaching and learning could be missed, creating a language learning environment which is different from that of normally hearing children and which may not represent optimal language learning opportunities for the deaf child.
The systematic and explicit characterisation of the phenomena described in this study has addressed the need for detailed descriptions of children’s conversations with their carers expressed in the literature (Snow 1994), and will contribute to the body of knowledge to which professionals, such as speech and language therapists and teachers of the deaf, can refer when considering critical issues in early intervention such as counselling parents about fostering language development. The study also demonstrates that CA is a powerful tool for the study of talk involving a participant who has a communication disability.
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INTRODUCTION

In this introduction, the organisation of the thesis is given within an outline of the main aims, methods and findings of the research.

The main aim of the research is to investigate the spoken language interactions between deaf children and their carers in families for whom Sylheti is the first language and English is the additional or second language (E2L). Using the method of conversation analysis, conversational interactions are analysed, these being the most pervasive and the most common use of spoken language. The families in the study are living in the U.K. Their children attend schools where spoken English is the medium of instruction. If the children are receiving speech and language therapy, this too is mainly conducted in English.

The first language of the families taking part in the research is Sylheti. This can be described as a language related to Bengali, spoken by the inhabitants of the province of Sylhet, in northern Bangladesh, and by the majority of Bangladeshi immigrants to the U.K. Further reference to the Sylheti language and community in the U.K. is made in Chapter 2.

The use of the terms ‘deaf’ and ‘deafness’ in this thesis require explanation at this early stage. These terms are used to mean the range of permanent, peripheral hearing impairments (that is, mainly sensori-neural impairments as distinct from central impairments) which are of sufficient severity to lead to problems in communication using spoken language. This use of the term ‘deaf’ is not to be confused with the term ‘Deaf’. The latter is currently used in the U. K. when referring to the Deaf community and culture whose mode of communication is sign, and for whom British Sign Language (BSL) is the first language. In the Deaf community, Deaf children are regarded as being different (from normally hearing children), and not as being disabled (Laurenzi and Hindley 1994). None of the families taking part in the study reported here considered their children to be ‘Deaf’ at the time of this study. All were committed to the spoken approach used in the schools that the children attended, and wanted their children to communicate using spoken language. Hence the focus of the research is on spoken language interactions.
Other key terms need explication here. The term 'prelingual' is used to refer to hearing impairments which are present from birth, or which are acquired within the first 12 to 15 months of life. For the deaf children in this study, the communication problems resulting from their prelingual deafness is the basis for their statement of special educational needs. All have educational placements in Units for Hearing Impaired children (HIU) within mainstream primary schools in the London boroughs of Tower Hamlets and Islington. Spoken language is their mode of communication: they do not formally use BSL in school or at home, although some iconic signs are used at times. All members of their immediate families are normally hearing. Case history data for the children in the study can be found in Appendix 3.

The motivation for the study is based on a number of factors. Firstly, it has been the experience of the researcher (corroborated by professional colleagues such as speech and language therapists, teachers, health visitors, doctors) that young deaf children from homes where English is not the first language have particular difficulties with communication skills, and especially with spoken language, over and above the difficulties to be expected given their level of hearing impairment. This is usually attributed to the fact of English not being the family language, without a more informed explanation being available. There is not a lot of published research into this particular area, although numerous writings on other aspects of the communication problems resulting from deafness in children from families where English is the first language (E1L) are readily available as will be presented in Chapter 1.

Secondly, there is a high proportion of deaf children from families where English is the second language (E2L) in the HIU's in London, and, for certain London boroughs, there is a particularly high proportion of deaf children from Sylheti-speaking families. For example, recent figures indicate that there is a high incidence of deafness in Asian children in general (Naeem and Newton 1996), and in the Sylheti-speaking community from the London Borough of Tower Hamlets in particular (Vanniasegaram, Tungland and Bellman 1993). In this Borough, 51% of all school children have Sylheti as their family language (Runnymede Trust, 1993). For the school year 1994/5, during which part of the study was conducted, there were 51 deaf children statemented for special
needs in the Borough. Not surprisingly, 25 of these were from Sylheti families. [These issues will be pursued again in Chapter 2, section 2.3].

Thirdly, the approach to education and to therapeutic intervention by professionals such as speech and language therapists and teachers is based on an understanding of language development in children which is informed by some fundamental assumptions. These concern language input to, and language interaction with, normally hearing and developing children in a Western (British), industrialised, monolingual (English) culture, henceforth referred to as western culture. Essentially, in western culture, it is considered that spoken language input and interaction is crucial in language development, and that the child's acquisition of her/his first language will, to a large extent, reflect the input from mature speakers of that language, mainly from carers in the home environment. [This vast research area will be outlined in Chapter 1 section 1.2]

The assumptions include the following:

- that the child will be spoken to by mature speakers of that language, mainly her/his carers (usually the parents);
- that the child will be learning the same language as that spoken by her/his carers;
- that the mature speaker may modify the structure of her/his language to suit their perceived ability of the child to understand the language;
- that the child will be regarded as a conversational partner from a very early age;
- and that, in a more general sense, in talking to the child, the language used by the mature speaker will reflect the belief and value system of the culture and the particular community to which that family belongs. This will be evidenced by, for example, the use of appropriate conversational styles to indicate status relationships, appropriate forms of address to different members of the community, 'taboos' and acceptable topics, to name but a few.

---

1 These figures were provided by the Asian Parents Association for Special Needs in Tower Hamlets; The Special Needs Department, London Borough of Tower Hamlets; Culloden School and Frank Barnes School
These assumptions raise the following issues which are relevant to the main aim of this study:

- the possibility that there is a difference in the spoken language input and interaction between carers and their normally hearing children, as opposed to (a) carers and their deaf children [see Chapter 1 section 1.2] and (b) carers and children from other cultures [see Chapter 1 section 1.3].
- the applicability of the findings of research with children from British or American families to children from minority cultures living within British or American societies [see Chapter 1 section 1.3, and Chapter 2 section 2.4]
- the methodology for examining language ‘input’ and ‘interaction’ [see Chapter 4]

The process of choosing an appropriate method for the investigation of conversational interaction which may illuminate these complex issues started with a preliminary group study using a quantitative design. This experimental study [detailed in Chapter 3] aimed to investigate how (1) deafness; (2) not having English as the first language and (3) a combination of (1) and (2), affected young children’s comprehension of English (comprehension clearly being a prerequisite to successful communication). There are neither standardised nor informal tests in Sylheti to measure children’s comprehension, hence an English language test was used, and the study was designed to measure the ability of four groups of children to understand grammatical constructions in spoken English. The groups were:

a) deaf children from Sylheti-speaking families
b) deaf children from English-speaking families
c) normally hearing children from Sylheti-speaking families
d) normally hearing children from English-speaking families

Audiological information concerning the deaf children in the preliminary study are given in Appendix 1.

Whilst the results of this study were informative about the children’s performance on the test, they could not contribute substantially to understanding the issues raised above, since little insight could be gained into how the children’s receptive language abilities may or may not affect their conversational interactions. Two other factors were also clarified, firstly that investigations based on English only would provide neither a realistic nor a complete picture of spoken interactions and secondly, that the young deaf children (aged < five years) in this preliminary study had very limited spoken
language, indicating that in the investigation of spoken interactions, it would arguably be more productive to use data from older children who had a bigger language repertoire.

This research therefore evolved into a study using a qualitative method, which aimed to examine and describe spoken interactions between deaf children and their family members, where Sylheti was the language spoken at home. The best way to do this was considered to be to contrast the data with descriptions of spoken interactions between English-speaking deaf children, and both English- and Sylheti-speaking normally hearing children and their family members. Hence, to enable some broad comparisons to be made, the four categories of children which defined the groups in the preliminary study were retained. The design of the main study, therefore, included making descriptions of conversational interactions in Sylheti-speaking and English-speaking families with a deaf child, and in families, both English-speaking and Sylheti-speaking, whose children are normally hearing. Participants were drawn from these four categories, and were ‘combined’ on the basis of age, language ability and language spoken at home for purposes of comparison. The details of participant selection are given in Chapter 4 and in Appendix 2.

After careful consideration of different qualitative methodologies used in the analysis of discourse and of spoken interactions, the procedure known as Conversation Analysis (CA) was deemed to be the most appropriate to use for the examination of the actual interactions between the children and their carers. The reasons for this choice will be more fully discussed in Chapter 4. In brief, however, the inductive, data-driven premise of CA, arising from ethnomethodology, enables the analyst to examine ‘talk-in-interaction’ between two or more participants, in detail, without resorting to intuitive assumptions, or applying preconceived categories. The procedure is to describe interactional behaviours (e.g. utterances, non-verbal behaviours, pauses) by using the same normative procedures for recognising those behaviours as are used by the participants themselves. In this way, the design of each participant's behaviour (or ‘turn’ in the talk), and the sequential implications of that turn can be described and accounted for. Some conversation analytic descriptions of talk-in-interaction between normally hearing English-speaking children and adults are already available in the literature for comparative purposes.
Furthermore, the collection and analysis of data from each of the four categories of children mentioned above would make it possible to address some of the cross-cultural issues in this area of research. Since the study concerns talk in families from a culture different to that of the researcher, and for which there are no descriptive accounts already available, an empirical approach which does not rely on assumptions and established taxonomy was considered eminently suitable.

The data was collected in the family home: video and simultaneous audio recordings were made of each child in conversation with one (or more) of his carers, with the assistance of a native Sylheti speaker when necessary. Once the data was obtained, transcriptions were prepared and a preliminary analysis carried out in order to highlight the salient features of the interactions. Question-answer sequences (during the activity of talking about pictures) were a characteristic feature of all the interactions, and it is this feature which became the focus of the analysis. The reason for this selection are set out in Chapter 4. Details of the data collection, the selection of samples of data for analysis and the translation of data into English, are also given in Chapter 4. Full transcriptions of each data set can be found in Appendix 4.

The analysis and discussion of selected segments of data for the families in the study is presented in Chapters 5, 6, and 7: Chapter 5 focuses on the English-speaking families; Chapter 6 on the Sylheti-speaking families, where the same language is spoken during the interaction, and Chapter 7 is an examination of the Sylheti-speaking families where the participants speak different languages during the interaction. A list of the fragments of conversation quoted in these chapters is given in Appendix 5.

Through the analysis of the data, it was possible to demonstrate the impact of certain key factors in the design and sequential properties of the conversational interactions documented. These include:

- the age and language ability of the child
- the hearing status of the child
- the first language of the family (English or Sylheti)
- the pattern of use of the first language (Sylheti) and the second language (English) by various members of the family.
- whether or not the same language was spoken by the adult and the child during the interaction (this factor had not been apparent at the outset)
In chapter 8 the main findings of the analysis with respect to these factors are discussed. There is also discussion of several important questions which have emerged from the data, the answers to which only further research can unravel:

- what is the first language of the deaf children from Sylheti-speaking families?
- how might the knowledge that the mothers speak Sylheti to their English-speaking deaf children inform approaches to education and therapy with those children?
- are our underlying assumptions about language development shared by members of the Sylheti cultural and linguistic group?
- can it be assumed that the carers from a culture different to western culture have the conviction that they have an active role to play in assisting their deaf child to overcome the communication disability resulting from deafness?

The conclusions and implications of the research are presented in Chapter 9. The study addresses the need for detailed descriptions of children’s conversations with their carers expressed in the literature (Richards and Gallaway 1994; Snow 1994; Martin-Jones and Romaine 1986). The systematic and explicit characterisation of the phenomena described will promote an understanding of conversations involving deaf children, and will strike a chord with parents of deaf children and with professionals alike. These descriptions contribute to the body of knowledge to which professionals, such as speech and language therapists and teachers of the deaf, can refer when considering critical issues in early intervention such as counselling parents about fostering language development. The descriptions also give strong indicators as to the questions which need to be addressed in future research by the employment of either a quantitative or a qualitative method of study. In regard to the latter, this work has demonstrated that CA is a powerful tool for the study of talk involving a participant who has a communication disability. Applying CA to such conversations is a relatively new area of investigation, and this study has contributed to the growing body of knowledge in the field, both empirically and in respect of methodology.
INTRODUCTION TO CHAPTERS 1 AND 2.

The primary focus of this research is the unique situation of deaf children in the U.K. whose families speak a language other than English at home, particularly families who speak Sylheti. Children with normal hearing (and with no other difficulties) from homes where English is spoken usually learn to talk and to understand the speech of others, becoming efficient and skilled in communication in a relatively short period of time. The specific language acquired is that spoken by their family in the home, their 'first' language. For the majority of children in the U.K. this is English. There are many families in the U.K. whose members are not native English speakers, but who learn English as a second language (E2L). Normally hearing and speaking children from such families do not usually have major difficulties learning English. They learn it at school and mostly achieve fluency or at least functional proficiency in English. This tends not to be the case for deaf children, for whom acquisition of a first spoken language may be problematic, and for whom having to learn English as well presents additional problems. These problems become apparent in ordinary conversational interactions.

To provide a background to the research, in Chapter 1, the effects of prelingual deafness on speech and language development and on conversation are reviewed, as are the research findings into language learning practices with deaf children and with normally hearing children in western culture and in cross-cultural studies. The chapter ends with a brief overview of service provision for deaf children in the U.K.

Chapter 2 provides an outline of some theoretical issues in the general area of 'bilingualism', that is, the academic forum within which speakers of English as a second language are usually discussed. Recent demographic trends concerning linguistic minorities and deafness are presented. Following this, a description of the Sylheti speaking community in London is outlined, including some pertinent historical trends which have shaped the community. The final sections concern diversity of languages and patterns of language use in multilingual families.
CHAPTER 1

DEAFNESS

1.1 The effects of prelingual deafness on conversation and on the development of spoken language.

The normal development of competence in speech and language is usually thought to start in the first days of life with the precursors to language use such as turn-taking and mutual eye-gazing between babies and parents. Normally, there is smooth progress through the development and meaningful use of the sound system appropriate to the family’s first language and the combination of strings of sounds according to its grammatical rules, with continuous learning of the meanings of words. These skills become the codes of practice in conversation appropriate to the particular language and culture of the family. For most children, the ability to use speech in conversational interactions is achieved by about their second year.

Acquisition of a first spoken language does not proceed so smoothly for children who for a variety of reasons have difficulty developing language and speech skills. One such reason is prelingual deafness. There is extensive documentation concerning the multiple problems that deaf children from English speaking families have in acquiring and using spoken language (see Gallaway, Nunes and Johnston (1994) for a bibliography of recent research). Mogford (1988) concludes her review of research of the expressive and receptive language abilities of deaf children by emphasising the interrelationship of different aspects and stages of language development, and how, in the deaf child, deficits in language acquisition are built up in layers resulting in a multiplicity of language problems. It is accepted that the majority of deaf children have some degree of linguistic difficulty with understanding, producing and using spoken English at the levels of phonology, syntax, semantics and pragmatics. Whilst it is apparent that deaf children have difficulties at all these levels of language, it is their conversational competence that will determine their effective communication with others, especially in the hearing world. For the deaf children discussed later, this communication is by means of conversations in spoken rather than in signed language. In Deaf families where British Sign Language is the first language, such conversational difficulties are not usually reported (Bouvet 1990; Gallaway and Woll 1994).
1.1.1. *Conversations*

Whilst it can be taken as read that conversations with deaf children will in some way be different from those with normally hearing children, characterising this difference is not straightforward. Deaf children do not form an homogenous group, neither do the adults who are involved with them, making descriptions of typical conversations difficult. By referring to a few key studies from the multitude of research work that has been conducted in this field, some characteristics of these conversations can be outlined. For a comprehensive review of recent research see Gallaway and Woll (1994). As these authors point out, given the wide variety of methodologies used in the research, and the general lack of clarity in the use of terms like conversational “control” and “responsivity”, the findings can be difficult to interpret (Gallaway and Woll 1994 p. 204). Most of the studies are based on a linguistic analysis of each participant’s contributions to a conversation, but do not provide an insight into how the participants go about actually constructing a mutually coherent conversation. The characteristics are usually described in terms of the way in which each participant formulates her/his utterance or turn. For the deaf child, these utterances are of course dependent on their age and level of language development, but generally researchers indicate that deaf children are less ‘responsive’ and that adults tend to be ‘controlling’ by use of questions and imperatives.

Conversation is taken in this thesis to include any kind of verbal interaction between two or more participants, in whatever environment that interaction occurs. Seen in a broad perspective spanning both linguistics and sociology, conversation is the “primary medium of interaction in the social world and the medium through which children are socialised into the linguistic and social conventions of a society” (Drew 1990a p. 1).

In their seminal work on talking to deaf children, Wood, Wood, Griffith and Howarth (1986) differentiate ‘conversation’ from other kinds of discourse such as ‘debate’, or ‘teaching’ (ranging from labelling games with young children to actual classroom situations), suggesting that ‘conversation’ is verbal interaction which relates to talking “about things which are not in the immediate environment of the talkers and listeners” (Wood et al 1986 p. 49). Distinctions like this become difficult to maintain however, when verbal interactions, in whatever environment, are very closely examined, as has been shown by
the findings of analyses of conversations based on an ethnomethodological, rather than a linguistic, framework\(^1\).

However, there is common ground in the literature: conversation requires that the participants are partners in the exercise, who take turns to speak and to listen in a relatively orderly manner, doing so using words in a way that is coherent and accessible to each other, and if this is not the case, that the listener will indicate her/his difficulty to the speaker, making it possible for that difficulty to be resolved. Underlying this is the assumption that the participants are competent in the skills required for the task, which are, simply put, speaking, listening and using the appropriate social conventions of interaction.

Deaf children are generally not considered to be as competent as normally hearing children in one or another or all of these respects, and indeed, research has shown that this is the case, as will be outlined in the following section. Wood et al (1986) provide a detailed characterisation of the conversations they observed between teachers and deaf children at various ages and stages of development\(^2\). In spite of individual variation, a significant finding (reported in detail in Wood, Wood, Griffiths, Howarth and Howarth 1982) was that the conversations were ‘controlled’ by the teachers. The teachers’ utterances were analysed in terms of conversational ‘moves’, at different levels of ‘control’ and related to the children’s responses, which were analysed in terms of mean length of utterance or turn. Broadly speaking, the more controlling the teacher was, the less responsive was the child. One aspect of this control can be characterised as including the teachers’ frequent use of questions, and an adaptation of language thought to be suited to the deaf child’s comprehension. As will be seen in section 1.2 below, these are not dissimilar to features in talk directed to deaf children by adults other than teachers. Before discussing this further, it is necessary to outline some aspects of speech and language development in deaf children.

---

\(^1\) This issue will be fully explored later on, in the discussion of conversation analysis in Chapter 4.

A large body of research relates to deaf children's production and perception of the speech sounds of their home language. Much of this work has been done in English-speaking countries, mainly in the U.S.A. and the U.K. There is evidence that hearing-impaired children's development of the perception of phonological contrasts in English is slower than is the development of such contrasts in normally hearing children (Hazan, Fourcin and Abberton 1991). At the grammatical level, the ability to understand certain grammatical structures is closely related to the features of the hearing impairment per se. For example, a common difficulty for deaf children with predominantly high frequency sensori-neural hearing losses who are learning English, is in confusing grammatical morphemes marked by segments which have predominantly high frequency energy, such as plurals, contracted auxiliaries and copulas, third person singular verb endings and simple past tense (Owens, Benedict and Schubert 1972; Bench and Bamford 1979; Velmans and Marcuson 1983).

Deaf children also demonstrate problems in understanding larger grammatical chunks even when they know the vocabulary and the concepts involved (Quigley, Wilbur, Power, Montanelli and Steinkamp 1976). In general, researchers have shown that deaf children's development of some grammatical constructions proceeds, by and large, in the same order as does development in normally hearing children, but at a much slower rate. Some studies show that the competence of school-leaving deaf children is frequently equivalent to that of normally hearing children just entering secondary school (Bishop 1983; Lyon and Gallaway 1990; McAnally, Rose and Quigley 1987; Bamford and Saunders, 1991). Deaf children have particular difficulty with word order (Bishop 1983, Quigley, Power and Steinkamp 1977), pronominalisation (Oshima-Takane, Cole and Yaremko 1993; Wilbur, Montanelli and Quigley 1976), the verb system (Quigley, Montanelli and Wilbur 1976), relativisation (Wilbur, Quigley and Montanelli 1975) and complementation (Wilbur, Montanelli and Quigley 1976).

In her 1983 study, Bishop contrasted performance on the Test for the Reception of Grammar (TROG) in profoundly deaf children aged 8 to 12 years, when the TROG was administered in three modes: spoken, written and signed. The findings indicate that the deaf children in the main performed worst when the test items were spoken or written, and
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best when signed. She concludes that in her sample of deaf children, the understanding of spoken English on the TROG items was below the level achieved by 4 year old normally hearing children. Bishop accounts for this by the fact that for profoundly deaf children who rely on auditory and visual representation of speech, such representations will at best only be partial, making the decoding of speech signals difficult and confusing. Errors made by the subjects on some test items were predictable, on account of either confounding or absent lip patterns for the words. Given that the TROG items are constrained in their vocabulary and by their pictorial representation, and hence could be considered relatively ‘easy’ to comprehend, the deaf children in Bishop’s study nevertheless found the spoken version of the test very difficult. Bishop suggests that a deaf child would find the understanding of spoken language in a natural setting even more difficult.

With regard to expressive language, as a general finding, Bol and Kuiken (1990) showed that hearing impaired children aged between 3 years and 9 years tended to use shorter utterances, had less variety in sentence structure and made less frequent use of function words than normally hearing children did. Some researchers imply that the grammars evident in the speech of deaf children are related to insufficient input, for example, de Villiers, de Villiers and Hoban (1994) who conclude that deaf children who are learning spoken language develop their own ‘incompletely specified grammars’ which are predictable and which, they suggest, are due to receiving insufficient input.

As has been mentioned before, there is great heterogeneity in any group of deaf children’s understanding and use of spoken language. Robinshaw (1996) suggests that the determiners of ‘language success’ in a deaf child are primarily to do with consistency of input and effective audiological management. A deaf child’s development of spoken language is intricately associated with a multitude of factors in addition to the language input s/he receives, such as whether her/his parents are themselves deaf or normally hearing, the level of actual hearing impairment the child has, the time of diagnosis of the impairment, the appropriacy of hearing aids and effective use of those aids, and the type of education the child has received, to name but a few.

As will be shown in the following section, the talk that occurs around, and is directed to infants is of considerable importance in the development of competence in using spoken language. For the deaf child, the nature of this input is vital.
1.2 Language Learning Practices with Deaf Children and with Normally Hearing Children

1.2.1 Deaf children

However helpful the studies referred to above are in cataloguing the deficiencies in deaf children's spoken language (Webster 1986), these results do not provide much specific information about the possible consequences for the child's social interaction, since interactional issues are not directly addressed. Problems in ordinary conversations are the most obvious symptoms of speech and language difficulties experienced by these deaf children, and it is the conversations they have at home and later at school that are considered by many researchers in the field to play a crucial role in their acquisition and use of linguistic skills.

Although there are some studies\(^4\) which point to the similarities between interactions involving parents with their deaf children, and parents with their normally hearing children, most of the research points to the fact that these interactions are different, particularly with respect to the style of language input of the hearing parent\(^5\). The reasons put forward for this difference centre around the notion of the carer 'controlling' the interaction by modifying her/his input into 'restrictive' language, for example by frequent use of imperatives, very short sentences, the employment of a repetitive, narrow vocabulary and the use of questions (Cheskin 1981; 1982; White and White 1984). Many studies suggest that adults' control or domination of conversation with deaf children is achieved by the frequent use of turns designed as questions\(^6\). Lyon (1985) suggests that maternal control in particular, could constitute "a secondary and cumulative impediment" (p. 127) to language development in the deaf child. However, Gallaway and Woll (1994) indicate that this control could be also seen as an appropriate adjustment made by the carer to her/his language input as a result of her/his assessment of the child's receptive language levels. They add that restrictive

\(^4\) Hughes and Huntington 1983; Hughes 1983; Tucker 1983; Nienhuys, Cross and Horsborough, 1984


language may well be appropriate for a “still incompetent learner” (ibid. p.202). In 1979, Gregory, Mogford and Bishop suggested that the mother's input varies with her perception of the child's linguistic ability. Cross, Johnson-Morris and Nienhuys (1980) concluded that maternal speech adjustments are determined by the receptive abilities of the child, and that mothers of deaf children should be expected to produce "aberrant" (p. 188) speech adjustments. Musselman and Churchill (1993) suggest that the inconclusive findings with respect to understanding deaf children's language acquisition in the abundant studies of maternal conversational control sanction “future studies which investigate conversational interaction at a more molar level” (ibid p. 288). The present study aims to do that.

Although mainly concerned with classroom talk rather than with parent-child conversation, the work of Wood and his colleagues is relevant to the discussion. Many valuable insights have been gained from this work, such as the function and structure of 'teacher language' (Wood, Wood, Griffiths and Howarth 1986 p.135) and how this can affect a deaf child's communication, particularly with regard to the use of questions, turn-taking and repair of breakdown in conversations. As was mentioned above, the distinction is blurred between teacher language, and the style of talking used by other adults or older siblings when conversing with deaf children at home. This is certainly shown to be the case for the conversations analysed in the current research, as will be seen in later chapters.

That the speech of adults, and parents or carers in particular, addressed to the deaf child is of crucial importance to that child's language development is beyond doubt (Gallaway, Hostler and Reeves 1990, Gregory 1984). The debate as to whether or not, and how, this input facilitates language development in children (deaf and normally hearing) will be outlined in the next section.

---

1.2.2 Normally hearing children

The phenomenon of ‘child-directed speech’ (CDS) or ‘motherese’ (the language spoken to children by adults or other competent speakers) and its possible role in facilitating language development has been intensively studied. The vast literature\(^8\) of the past 20 years or so reflects an often heated debate as to whether CDS is crucial for language acquisition (Moerk 1976; Furrow and Nelson 1986, 1984; Furrow, Nelson and Benedict 1979) or whether it is only one aspect of a ‘multi-factor functional model’ of language acquisition (Newport, Gleitman and Gleitman 1977). Examination of the research shows that the implicit relationship between CDS and the actual acquisition of language by a child is not at all clear-cut (Gleitman, Newport and Gleitman 1984; Furrow and Nelson 1986; Snow, 1986). More recent opinions, such as that expressed by Pine (1994) suggests that the crucial question is how children make use of CDS at various points in the process of acquiring language, and that it is less interesting to debate whether or not CDS facilitates language development.

Less controversial, however, is the research evidence showing that CDS has certain features which differentiate it from the speech adults address to each other (Snow, 1972; 1977a). Richards and Gallaway (1993; 1994) express the ‘differentness’ of adults’ speech to children by describing certain features of such speech, and their function. For example, they refer to the simplification, (ibid p.261 (their italics)) of the adult’s utterance, which serves to reduce the processing demands on the language learner. The adult simplifies her/his speech, for example, by using repetitions, pauses and slower rate of delivery. Gallaway and Richards’ discuss clarification (ibid p. 262) which can be achieved by the repetition and recasting of sentence frames. They refer to gaining and focusing the attention (ibid p. 263) of the language learner as being a necessary contributor to interaction and language learning, as well as to providing feedback and/or modeling (ibid p. 264) of correct utterances and correct conversational structure. They also mention the notion of facilitating conversational participation (ibid p. 264), which is of particular relevance to the current study, and which will be discussed throughout this thesis. Although this is not easily distinguishable from either ‘providing feedback’ or ‘modelling’, it is similar to the discourse features suggested by Snow (1977b) which include a high proportion of questions, reflective questions and
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\(^8\) A full review of this literature is not required here, but for a recent overview, see the chapters by Snow; Pine; Richards; Richards and Gallaway in Gallaway and Richards (1994).
expansions in adults’ speech. Many other studies, particularly from the 1970’s, also
focus on the syntax and frequency of use of questions by adults, and on the responses
made to those questions by children.

As Newport, Gleitman and Gleitman (1977) and Snow (1986) have pointed out, the
complex way in which CDS operates is based on the fact that primary carers do not
simply communicate information to their children, but they engage them in
conversation. The interactional context in which CDS occurs is crucial, not only the
immediate context between the conversational partners, but also the wider context of
the family and culture or subculture in which the family operate (Durkin 1987), as will
be explored in the following section. In the present study, it is the interactional context
of spoken language that is of interest, and it is useful to consider these features or
"potentially facilitative functions" (Richards and Gallaway 1994 p.264) and question-
answer sequences in particular, in interactional terms. As will be seen later, using the
method of conversation analysis makes this possible.

1.3 CROSS-CULTURAL STUDIES

As has been said above, all interaction occurs in a cultural context, and in order to
provide sufficient background for the present study, it is necessary here to examine, in
brief, interaction between adults and children in the language learning process in other
cultures. Western culture was characterised in the Introduction using the words
‘British’, ‘industrialised’ and ‘monolingual’ (English). One could add the words ‘white’
‘middle class’ and ‘nuclear-style families’ to this characterisation, since, as Lieven
(1994) has pointed out, the majority of research findings into language learning relate
to children in western culture from such families. Because this research informs much
of U.K. practice in education and in rehabilitation, it is necessary to question whether
these findings are transferable to the language learning of children in different cultures.
The following overview of research from other cultures will form the background to a
major concern of the current study which is whether there is a difference in spoken
language input and interaction between children and their carers when firstly, those
children are deaf, and secondly, the language and culture of their family is different.

Ervin-Tripp 1970; Crosby 1978; Dore 1977; Tyack and Ingram 1977; Cairns and Hsu 1978;
Horgan 1978; Berninger and Garvey 1981; Richards and Robinson 1993
In the cross-cultural research literature, there are several studies which concern language learning in other countries with their own distinct cultures, such as Schieffelin’s work with the Kaluli of Papua New Guinea (Schieffelin 1983; 1985) and Ochs’ descriptions of the society of Western Samoa (Ochs 1982). There is rather less research of this kind into distinct ‘minority’ cultures existing within a ‘majority’ or ‘host’ culture, such as Heath’s (1983; 1986) study of neighbouring communities in the south-western United States of America.

The current study is concerned with the culture of Sylheti-speaking Bangladeshis living in London, a ‘minority’ within the majority western, English-speaking culture. There is no published work available on language learning and child-rearing practices in Bangladesh itself, nor is there much concerning this aspect of cultural practice in the Bangladeshi community in London. Such practices may or may not be the same in Bangladesh and here in London. It is most likely that these practices are constantly in the process of change as the London community shapes itself to changing pressures and demands. The work of Gregory and her colleagues (Gregory 1993a; 1993b; 1994; 1996a; 1996b; Gregory, Mace and Rashid 1993) investigating reading in children from the Bangladeshi community in East London, has illuminated literacy practices in Sylheti speaking families, and from this, some insight can also be gained into language learning/teaching practices.

There is also very little published work which expressly addresses the language learning of deaf children from minority cultures in this country (Sharma and Love 1991; Speedy 1985). In many group studies of language acquisition by deaf children, children from linguistic or cultural minorities are excluded from participation because of the methodological difficulties which would result from including them.

The acquisition of language by normally hearing children in cultural environments other than a western one has been the focus of numerous studies. Many of these are methodologically somewhat different to the reports of research in western culture. In the latter, research is usually quantitative and is based on linguistic theory, with the researcher sharing the culture and language of the subjects. In studies of other cultures, where the researcher usually does not share the culture of the researched, the methodological approach is more often ethnographic and is based on
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10 See Chapter 2 Section 2.4 for a description of this community.
anthropological or sociolinguistic theory in which the social context of language learning is crucial. Making comparisons across cultures from these reports has inherent dangers; for example, as Lieven (1994) has pointed out, a theoretical question arises when the same behaviour is observed in two different environments as to whether that behaviour fulfils the same function in both environments.

Notwithstanding these concerns, or the contrast in methodology, it becomes clear from these studies, that in all environments there is a reported difference between the way adults talk to adults, and the way adults talk to children. It also seems to be clear that whatever these differences are, they somehow are functional in helping a child to learn the features of their particular language and to learn how to attribute meaning to utterances in that language. Cross-cultural studies, furthermore, remind us that children bring a wide range of formidable cognitive, social and other skills to bear on the task of learning language, no matter what the conditions are in which that learning is taking place.

The difference between the way adults talk to adults, and the way adults talk to children is described in western culture, as was shown above, as CDS, which is considered to be helpful to children in learning language. Fernald and Morikawa (1993) make the case for a culturally widespread CDS or "infant-directed speech style" (ibid p.637) including features such as exaggerated prosody and frequent repetition, which is observable in many different languages, and which is manifested in response to "universal characteristics and response tendencies of the human infant" (ibid p.654). Findings from research into child rearing and care giving practices in other cultures however, suggest that this view is too simplistic. CDS may be helpful to western children, but it cannot be essential since children learn to talk in a wide variety of cultural environments quite different to ours.

To illustrate this, there are several studies reporting findings from societies in which in the early years, speech is normally not directly addressed to infants at all. It is therefore questionable whether an identifiable CDS-type of register exists in these cultures. For example, the Kaluli people of Papua New Guinea do not address speech to prelinguistic children (Schieffelin 1983; 1985). For the Kaluli, language is a major means of social control, and when the child is older, s/he will be taught what to say in various social situations. Another example is given by Ochs (1983) in her discussion of
care-giving in Western Samoan society, where status is reflected in speech styles. Ochs (1983 p. 190) notes that these caregivers have little inclination to “engage in the pre-language communication reported over and over in the literature on maternal input” in western culture. There is also no talking to babies in Quiche Mayan society where babies are regarded as being vulnerable and needing to be kept quiet and calm (Pye 1992, cited by Lieven 1994). In her comparative study of three neighbouring communities in the south-eastern state of Carolina in the USA, Heath (1986) notes that adults from the Trackton community (characterised as an originally agricultural, black, working class community) do not interpret any of the baby's sounds or gestures as communicative attempts, believing that babies will “come to know” about language without being taught.

A common feature in these dissimilar cultures, however, is that the infants are reported as being constantly present in, and part of the social space or verbal environment in which the competent speakers of the language are interacting with each other. Lieven (1994) sums up as follows:

“Children in these cultures are immersed in a structure of meaning which may well need less articulation (than in our culture) in terms of Baby Talk directed at them precisely because they are a much more integral part of it.” (Lieven 1994 p. 63) (my italics)

Furthermore, Lieven (1994) points out that the above researchers indicate that as the babies from these, and other cultures start to talk, evidence of their having attended to the verbal environment becomes clear as a considerable amount of their speech consists of echoing and repeating the talk around them. The verbal environment does not, as is common in our society, consist mainly of a dyadic situation in which the caregiver, usually the mother, interacts verbally with the child. It is often more common that the verbal environment is polyadic, and that a variety of adults, or speakers more competent than the child, such as older siblings, will interact with that child. The role of older siblings, for example, is crucial in some cultures, as is the case in parts of Nigeria, where small children are looked after by older children or ‘maids’ (Nwokah 1987). Gregory, Mace, Rashid and Williams (1996) have shown how older siblings take the role of mediators of literacy learning in families of Bangladeshi origin living in London.
It is also interesting to note the type of speech that is addressed to children once they are no longer babies (about 2 years). In western culture, the practice reported in most research is that of a child-centred "topic-expanding style" (Lieven 1994 p. 67) which starts with CDS and seems to progress to where whatever the child says (or gestures) is taken by the adult as the starting point of a conversational interchange thus creating the opportunity for language teaching and learning. It seems to be accepted wisdom, in a western context, that seizing this opportunity as often as possible is the best way for a carer to optimise their child's language development, because this provides a joint focus of attention, and a forum for the giving of phonetic, syntactic and semantic information. Research reports show that this conviction is evident in some other societies which are similar in several respects to the U.K. or U.S.A. but in which a different language is spoken, such as Japanese (Fernald and Morikawa 1993), Hebrew (Berman 1985) and some Chinese groups (Erbaugh 1992).

Furthermore, in contrast to the western child-centred approach, in other cultures there are plenty of reports of explicit teaching of speech routines to children using a directive approach. For example, the Kaluli (Schieffelin 1985), teach their children various forms of assertive language for use in social interactions like requesting, challenging or shaming, to ensure that the children will get what they want by using 'adult' language. They do this by encouraging the child to imitate "hard talk" (that is, the adult form of utterances) and by actively discouraging "soft talk (that is, baby talk or sound play)" (Schieffelin 1983 p. 182). Lieven (1994) provides a summary of research evidence from several studies showing various cultures in which adults address directive speech to their children who learn to talk perfectly well.

In spite of the child-centred theories, there is also a considerable amount of directive talk to children in western culture. For example, when talking to children, adults frequently make use of 'test questions'\textsuperscript{11} that is, questions to which the adult asker already knows the answer, with the aim of 'teaching' children the labels for objects and events (Tarplee 1993). We also use a directive, imitative style to instruct children in selected speech routines, for example, the saying of 'please' and 'thank you' and other social courtesies.

\textsuperscript{11} Test questions will be discussed again in detail later in this thesis. See Chapter 4 Section 4.3.4.
It is important for educators and rehabilitators attending to language acquisition by deaf children to have some understanding of whether certain features of speech between adults and children are facilitative or deleterious to language acquisition (Lewis and Gallaway 1995). Research in this area has not clarified the situation. For instance, none of the studies examined here quantify what proportion of talk between children and their carers is either child-centred and topic expanding, or directive and imitative, assuming, that is, that such quantification would be feasible in the first place. It is not possible to come to any firm conclusions as to how the child may be using the input to acquire the features of the language or to attach meaning to the utterances s/he hears. In western culture, it is thought that adults do not directly teach children language, but that children's language acquisition is fostered mainly by using a child-centred style. By implication, this is considered to be the best way to deal with all children learning language, including deaf children. The impact of this belief when applied to the service we deliver to families of deaf children whose language learning/teaching practice is different from ours in this regard, needs careful examination.

It is also important to attend to the clear-cut fact that when a child learns language, s/he is also learning her/his culture. In relation to the current study, an important question here relates to the cultural learning, so to speak, of Bangladeshi/Sylheti children within a British/English host culture, where the schooling necessitates understanding of the host culture and language, but affiliations at home necessitate understanding of home language and culture.

For deaf children growing up in this dualistic environment, there is a third cultural draw, that of the Deaf culture, which is quite distinct from any 'hearing' culture. Sharma and Love (1991) insist that the characteristic of deafness cannot and should not be separated from the experience of being black (they include people of Asian origin in their use of the term 'black'). The uniqueness of Deaf culture, as with other cultures, has to do with language and is particularly clear-cut when sign language is used. Sharma and Love (1991) report, for example, that deaf people in their survey indicated that they can distinguish ethnicity from the presence of 'dialect' or 'accents' and other nuances displayed in signs.
Although the language of Deaf culture is sign language, deaf children whose communication mode is spoken language, and who are not overtly identified with the Deaf culture while they are at school and within their hearing family, may well choose to identify more with the Deaf culture later in their lives. The identification of individuals with a cultural group can be gauged by their use of language (Gumperz 1982), showing a wide range of skills in switching structures and semantics to suit the occasion. There is an extensive literature in this area, many studies focusing on code-switching and code-mixing to signal affiliations and identity. Many Deaf people demonstrate an ability to vary their language between sign and speech.

However, for deaf children learning spoken language in a linguistically diverse environment, acquiring such skills can be problematic. Problems in learning their first, spoken language have been mentioned above. Additional difficulties can arise from the fact that there is likely to be more than one language spoken at home (see Chapter 2 section 2.3). Reports of investigations which relate specifically to the interaction between the difficulties a deaf child has acquiring a spoken language on the one hand, and being exposed to more than one language on the other, are difficult to find. It is hoped that this study will address some of the issues involved.

Further complications arise because deaf children are entitled to, and receive, habilitation or rehabilitation from the Health and Education services, which, in the vast majority of cases, are provided in English. As has been mentioned before, this rehabilitation is primarily aimed at establishing the deaf children’s ability to communicate and to be educated (in the U.K., in English). Language is no longer a matter for the family and community alone, but becomes the province of ‘outsiders’ who are seldom members of the minority community. Professional groups do address these issues (Camden and Islington 1995; Leather and Wirz 1996; Schellekens 1996). The complexity of these points and the frustration it can engender in all parties concerned is encapsulated in the following comment made by a deaf man of Indian origin who took part in Sharma and Love’s study (1991):

“I can speak a little English but I’d like to speak Gugerati. I asked for speech therapy in Gugerati but only English is available. I want to speak Gugerati so I can talk to my mum and so that I can make devotions in the temple. I asked the social worker but she said
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12 See Chapter 2 and Chapter 8 for further discussion of this point.
my mum must learn to sign. But my mum's too old to learn English. If only I'd been brought up to speak Gujarati we could communicate." (Sharma and Love 1991 p.9)

Even if the deaf person/child chooses to use spoken language as their main mode of communication and sign language is not an additional language in the repertoire, issues to do with cultural affiliation and its expression in the language are still complex. All the deaf children in the current study use spoken language to communicate, but they may also use a few iconic signs when it is expedient to do so. As will be discussed in the next section, the task for educators and 'rehabilitation' professionals is to provide a service which truly serves the needs of the children in question. There is an obligation to provide a good service for all children. As Gregory (1994) and Duquette (1992) have pointed out, providing the same for all cultures does not mean that this will be an equal service. To be egalitarian in service delivery requires an understanding of which language is most comfortable for the children and whether they can communicate easily in that language, firstly with their family and then with others. The language used by the children will have implications for later cultural affiliations, and, at the very least, awareness of these issues is crucial for the professionals involved.

1.4 SERVICE PROVISION FOR DEAF CHILDREN IN THE U. K.

There is a twofold reason for a brief discussion of the service provision for deaf children (that is issues in habilitation/rehabilitation and education) at this point. Firstly, policy issues in the habilitation of deaf children in the U.K. in general will have had an impact on the language learning experiences of the children participating in the current study. Secondly, the eventual findings of the study will later be related to matters of service provision.

Although there are various professionals involved with deaf children, for the most part, the focus of their intervention is very similar: it is to enable the child to communicate, and to be educated; to this end, there is normally sincere and often effective collaboration between the professionals. Speech and language therapists and teachers of the deaf, for example, have over the years established a set of working principles to ensure their continuing joint efforts on behalf of deaf people (British Association of Teachers of the Deaf/College of Speech and Therapists 1990). There are also, however, long-standing and ongoing debates about the strategies for achieving the aims of effective communication and education. Before briefly outlining the debate below (in terms of the communication options
available to deaf children), some general points about deaf children and the U.K. National Curriculum need to be made.

The Code of Practice (Department for Education 1994) strongly recommends that all children with special educational needs participate actively in the National Curriculum (see also National Curriculum Council Circular 5, 1989). Practitioners working with the deaf have to address the problem of providing access to the National Curriculum for deaf children (Webster and Webster 1990; McMaster 1990). Teachers have to write statements about children's abilities in order to make special arrangements for modifications or exemptions. It is, however, uncommon for deaf children to be exempted or 'disapplied' from the National Curriculum and the achievement targets within it (Elphick 1989), although the curriculum can be differentiated for them (Department for Education and Employment 1994). Of particular interest with respect to the current study are the targets for 'speaking and listening' in English, which necessitate some level of proficiency in English (McMaster 1990; National Curriculum Council 1989). It is in the area of specific statements of attainment that the achievement targets for deaf children need to be examined. As will be discussed again in Chapter 2, there is currently very little published work on deaf children's achievements in primary school, the last available national record being Conrad (1979).

It is obviously important to give special consideration to the needs of those deaf children who come from cultural and linguistic minorities. When this notion is applied to the National Curriculum English requirements, it becomes imperative to understand the difficulties these deaf children in particular may experience, since the very difficulties they have in communication are being directly tested. For example, the statements of attainment for the Listening and Speaking target in English are based on tasks such as retelling stories and participating in group discussion (Department for Education 1995). These tasks are known to be difficult for deaf children since they rely not only on linguistic ability, but also on good listening ability in generally unfavourable acoustic settings such as a classroom group discussion. The tasks also require competence in conversational skills such as turn-taking, repairs and topic changes (Wood, Wood, Griffiths and Howarth 1986; Girolametto, Greenberg and Manolson 1986).

The skills that children bring to bear on the performance of these tasks are complex, and have as much to do with the home culture as with the school culture, and need to be attended to by professionals who are both providing for the children's special needs, and
then testing them to check that progress is being made. In depth analysis of real conversations that deaf children have with their carers will be informative and helpful in this regard, and it is one of the aims of the present study to provide this.

To return now to the debate about strategies for intervention for deaf children, there are the three communication and educational options currently available to deaf children in this country. These are Auditory-Oral; Total Communication and Bilingualism (Lynas 1994). A brief outline of each option will set the scene for later discussion of the findings of this study.

The aim of Auditory-Oralism is for deaf children to achieve fluent and intelligible oral communication and a mastery of both the verbal and the written form of the language. This is to be done by effective use of residual hearing with the best possible amplification, and provision of appropriate natural language experience. Many professionals in the field make the moral case for this option, presenting it as the best preparation deaf children can get for taking part in the hearing world, and indicating that it makes equal opportunities for deaf children a reality. There is ample research evidence to attest to the success of the approach, but perennial problems remain unanswered, such as possible suppression of a deaf child’s ‘Deaf’ identity; the possibility that ‘perfect’ conditions may need to pertain before the option can be successful; and the persistent failure of the approach for profoundly deaf children.

The aim of Total Communication (TC) is to promote effective communication and linguistic understanding by the combined use of signed and spoken language. In spite of TC’s seemingly common-sense underlying assumptions, research has shown that there are more problems with the approach than there are solutions. Several studies in Britain and elsewhere have indicated that the approach does not lead to better educational performance (British Deaf Association 1990; Hansen 1990; Paul 1988). The notion of total/simultaneous communication is beset with practical and theoretical difficulties. for example, the presentation of speech and sign together can be slow and inaccurate and it is by no means clear that deaf children can follow both auditory and visual delivery simultaneously (Matthews and Reich 1993; Lai and Lynas 1991).

The third option is Bilingualism, the basic premise of which is that communication in natural sign language (BSL in the U.K.) facilitates later educational achievement,
particularly with regard to literacy, and that this will lead to equal opportunities for deaf children. This is achieved by the deaf child acquiring BSL as her/his first language, and then learning the verbal language as a second language, mainly in the written form. Speech is de-emphasised. Bilingualism is the option favoured by the Deaf community, many of whom reject the medical model of disability and the so-called ‘normalisation conspiracy’ (Beazley and Moore 1995). Bilingualism is being implemented in the U.K., for example, in schools in Leeds, at the Royal School for the Deaf (Derby) and at Frank Barnes primary school in London.

A parallel has been drawn between the Bilingualism literature between verbal second language acquisition and the acquisition of sign language and spoken language (Paul 1992). Although researchers have questioned the validity of this way of thinking (Mayer and Wells 1996), the debate about Bilingualism in deaf education is relevant to the current research. However, there are problems in the implementation of this option, for example, the practical issues associated with learning to sign, both by the teachers and by the parents, particularly if they are normally hearing people who have not had much exposure to deafness prior to the diagnosis of deafness in their child. This is an especially important consideration for families from other cultures, as is the case with the children in this study. In recommending this option, and in hoping for its success, professionals would need to understand the hearing parents’ attitudes to disability in general, and to deafness in particular. They would also need to comprehend the cultural implications of adding sign language to the family’s language repertoire, and the practical constraints on the learning of sign language. The Muslim mothers of Sylheti children, for example, would have considerable obstacles to overcome in learning sign language such as attendance at classes, affording and navigating the transportation system; being exposed to perceived dangers in the outside world; being taught to sign by a male teacher, or by someone who may not speak Sylheti, to name but a few.

The entire field of education of the deaf child is beset with uncertainty and moral dilemmas. The central ethical issue relates to the question of who should be the final arbiter of what is best for a deaf child: - the parents ? the children ? the hearing professionals ? the Deaf community ? and to how adequate resources could be made available. This point was raised recently by Hindley and Daniels (1996) who asked for
"... reasoned comparisons of different forms of intervention and the vital argument concerning the use of scarce resources... and... discussions involving deaf children in decisions about their future". (Hindley and Daniels 1996 p.9).

These issues will be addressed again later, and this further discussion will be enhanced by the reviews of three additional and related topic areas which follow in Chapter 2, and which have considerable bearing on the issues raised above. These are the demographic trends with regard to deafness and to minority groups in the U.K and in London in particular; the Sylheti community in London; and the way in which so-called 'bilingualism' is viewed in the literature, the diversity of languages and the pattern of language use in minority language communities.
CHAPTER 2

BILINGUALISM AND SYLHETI SPEAKERS

3.1 THEORETICAL ISSUES IN BILINGUALISM

This chapter begins with a brief review of terminology, since the words used to describe concepts and practices in the field of bilingualism are sometimes ambiguous and may be differently characterised by various writers and researchers in the field. As Martin-Jones and Romaine (1986) pointed out, much of the bilingualism literature reflects "the ideological bias of linguistic theory which has been primarily concerned with the idealised competence of monolingual speakers in Western Europe and the United States; communities which on the whole have a high degree of stability, autonomy and historicity, and possess highly codified standard languages" (Martin-Jones and Romaine 1986 p. 33).

However, this view does not reflect the remarkable diversity and complexity of ways of speaking used by all language communities, and especially by those who are able to speak more than one language.

The term bilingualism has defied precise definition (Romaine, 1994). It is frequently used rather loosely in connection with both first and second language learning. It is also the name given to the study of the phenomenon of speakers knowing and using two languages. Sometimes in the literature, the word 'bilingualism' is also used quite broadly to refer to speakers of more than two languages, although this phenomenon may more accurately be called multilingualism, which implies knowledge and use of more than two languages. Bilingualism in the area of Deafness means the use of both a signed and a spoken language. Second language acquisition is perhaps a less confusing term, referring to the learning of a subsequent language (or languages) once proficiency in the first language has been acquired.
Descriptions of bilingualism include discussion of the following notions. The first concerns proficiency, that is, how well the speaker knows each of the languages; or the degree to which the speaker is proficient in each language. The second concerns the uses to which the individual puts the various languages in her/his repertoire, in other words, the function which the languages serve for the speaker. Then there are the interrelated notions of code-switching and code-mixing. Code-switching indicates the occasions on which, and the extent to which the speaker changes from using one language to using another. Code-mixing concerns the circumstances and reasons for a speaker combining the languages in their talk.

There is also a variety of words used to describe the language which a speaker feels most comfortable using, for example, first language; vernacular; mother tongue; home language; native language. In this thesis, there will mainly be reference to ‘first language’ (L1) and, by the same token, to ‘second language’ (L2) (Duncan 1989). With regard to L2, which is English for the families in this study, there will be reference to English as the second language (E2L).

An important notion in this study is that of the linguistic minority. This broad term is frequently used in the literature and is taken here to mean a community of people living in a country, whose speaking of a particular language sets them apart from other communities in that country. Schellekens (1996) has recommended use of the term ‘language minority’ rather than ‘linguistic minority’, as the former is without connotations of the discipline of linguistics, and implies language use in everyday life. However, for the purposes of the current discussion, the term ‘linguistic minority’ is considered to be appropriate. Hoffman (1991) distinguishes different types of linguistic minority. There are those indigenous communities whose language is not the official language of the state in which they live (for reasons such as alterations in state frontiers) but is an official language elsewhere, as would be the case for example, for the German community living in Denmark. There are also those indigenous communities who can be considered as linguistic minorities because their language is not the official language of any state. Examples are the Welsh in the U.K. and the Basques in Spain. Deaf people for whom Sign Language is L1 could also be considered in this group. There are those communities which are not long established in a state, whose members (or their parents or grandparents) have relatively recently moved to that state for various reasons. This latter type of
linguistic minority is common in many countries in the developed West which is seen as being relatively stable in political and economic terms, and thus attracts people from less stable countries. Examples abound, such as the Chinese communities in North America and in the U.K., and North African communities in France and Spain.

In the U.K., such communities have burgeoned, particularly since 1945, with immigration and economic migration following events such as the granting of independence to former colonies, and various other political and geophysical upheavals throughout the world. The Bangladeshi community in the U.K. falls into this category. Refugee communities may have a status in the host country which is different from that of immigrant communities.

In any type of linguistic minority, issues to do with the language spoken by that minority and the language spoken by the majority or host community are crucial, for example, the perception of the relative status of the two languages. Linguistic minority groups are also 'cultural aggregates'. In addition to having a different L1, they often also have a distinct cultural and ethnic identity distinct from that of the majority culture and from other minority cultures in that society. Multiculturalism and multilingualism are features of most large cities in the U.K.

"Multi-culturalism is best understood through multilingualism, because language as a vehicle carries the most precious load of culture of which it itself is a part. Language is the most important among all identity markers."
(Pattanayak 1987 p. 44)

Having said this, however, the U.K. is a monolingual country, insofar as English is used for all official purposes and is also the L1 of the majority. Other monolingual countries like France and the United States of America also use one official language, the language of the majority, for education, religion, the media, and of course, for interpersonal communication. In contrast, in much of the rest of the world, speaking more than one language is the norm, and learning another (or a few other) languages is an important focus of education. Where two languages are used proficiently and frequently by adults to each other and to their children, the children acquire both languages and thus also become bilingual, as is the case in the province of Quebec in Canada. People in many countries in Africa, and especially on the Indian sub-continent, have a complex language repertoire and multilingualism is the norm. In Bangladesh, for example, Muslim people speak the
language/dialect of their region as their L1, for example, Sylheti from Sylhet district. They receive their formal education in standard Bengali (which differs significantly from Sylheti, as will be shown later). They learn Arabic mainly for religious purposes, and children are taught English as a compulsory subject in school.

This rich pattern of language use in the daily life of a multilingual family will undergo changes if that family is living away from home. A family like this, living in the U.K., must use more English, which will become an increasingly important part of their language repertoire (Alladina and Edwards 1991). The minority language (and any other language the family may be accustomed to using) will be employed at home by the family members but use of the majority language of the community will mainly have to be learned and used outside the home. The adults may have learned English at school, in their country of origin, and their proficiency will depend on the level of schooling they achieved and the opportunities they had to use English. Once in the U.K., they will be obliged to use English in certain situations, and may or may not have to learn English. Clearly, opportunities for learning or improving English vary across the country, and the uptake of these also varies depending on the individual. Levels of proficiency in English by adult immigrants is difficult to measure with any accuracy. The Policy Studies Institute has recently analysed the latest data provided by the Office of National Statistics Labour Force Survey (Madood and Berthoud 1997; Jones 1996). One of the main conclusions following this analysis is that assumptions about the adult immigrant population developing fluency in English just as a result of living and working in an English-speaking environment are incorrect.

Children from linguistic minority families are likely to attend local schools where the National Curriculum is delivered in English. They will be expected to develop some proficiency in both spoken and written English. Data about competence in English is difficult to collect, not readily available and tends to be complex and difficult to interpret, as Schellekens (1996) points out. However, most normally hearing children manage to achieve some proficiency in spoken English whilst also retaining a certain level of proficiency in their L1 and the other languages used in their family home.
Several writers (such as Duncan 1989) describe the particular difficulties arising from what can be termed a 'dual language input' for children whose speech and language is not developing normally. Deaf children are a case in point: they will be receiving language input in one or two languages from their families at home and they are then also expected to somehow cope with educational input in English. In this regard, the conditions for language acquisition by the deaf child from a multilingual family are substantially different from those for the deaf child whose monolingual family speaks only English.

Up to this point, this discussion has avoided trying to quantify what 'ideal' bilingualism or multilingualism is, although in much of the literature there is the assumption that there is such a thing as the 'complete' or 'balanced' bi/multilingual speaker, someone who has perfect competence in two (or more) languages. There are those who are indeed proficient in several languages, but they are exceptional. Duncan (1989) points out that a bilingual speaker may well be proficient in her/his additional language, but this may be a non-standard form of that language, and it may not be the same, structurally or pragmatically, as that language when spoken by a native speaker. In the educational and rehabilitation world, a corollary to the concept of proficient bilingualism is that anyone who does not live up to this ideal is somehow deficient, and that their deficiency can be measured and compared with the ideal. 'Deficient' speakers of more than one language who display proficiency in none have in the past been described as being 'semilingual', a term originally coined by Hansegard (1968, cited by Romaine 1989), and developed by Cummins (1979) and Skutnabb-Kangas (1981; 1984; cited in Romaine 1989) mainly in the attempt to explain the poor academic performance of immigrant children. It is pertinent to explore the notion of semilingualism further at this point since it may have relevance when considering the linguistic competence of some of the children in the current study.

Semilingualism excited heated debate in the 1980s (Martin-Jones and Romaine 1986; Edelsky, Altwerger, Barkin, Flores, Hudelson and Jilbert 1983). As with other terms in this area, semilingualism is difficult to define and is inconsistently used. Cummins (1979) used the term to describe children with less than 'native-like' skills in their two languages, which lack of skill had damaging consequences for cognitive
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1 Cummins later disassociated himself from the term (Cummins and Swain 1983)
and academic performance. Hoffman (1991) summarises the generally accepted negative connotations of the term which imply that if a person uses two languages this will have a deleterious effect on language ability, leading to problems in both languages. The concept appears to contain some potentially misleading conceptions regarding the relationship between linguistic and cognitive competence in terms of scholastic performance (Hoffman 1991).

Cummins (1979) formulated a series of hypotheses about types of bilingualism ('additive'; 'dominant'; 'semilingualism') each of which would reflect differences in cognitive development dependent on the level of competence achieved. By testing this competence, the outcome of educational programmes for linguistic minority children could be determined. Competence could be tested at two levels: firstly, 'basic interpersonal communication skills' (BICS) that is, surface fluency with the help of contextual clues, and secondly 'cognitive academic language proficiency' (CALP). Cummins (ibid 1979) suggested that the cognitive competence required for the performance of intellectually demanding tasks was dependent on the relationship between L1 and L2, and that learning in L2 could only progress effectively if the child in question was proficient in both L1 and L2. This was Cummins' 'developmental interdependence hypothesis'. Romaine (1989) gives examples of several studies which set out to investigate the suggested interdependence between cognitive, linguistic and academic skills. In most of the studies there are several problematic variables which produce in inconclusive results. For example, it is difficult to distinguish the effects of schooling (which has cultural overtones) from those of cognitive development, on test performance. Also open to question is the way in which different aspects of language are compartmentalised in order to make linguistic measures. Only some aspects of language, such as pronunciation and vocabulary, may be measurable in a quantifiable manner. Others, such as effective communication, are not. Furthermore, as Romaine (1989) notes, in the case of literacy measures, neither BICS nor CALP have been shown to be effective predictors of performance.

Semilingualism was employed by its proponents as a framework from which interpretations could be made of performance indicators from a variety of linguistic test procedures conducted mainly in the school setting. If a child's performance on such tests was of a poor standard, s/he may be considered to be 'semilingual'. The
concept appeared to have little to do with real interactive communicative ability in
one or other language. Forming the basis for assessment of proficiency, it implies a
deficit model of language competence. This has socio-political overtones, for
example, in the potential for negative characterisation of immigrant children. In this
way, the concept of semilingualism could be considered to be potentially perjorative,
or even "belittling and disparaging" (Baker 1993 p. 9). Negative concepts like
semilingualism could filter down to influence accounts of behaviour in inter-racial
situation. An example is given by Jupp, Roberts and Cook-Gumperz (1985). They
point out that in the case of South Asians in Britain, differences in language
background and use of both mother tongue and of English have resulted in a
perceived difference in their communicative power, which is reflected in employment
opportunities. This in itself can be considered as an overt cause of interethnic
tension, particularly in the workplace.

In the current study, the concept of semilingualism has not been used in accounting
for the communicative interactions which are investigated. As will be seen in chapter
3, quantitative measures of language performance were found to be unhelpful in
providing insights into patterns of spoken communication. In the context of Sylheti-
speaking people living in the U.K., and of deaf children from Sylheti-speaking
families in particular, it seems more appropriate to consider the richness in the
varieties of Sylheti and English which may be used, rather than to estimate the level
of completeness of bilingualism or the possibility of semilingualism in any one family
member, especially since proficiency is estimated by the employment of
assessment methods which may or may not be valid. It is hoped, in this study, that
the methodology which adopts an ethnographic rather than a quantitative approach
(as will be explained in Chapter 4), will enable a perspective to be gained which will
avoid value judgements about language competence, for deaf children, whose
language acquisition can be problematic, and for children learning English. It is by
no means clear what language deaf children whose families speak Sylheti do actually
learn as their first language. Given the generally complex pattern of language use in the
families, the possibility exists that the deaf child's first language is neither the 'mother
tongue' used by her/his parents nor is it the English used in the community.
In the following section, which is a review of the numbers of both deaf children and
children from minority language groups in London, the need for an open-minded
approach is put into a demographic perspective.
2.2 DEMOGRAPHIC TRENDS: DEAFNESS AND LINGUISTIC MINORITIES

2.2.1 Deafness

Recent data (Davis, 1993a and 1993b) indicate that the incidence of permanent prelingual sensori-neural deafness (better ear hearing level average >50dBHL) in children in the U.K. is approximately 1:1000. Information about how many of these children come from families where English is not the first language is rather more difficult to obtain. Recently, Naeem and Newton (1996) have shown that the prevalence of moderate to profound hearing loss in the better ear in Asian children was higher (5.79 per 1000) than for non-Asian children (1.4 per 1000). Sutton and Rowe (1997) indicate that being of Asian origin represents a risk factor for childhood sensori-neural hearing loss with an odds ratio of 2.5. Official statistics concerning deaf children in particular however, have not normally included information about linguistic groups (personal communication, National Deaf Children’s Society Information Officer 1995). With regard to children who receive special educational provision, Speedy (1987) reported that 9.7% of school-aged children in special schools for the deaf and 7.3% of the children in units for the hearing impaired or needing specialist mainstream support were from a South Asian background. More recently, Turner (1996a; 1996b) surveyed the provision of educational services for pre-school hearing impaired children throughout the U.K. She found that of the 2118 pre-school children who were being provided for by the responding health authorities, 12.2% were from South Asian (Indian, Pakistani and Bangladeshi) backgrounds. Separating out the figures for all the inner London boroughs, Turner (1996b) found that the proportion rose to 20.4%. As was mentioned in the Introduction, at the time of this study, there were 51 deaf children statemented for special needs in the London Borough of Tower Hamlets, and 25 of these were from Sylheti families.

Some efforts have been made to try to account for these high numbers. Vanniasegaram, Tungland and Bellman (1993) indicated that the prevalence of hearing loss (> 50dBHL in the better ear) was more than three times the national average in the London Borough of Tower Hamlets, and more than two times the national average in

2 These figures were provided by the Asian Parents Association for Special Needs in Tower Hamlets; The Special Needs Department, London Borough of Tower Hamlets; Culloden School and Frank Barnes School.
the London borough of Hackney. These statistics are attributed to a high incidence of congenital rubella and to the high incidence of mendelian deafness in the Bangladeshi population of these boroughs. Vanniasegaram et al. (ibid) relate this latter finding to the high ratio of consanguineous marriages in the Bangladeshi community. Al-Shihabi (1994) showed that the incidence of idiopathic sensori-neural hearing loss in children from consanguineous marriages was four times higher than those from non-consanguineous marriages. In spite of these findings, the question of consanguineous marriages being a causative factor in deafness can be a sensitive issue to members of the communities concerned, and should be treated as such by western professionals. Naeem and Newton (1996) point out that the prevalence of sensori-neural hearing loss in Asian communities is expected to decline in the future on account of factors such as the reduction in numbers of new immigrants, and, because subsequent generations may break the tradition of arranged marriages, thus reducing consanguinity effects.

2.2.2 Linguistic Minorities

Reliable statistics concerning linguistic minority groups are notoriously difficult to obtain (Smith, 1982; 1985; Linguistic Minorities Project 1985). Before it was disbanded in 1989, the Inner London Education Authority regularly published useful local statistics. Since the inclusion of a question on ethnicity in the 1991 Census (Census Monitors 1991), it has become somewhat easier to predict the numbers of people within linguistic minority groups from the numbers of people answering the question about ethnicity. Recent publications from the Runnymede Trust (1987; 1993), the Centre for Information on Language Teaching and Research (Hansford 1997), the Policy Studies Institute (Jones 1996; Madood and Berthoud 1997) and the London Research Centre (1995) have addressed the issue in some depth. As Hansford (1997) points out, local groups such as Education Authorities and Racial Equality Councils do collect information on local issues, but may not have the resources to collect and publish statistics. The Department of Education and Employment conduct regular surveys of schools and data concerning pupils with English as their second language in both primary and secondary schools in all Local Education Authorities is available. Whilst it is still difficult to be precise, the following section provides an outline of demographic information about the Bangladeshi community, mainly in the London Borough of Tower Hamlets.
The 1991 Census indicated that in the whole of the U.K., 6% of the population (about 3 million people) are from all ethnic minorities, half of whom (3%) are of South Asian origin (India, Pakistan, Bangladesh). Nearly half (46%) of the 3 million people from all ethnic minorities live in London. The following figures are extracted from the London Research Centre's report on the 1991 census data relating to the capital (Storkey 1994). The ethnic minorities represent over 20% of London's population, 7% being of South Asian origin: 1.3% are Bangladeshi, numbering about 86,000 people, most of whom live in the London Borough of Tower Hamlets. With regard to the numbers of children, one of the last reports of the Inner London Education Authority showed that 45% of the child population in Tower Hamlets and 13% in Hackney, were from Sylheti speaking families (ILEA Biennial Survey 1989), and in that same year, the Sylheti speaking population alone accounted for 50% of live births in those two boroughs (Hackney and Tower Hamlets Child Health Statistics, 1989). The next biggest Bangladeshi group in London is found in Camden, and a smaller community lives in Newham.

2.2.3 Deafness and linguistic minorities in schools

In 1989, the Inner London Education Authority (ILEA 1989) indicated that in some districts of London alone, 50% of children did not have English as a first language. Recent statistics from the Tower Hamlets Strategy Group (1995) similarly show that just over half the school population of the borough came from families of Bangladeshi origin, where the predominant language spoken is assumed to be Sylheti. These estimates are reflected in the 1996 Schools' Census data (Department for Education and Employment 1996) which indicate that 56.3% of the pupils in both primary and secondary schools in Tower Hamlets did not have English as their first language (unfortunately the first language is not specified). There is no data concerning the level of competence in English by these pupils. In 1989, the ILEA survey suggested that the E2L children did begin to learn English when they started school at age 5 years, but that 25% of them were still not fluent in English at secondary school level (ILEA 1989). Some sources of data suggest that in inner London primary schools, 19.4% of pupils are not fluent in English (London Research Centre 1995).
There are some statistics of this kind available for deaf children. In 1987 Speedy conducted an ‘ethnic’ survey of 592 schools and units for deaf and hearing-impaired children. Based on a return rate of 72%, she showed that approximately 88% of the pupils in the schools and units were English and spoke English at home and 2% were from Afro-Caribbean backgrounds with English spoken at home. Approximately 9% were from Asian backgrounds and did not have English at home and a further 1% were from ‘other’ backgrounds, with the first language ‘not known’. More recently, in a study of deaf pupils in ordinary secondary schools, Powers (1996) showed that in his sample (N=335), 77.6% were categorised as White and 22.4% were from ethnic minority groups. The breakdown of the ethnic minority groups showed the following results: 2.7% were Black, 3.6% Indian, 4.1% ‘other’ and 12% were Pakistani/Bangladeshi. In addition, Powers comments that the proportion of deaf pupils from Pakistani/Bangladeshi backgrounds was almost five times that for the population at large. With regard to first language, Powers (1996) does not detail specific languages spoken at home, but his statistics indicate that 11% of the sample had a language other than English at home, and 7% of the sample had an ‘other’ language plus English at home.

Turner’s survey of service provision for pre-school hearing-impaired children (1996b) addressed the question of first language more directly, and included a question which asked ‘for how many children in each ethnic group is English not the predominant language?’ Responses to this question indicated that 18% of the South Asian ethnic group in London did not have English as the predominant language. Whilst it is not clear what the predominant language actually is, the figure for the South Asian group is very high compared to other ethnic groups. For instance, in the Black African group in London, only 2.3% did not have English as the predominant language.

An important implication of not having English as the predominant language appears to relate to educational achievement. Powers (1996) showed clearly that examination results for deaf pupils at GCSE level were affected by both the ethnic background of the pupils, and the main language used at home. The most striking effect was that of the 335 pupils in the sample, only 5% who did not have English as
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3 With the permission of the author, the percentages used here have been calculated from the figures used in the original text (Speedy 1987)
the main language at home achieved 5 or more A-C grades. 16% of the sample who did have English as the main language achieved A-C grades.

By way of contrast, it is of interest to consider some performance indicators for normally hearing E2L pupils. The Runnymede Trust (Runnymede Trust 1993) quotes data from the Tower Hamlets chief education officer’s report for 1992, in which it is made clear that there is a high correlation between educational achievement and fluency in English in bilingual pupils. According to this report, children who spoke languages other than English at home, but who were reasonably proficient in English by age 7 years, “performed way above” the average for children who spoke only English (Runnymede Trust 1993 p. 17). It was also the case that at age 10, children who were fluently bilingual “achieved way above” the average performance when compared to other 10 year olds in London. At the time of writing, no information was available concerning the competence in English of deaf pupils. In a recent move, a consortium of organisations concerned with deafness, led by the Royal National Institute for the Deaf, have launched a research initiative to investigate the achievements of deaf pupils in both special educational establishments and in ordinary schools (Royal National Institute for the Deaf 1997).

2.3 DIVERSITY OF LANGUAGES AND PATTERNS OF LANGUAGE USE

Children in schools in the U.K. speak a huge variety of languages and dialects. In London alone more than 180 languages were identified by the Linguistic Minorities Project in 1985. With the changing demographic patterns, and the movement of people around the world in response to various political and geophysical events, the range of languages found in London schools is now more diverse. Hansford (1997) notes that while information about longer established linguistic groups is available, information about more recently arrived groups, particularly refugee groups, is less easily obtained. This is borne out by recent data from the London Research Centre (1995). Their statistics indicate that 40.4% of primary pupils in inner London did not have English as their main language. 16.5% of these spoke named languages, the most commonly named main language was reported to be Bengali (9%). 23.9% of pupils who did not have English as their main language, spoke languages listed as “other” or “unclassified”. In 1987, Sylheti was also listed as one of the most
commonly used languages after English in London schools (ILEA Language Census 1987).

Of the schools which agreed to take part in the current study, at the time, one had 40% Sylheti-speaking children in the HIU and the other had 30% of its children from homes where English is the second language with a variety of first languages.

Not only is there a diversity of languages spoken by multilingual families, but within these families, there is a complex pattern of language use. This pattern is made up of a number of factors. There are the family's individual and collective attitudes and behaviours with respect to languages, particularly the attitude of the family to the perceived status of their first language, and to the learning and use of English (personal communication, Duncan 1992; Moffat 1990; Smith 1985; Chalmers 1996). Then there is the relative proficiency of family members in their first language, and in other 'home' or minority languages, as well as their ability to speak English. These factors reflect complex social and economic elements which are difficult to quantify, but which cannot be ignored. Their influence on the overall performance of the children speaking both L1 and E2L could be considerable (Moffat 1990; Sharma and Love 1991).

For Sylheti-speaking families, the dominant language is Sylheti, but it is likely that in many such families a certain amount of English will be spoken at home. This depends on factors such as the length of time various members have lived in the U.K. and their educational background, and the number and age of siblings who are at school learning in English. The older children often speak English among themselves at home, and reserve use of their first language for communication with the adults, especially with older women who often do not use English. The children usually attend 'Saturday school' where they are taught to read and write standard Bengali. In Muslim families, a knowledge of Arabic for religious ceremonial purposes is essential, especially for boys. Media influences are important: some family members may watch English language television programmes, but in many families, 'Bollywood' videos, usually in Hindi, are standard viewing fare. Some families may listen to audio tapes of Sylheti comedians, or to local radio stations which may include Sylheti broadcasts.
2.4 THE SYLHETI-SPEAKING BANGLADESHI COMMUNITY IN LONDON

The following description of the Sylheti-speaking Bangladeshi community is by no means a complete picture. It is important to remember that the information concerning the community presented here does not convey the strength of cultural, social and political activity and organisation within the community itself and the ongoing reformulation of the community’s character, influenced by many social, political and economic factors such as the rise of Islamic fundamentalism; the rise of (white) right wing nationalism; the Diaspora dilemma (that is, British vs Bangladeshi identity); and the currently static economic situation, to name but a few. More detailed expositions of these issues are available elsewhere. For purposes of this study, a discussion of some details concerning the Sylheti-speaking community will help to put into context the social and economic conditions of families from that community whose child is deaf. This provides a background to the data which will be presented later, and will also contribute to the discussion of issues relating to service provision for all deaf children.

2.4.1 The Sylheti language

About 64% of Bangladeshis currently living in London were born in Bangladesh, mainly in the Sylhet district of the north-eastern Division of Sylhet. Hence, the majority of Bangladeshis in London speak the regional language of that Division, which is known as Sylheti. In spite of the size of the London community, there has been relatively little research into its unique nature until relatively recently (see Eade and Momen 1995 for a detailed bibliography) and particularly little attention has been directed towards the Sylheti language per se (Smith 1985; Chalmers 1996; Eade 1990). It is curious to note that Sylheti speakers in Britain rarely refer to their language as ‘Sylheti’, usually calling it ‘Banga’ or ‘Bengali’ since it is the language spoken by almost the entire Bangladeshi, or Bengali community in this country.

Sylheti is not ‘standard’ Bengali, but, according to Chalmers (1996), Sylheti speakers regard it as ‘standard’, since they define standard Bengali from the perspective of their regional version of the language, that is, Sylheti. Although in
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Bangladesh itself, standard Bengali is the official language, there are numerous different but related speech varieties, one of which is Sylheti. There is adequate research to indicate that Sylheti (and particularly the Sylheti spoken in Britain) can be considered to be distinct from standard Bengali (Chalmers 1996; Spratt and Spratt 1987; Eade 1990). Chalmers (1996) demonstrates that in addition to its linguistic particularity, Sylheti's distinctiveness is threefold, having to do with the history and geography of the Division of Sylhet; the unique use of Nagari script in the literary tradition, and the size of the overseas Sylheti community. In keeping with other academic work in this field, in the chapters that follow, the language spoken by the Bangladeshi community in London will be referred to as Sylheti, in order to clearly distinguish it from standard Bengali.

2.4.2 The Sylheti-speaking community

The current Sylheti-speaking community in the East End of London was established in the post World War II years, although there is a century-long shipping connection between Sylhet and Britain. The Division of Sylhet in Bangladesh is a densely populated rural area, supporting subsistence agriculture in a Muslim village society where traditions such as extended families, arranged marriages, 'purdah' and the passing of wealth through the males are practised. The region's history of political instability and poverty over the years led to the common practice of men migrating to port cities such as Chittagong, to look for work. Many were employed there by foreign shipping companies as seamen, and travelled to other countries where they often remained, ostensibly to work there on a temporary basis with the intention of returning to their families in Sylhet when they had accumulated money and status. In this way, many men landed in London's Docklands in the 1950s and 1960s. Because of the colonial 'voucher' system, those who were able to, brought their kinsmen over to London, also hoping for economic opportunities which would augment their family income. Although they aimed to return, the jobs that were available (in the rag trade, for example) were not paid well enough to make this possible, and gradually the myth of return faded. Instead, the men sent for their families to join them in the U.K.

Although emigration slowed after the independence of Bangladesh in 1971, the practice of bringing family members to the U.K. continued; marriages were
arranged, and wives and children joined their husbands. After independence, there was still political and economic instability in Bangladesh, and whilst still maintaining strong ties with ‘home’ and an enduring desire to return, many families stayed in the U.K. In this way, a relatively homogenous Bangladeshi community in London has become established.

The community has a fairly distinct identity, given by its language, regional affiliation, religion, dietary customs, marriage and kinship traditions, despite the fact that the younger generation are naturally absorbing many aspects of western culture. The community is, however, constrained by its socio-economic position. In the mid-1980s Carey and Shukur and other observers noted that employment was scarce because of the closure of the docks, the changing trade cycles of the local economy and the lack of inner city industrial policies (Carey and Shukur 1985; Smith 1985). The situation has not improved in spite of the growing service economy to the community itself (such as restaurants and local shops) and which is gradually spreading to serve other communities (many of the ‘Indian’ restaurants in London are in fact Bangladeshi). Men will accept work even if the conditions are poor, but many families rely on state benefits.

A recent report (Wrench and Qureshi 1996) shows, among other findings, the relationship between educational achievement and employment in young Bangladeshi men. This bears out findings from the 1991 Census which showed that more than 35% of Bangladeshis over 16 years of age are unemployed, with less than 1% over the age of 18 years having any qualifications higher than school-leaving certificates (Storkey 1994). It is not clear where the qualifications referred to in the census were obtained. Most Bangladeshis who emigrated as adults will have had some education in Bangladesh. Women are likely to have completed at least 5 years of primary school, and men to have gone on to take part in the examination system equivalent to the British secondary school system (Gregory, Mace and Rashid 1993). Carey and Shukur (1985) point out that the older generation are gradually changing their expectations of their children, and encouraging education as a means to improving circumstances, rather, for example, than encouraging them to go into a family enterprise of some sort. This trend mirrors that found in other communities in the U.K., for example in Newcastle, the Chinese community are
reported to encourage their children to train for higher status employment rather than to enter the family catering business (Milroy and Wei 1990).

A report by the Runnymede Trust (1993) indicated that from 1989 to 1992 the staying-on rate for Bangladeshi pupils after GCSE rose from 35% to 60%. The report also indicated considerable improvement in school results for these pupils over that time period, although the government's secondary school league tables for 1993 showed that only 18.9% of pupils in Tower Hamlets achieved 5 or more GCSE subjects at grades A-C (Runnymede Trust 1993).

For Bangladeshi women, expectations are mainly that they will stay in the home, although there are anecdotal reports of an increase in the number of girls staying longer in the education system. Moving about can be difficult for the women, because of the purdah system, and because of fear of racial harassment. 'Staying at home' in Tower Hamlets is of course very different to doing so in the extended family set-up in Sylhet. The extended family is different here, and women may have only a few if any of their own family in London, having come here to join their husbands. The type of accommodation is also clearly very different: over 70% of the Bangladeshi community live in overcrowded accommodation (more than 1.5 persons per room) in council housing, much of it in the form of high-rise flats (Storkey 1994). According to Carey and Shukur (1985) fear of racism has led to overcrowding in the relatively few areas regarded as being 'safe'.

Furthermore, the largest proportion of the Bangladeshi community in London is under the age of 15 years, with very few over the age of 60, and of the South Asian ethnic group, the Bangladeshis had the highest rates of what the census refers to as 'limiting long term illness' across all age groups. Incidentally, this category in the Census included illnesses such as chronic heart conditions and hypertension: there was no question relating to the incidence of disabilities such as deafness. As was noted above, there seems to be a higher incidence of deafness in Tower Hamlets than in other boroughs. From this information, a picture of families with many dependants, some possibly ill or disabled, living in unsatisfactory accommodation with few financial resources in a relatively tense inner city area begins to emerge.
2.5 CONCLUDING REMARKS

From the point of view of rehabilitation, when a child in any family is diagnosed as being deaf, parents, teachers of the deaf, speech and language therapists, and other professionals will be concerned with the primary issue of that child's language development, in the context of that family's circumstances. The family will be counselled, and advised to speak to that child in order to foster language development. In the case of a family for whom English is not the first language, such as a Sylheti family, recommendations as to which language to speak to the child in are difficult to make. Some professionals suggest using the first language, others using English, or sometimes the family is advised to learn and use sign language with their deaf child. As was discussed in Chapter 1, there is much concern but no agreement amongst professionals as to the relative merits of these different approaches to language development in deaf children.

There is also no consensus concerning the advice given to parents about the best educational option for their deaf child: 'natural language' / 'auralism'; sign language/spoken language bilingualism or 'total communication' (Baker and Child 1993). Service delivery to families of deaf children is undoubtedly affected by the polarisation of professional views on these matters, (Beazley and Moore 1995) and nowhere is this complication more noticeable than in the case of deaf children from families who are not English-speaking. Considerations about speaking English or Sylheti, and using spoken or signed language could further complicate what may already be complex communication patterns in these families. Decisions and recommendations must be made with knowledge, and understanding, of the wider family and social context in order to be effective. These issues will be addressed again in the later chapters.

In this research, not only the conversational and linguistic abilities of deaf children, but also the fact of belonging to a family which has a language and culture distinct from English are of prime interest. The aim of the research is to investigate these two elements, which combine to make up the complex communicative environment of the deaf children being studied. As was mentioned in the Introduction, close examination of conversational interactions at home, in whatever language was the norm, was eventually considered to be the most effective way of achieving this aim.
Before progressing to the analyses of the conversations which are the main focus of the study, the findings of the preliminary group study will be presented, since the activity of conducting this study, as well as the results obtained, led to the subsequent use of the qualitative methodology of Conversation Analysis, which was employed for the main analyses.
CHAPTER 3.

PRELIMINARY STUDY TO INVESTIGATE HOW YOUNG CHILDREN'S COMPREHENSION OF ENGLISH IS AFFECTED BY DEAFNESS AND BY HAVING ENGLISH AS THEIR SECOND LANGUAGE.

3.1 BACKGROUND

As was pointed out in Chapter 1, the comprehension deficits in deaf children are reasonably well documented. These deficits tend to relate in particular to certain grammatical structures and inflectional word endings, such as word order (Bishop 1983) pronouns (Oshima-Takane, Cole and Yaremko 1993; McAnally, Rose and Quigley 1987) and negatives (Bishop 1983). Anecdotally, these comprehension deficits are reported to be even greater in deaf children who come from linguistic minority families for whom English is the second language. Since comprehension is clearly a prerequisite to successful communication, it was decided to carry out a study that would attempt to identify, with some precision, the nature of the comprehension deficits associated with deafness, with not having English as the first language and with a combination of these two together. Such information could provide important insights into the linguistic problems which underlie the Sylheti deaf children's difficulties in spoken interactions, and hence could also inform teaching and therapy with such clients.

In order to find out whether or not this was a viable line of research, a small scale preliminary study was conducted to address the question of how young children's comprehension of spoken language was affected by (1) deafness; (2) not having English as their first language and (3) a combination of (1) and (2).

The choice of a suitable test of verbal comprehension was difficult. There were no standardised or informal tests of verbal comprehension in Sylheti available in the U.K. at the time of planning this study (see also Mahon 1994). Since the population of children involved all attended schools where English is the medium of instruction, it was decided to use a suitable English test of verbal comprehension in an attempt to answer the research question. The rationale for this was that the use of a standardised English verbal comprehension test might provide useful data about the target group, that is, deaf E2L children, particularly if the performance of these children could be contrasted to that of children in the other groups, that is, deaf children from homes where English is the first language (E1L), normally hearing E2L children and normally hearing E1L children.
It was predicted that there would be a significant difference between the performance of all the normally hearing children and that of all the deaf children, and between all the E1L children and all the E2L children. Furthermore, it was also predicted that the normally hearing E2L children would perform better than the deaf E2L children.

3.2 Method

3.2.1 Subjects

Two primary schools in inner London with Units for Hearing Impaired children (HIU) had agreed to take part in the study. Children from these schools were to be selected for inclusion in this preliminary study. On the specific request of the head teachers, all the children attending the Nursery and Reception classes were to be considered for inclusion in the study. In the school in the London Borough of Tower Hamlets, approximately 70% of children came from homes where English is the second language and the first language is Sylheti. In the HIU of this school, approximately 40% of the deaf children had Sylheti as their first language. The second school in the London Borough of Islington had approximately 30% of children in the school as a whole, including the HIU, who were from homes where English is the second language with a variety of first languages.

The criteria for inclusion were:
- age range: four to five years;
- no reported learning difficulties at school;
- no reported difficulties with spoken language for the normally hearing children;
- no additional physical problems.

Additional criteria for the deaf children were:
- children for whom formal sign language was not their primary means of communication at home.
- children who were experienced users of amplification systems (hearing aids).
- children whose communication difficulties were mainly defined by their sensory hearing impairment.
Permission was obtained from the head teachers and appropriate inspectorate and management of the two schools. The parents of individual children were approached by letter for permission to include their children in the study.

The final sample included 44 children, 18 boys and 26 girls. As can be seen in Tables Ia to Id, the groups were of unequal size. This reflects the preliminary nature of the study, being an investigation of how, in two particular schools, young children’s comprehension of spoken language may be affected by both deafness and by not having English as a first language. The unequal group sizes also reflect the schools’ request to include all the children.

Table Ia: Hearing status and first language for all children in the sample (N=44)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deaf children</th>
<th>Normally hearing children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English as second language (E2L)</td>
<td>English as first language (E1L)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table Ia shows that of the 44 children, 11 were known to be deaf and were “statemented” for special educational provision on the basis of their hearing impairment. The audiological profiles for these children are given in Appendix 1. Of these 11 deaf children, 6 were from homes where English is the first language, and 5 were from homes where English is the second language.

Of the 33 normally hearing children, 23 were from homes where English is the first language, and 10 from homes where English is the second language. Although there were no reported consistent hearing problems for these 33 children, it must be taken into consideration that a proportion of them might have had fluctuating hearing problems due to otitis media with effusion at some time. Children who were reported by the teacher to have otitis media or severe upper respiratory tract infections on the day of testing were not included. The age, ethnic origin and first language distributions of the 44 children can be seen in Tables Ib; Ic; and Id below.
Table Ia: Age distribution of all children in sample (N=44)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age range in years</th>
<th>% of sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.0-4.2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3-4.6</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7-4.9</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.10-5.0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1-5.3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table Ib: Ethnic origin of children in sample (N=44)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic origin</th>
<th>Total % (N=44)</th>
<th>% Deaf (N=11)</th>
<th>% Hearing (N=33)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African/Caribbean</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table Ic: First language of all children in sample (N=44)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Total % (N=44)</th>
<th>% Deaf (N=11)</th>
<th>% Hearing (N=33)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sylheti</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Asian</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other + English</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2.2 Materials

The Test for the Reception of Grammar (TROG) (Bishop 1989) was used for this study. It is a test which provides a quantitative assessment of understanding of a set of grammatical contrasts in a formal test setting. Standardised age related norms for monolingual speakers of English ranging from four years to eighteen years are available. It also provides for a
qualitative assessment of ability if required. The test items include examples of a representative range of commonly used grammatical structures of English\(^1\)

Although the original standardisation studies of the TROG specifically excluded subjects who were hearing impaired and those who came from E2L families (Bishop 1989), the test has previously been used to investigate the comprehension abilities of deaf children (Bishop 1983), as was discussed in Chapter 1. The fact that Bishop's 1983 study specifically targeted the performance of deaf children set a precedent for using TROG with deaf children. The test is regularly used by speech and language therapists working with deaf children, and at the time this study was planned, it was the test of choice used by the speech and language therapists in the schools taking part in the study.

An additional reason for choosing the TROG for the current study concerns its format which is suitable for use with deaf children. Each test item is presented as a four-choice picture task. The child has to point to the 'correct' picture which corresponds to the verbal sentence given by the tester, and this does not require expressive speech from the child. Furthermore, the alternatives for several items include those which a deaf child might naturally choose. For example, in block E which tests negatives, the alternatives to the correct answer to item 13 "the boy is not running" (the picture for this item depicts a boy sitting down) are: "the boy is running", "the horse is running", "the cat is sitting". Since the word "not" is not easily lip-readable, deaf children might naturally choose the picture showing "the boy is running", a predictable error. A correct response to this item could therefore be indicative of true comprehension of the structure. The test also includes other constructions which, as was pointed out in Chapter 1, are considered to be difficult for deaf children, for example, pronouns (items in blocks I and G) and active/passive constructions (items in block L). Responses to these items could therefore, go some way to detailing comprehension difficulties in English. Since the subjects in the current study were being educated in an 'auditory/oral' environment, giving the test in a spoken mode was appropriate, and the question of signing the test (Bishop 1983) was not immediately relevant.

\(^1\) The constructions in the test include the following: two and three element combinations; personal pronoun; reversible active; singular/plural noun inflection; comparative/absolute; reversible passive; prepositions (in, on, above, below); postmodified subject; 'X but not Y'; 'not only X but also Y'; relative clause; 'neither X nor Y'; embedded sentence.
A related issue concerning the TROG was also of interest in this study. The available norms for the test start from age four years and it was considered that additional information about using the test with children of this age would be of value, since anecdotal evidence seemed to indicate that the test may not be adequately sensitive for this young age group, even for the normally hearing children.

3.2.3 Procedure

The children were tested individually in a small room next to their classrooms. The ambient noise levels were not ideal and varied considerably across test sessions, but never exceeded 45 dBA (measured with a Castle GA 201 sound level meter approximately at the level of each child's ears).

For the deaf children, the test was presented in the sound field with lip-reading cues. In order to approximate listening conditions such as those the child might experience at home, the deaf children used their personal post-aural hearing aids for the test session rather than the body-worn radio hearing aid systems used for classroom activity. The latter are not worn at home, and may have auditory features which differ from those of the children's personal aids. In order to ensure uniformity of delivery of the test stimuli, the author administered all the tests. Attention was paid to maintaining uniform prosody.

Since the main aim of using TROG in this study was a quantitative assessment of performance, vocabulary was only checked with the vocabulary cards if a child failed to respond. This was necessary for only one of the 44 children tested.

The test was started at Block A for all the children as recommended in the test manual (Bishop 1989). Normally, the test was stopped after a child had failed 5 consecutive blocks. For some children it was only possible to test a few blocks. In these cases, the test was stopped before five consecutive blocks were failed.

3.4 Results and Discussion

The analysis shows that, as predicted, there are highly significant differences between all the deaf children and all the normally hearing children and between all the E1L and all the E2L children. Further analysis also shows a significant difference between the normally
hearing E1L and normally hearing E2L children, but contrary to expectations, there is no significant difference between the deaf E1L and deaf E2L children.

Results are presented in two sections. Firstly, an analysis of the overall scores obtained by the groups of subjects, based on the number of test blocks passed. Secondly, a qualitative examination of patterns of performance on certain TROG items.

3.3.1 Quantitative analysis

a) Comparison of performance between deaf and normally hearing children, and between E1L and E2L children.

When the performance of all the deaf subjects was compared to that of all the normally hearing subjects on the total number of blocks passed, the difference between the two groups was significant, as had been expected ($p<0.01$, $W=843.5$, $N=44$, Mann-Whitney Confidence Interval and Test).

There is also a significant difference between all the E1L subjects vs all the E2L subjects on the total number of blocks passed ($p>0.005$, $W=843.5$, $N=44$, Mann-Whitney Confidence Interval and Test).

b) Normally hearing children.

As can be seen in Table II, the performance of the normally hearing subjects ($N=33$) which includes 10 E2L children, shows a high proportion of subjects who only pass a few blocks: 19 pass $<20\%$. This result accounted for the scores of the normally hearing E2L group: all ten subjects in this group pass only $<20\%$ of the blocks. Subsequently, as was expected, there is a significant difference between the normally hearing E1L group and the normally hearing E2L group in number of blocks passed ($p>0.01$, $W=158.5$, $N=33$, Mann-Whitney Confidence Interval and Test).
Table II: % of test blocks passed for normally hearing children.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of test blocks passed</th>
<th>All normally hearing (N=33)</th>
<th>normally hearing E1L (N=23)</th>
<th>normally hearing E2L (N=10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-70</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71-80</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-90</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91-100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It was of interest to examine the scores for the normally hearing E1L children (N=23) in the study more carefully since anecdotal evidence has suggested that the TROG might not be a sufficiently sensitive test to use with a younger age group. As can be seen in column 3 of Table II, the majority of children (19 of the 23) passed <50% of the blocks, only 3 passed between 51% and 60% and only one passed >60% of the blocks. When these scores are converted to centile equivalents (according to the age bands recommended in the TROG manual (Bishop 1989)) and shown in Table IIIa, three children scored at the 75th centile, five children scored at the 50th centile, and the rest of the children scored between the 1st and the 25th centile. The distribution of centile equivalents of scores is not dissimilar to that suggested by the TROG standardisation for this age group (Bishop 1989 p.17).
Table IIIa: Centile equivalents for normally hearing E1L subjects

| Centile equivalents for blocks passed [using age bands suggested in TROG manual (Bishop 1989)] | 
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| <1 | 5 | 10 | 25 | 50 | 75 | 90 | 95 | 99 |
| Number of normally hearing E1L children (N=23) | 3 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 3 |

Given the small number of subjects in these groups and the possibility of further sampling bias (since other variables, such as socio-economic rating, were not controlled for), it is not possible to comment further on these results. However, despite these concerns, it may be of interest to contrast the centile equivalents of the E2L normally hearing children with those of the E1L normally hearing children, as shown in Table IIIb below.

Table IIIb: Centile equivalents for normally hearing E1L and E2L subjects

| Centile equivalents for blocks passed [using age bands suggested in TROG manual (Bishop 1989)] | 
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| <1 | 5 | 10 | 25 | 50 | 75 | 90 | 95 | 99 |
| Number of normally hearing E1L children (N=23) | 3 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 3 |
| Number of normally hearing E2L children (N=10) | 4 | 5 | 1 |

c) Deaf children

As can be seen in Table IV, the deaf children as a whole passed very few blocks, 7 of the 11 children passed <10%, with only one child passing between 21% and 30%.
Table IV: Percentage of test blocks passed for deaf children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of test blocks passed</th>
<th>All deaf N=11</th>
<th>Deaf E1L N=6</th>
<th>Deaf E2L N=5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-70</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71-80</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-90</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91-100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results for the deaf children as a whole are comparable to the findings of Bishop (1983) in her study of primary school-aged deaf children. She showed that of the 18 children who were able to do the TROG, only one passed 40% of blocks and the others passed less than 25% of blocks.

There is no significant difference in the performance between the deaf E1L and the deaf E2L groups (p>0.5, W=33, N=11, Mann-Whitney Confidence Interval and Test). This result shows the 'floor' effect in evidence for these two groups. All the deaf children were only able to do very few of the test items, and in fact both the E1L and the E2L deaf children responded to less than 25% of the test items, as shown in Table V below.

In order to account for this finding, the raw data was examined more closely. When the test items were divided into those which concerned vocabulary (items in blocks A, B, and C) and those which concerned grammatical structures (blocks D - T) some interesting effects were noted. These results are shown in Table V.
Table V: Mean percentage of responses to all test items for the children in all groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>% total responses to all items on test</th>
<th>% total responses to 12 vocabulary items in Blocks A, B, C</th>
<th>% correct responses to vocabulary items in Blocks A, B, C</th>
<th>% total responses to 68 items in Blocks D - T</th>
<th>% correct responses to items in Blocks D - T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deaf E2L children N=5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>79.8</td>
<td>57.2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deaf E1L children N=6</td>
<td>23.33</td>
<td>77.67</td>
<td>60.17</td>
<td>13.33</td>
<td>30.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nH E2L children N=10</td>
<td>41.25</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>73.1</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>44.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nH E1L children N=23</td>
<td>62.17</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>92.17</td>
<td>55.09</td>
<td>67.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 nH = normally hearing

2 The percentage correct responses were related to the total number of responses made. For example, 57.2% of 79.8% of responses made by deaf E2L children to vocabulary items were correct.

3 The percentage correct responses were related to the total number of responses made. For example, 21.6% of 14% of responses made by deaf E2L children to grammatical items were correct.

Both the E2L and the E1L deaf children responded to more than 75% of the items concerned with vocabulary. Of these responses, more than half were correct for both groups. Both groups of deaf children showed a limited response to items in Blocks D - T, which concerned grammatical structures. Out of all the 11 deaf children, only six children (three E2L and three E1L) attempted blocks D-T. These six responded to just under 15% of the items in blocks D-T, getting less than 30.5% right.

In contrast, all the normally hearing children responded to 100% of the vocabulary items. The E1L children got on average 92% of these right, whilst the E2L children only got 73% right. The difference is even more pronounced for items in Blocks D to T where the E1L children responded to 55% of items, getting 67.5% right, and the E2L children only responded to 29.6%, getting only 44.5% right.
Although 'unpacking' the raw data in this way has shown up interesting differences between the groups, it is apparent that given the small numbers, and the tiny proportion of the test items that were attempted by the deaf children, that this type of investigation is of limited value as a way of addressing the research questions. The grammatical items (in blocks D-T) attempted by the children were analysed in more detail in the hope of gaining additional insights into the impact on comprehension of deafness and E2L respectively.

3.3.2 Qualitative analysis

Qualitative analysis of responses to Blocks D - T was limited by the fact that there was little data for the deaf E2L and deaf E1L subjects in particular, but also for the normally hearing E2L groups.

This analysis was done in the 'qualitative' manner suggested by Bishop (1983; 1989). Given the limited responses, from the deaf groups, only blocks E (negatives), G and I (personal pronouns), could be analysed in this way. An attempt was made to examine the patterns of both correct and error responses within the subgroups.

The error count is made on the basis of the types of distractors that each item contains (Bishop 1989 p.13 and p.20). That is, if a child gives a response other than a correct response, the type of error that is made is determined by the distractors in that item. Distractors can be either lexical or grammatical. For example, in item 13 of Block E, the target sentence is 'the boy is not running'. The distractors are 'the boy is running' (grammatical distractor), 'the cat is sitting' (lexical distractor) and 'the horse is running' (lexical distractor). Thus, if a child gets this item wrong, then the error can be categorised as either lexical or grammatical.

Block E: Negatives

Table VI shows the number of responses from those subjects in each subgroup who responded to Block E (negatives).
Table VI: Number of responses in classes a to d for subjects on Block E (negatives)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects in subgroups who responded to test items</th>
<th>Response class*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deaf E2L N=1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deaf E1L N=3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing E2L N=10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing E1L N=23</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Response class (from Bishop 1983 p.426)
a=pass (all items correct)
b=one or more lexical error
c=grammatical errors on all items
d=grammatical errors on some items

The deaf children:
Only 4 (out of 11) deaf children responded to this block, and none of them got it right. Only one child in the deaf E2L group (N=5) responded to the block, and in this response, he made grammatical errors on all items.

In the deaf E1L group (N=6), 3 children responded to the block, and all made grammatical errors on some items. This analysis indicates that this form of negative is probably not understood by all these deaf children.

The normally hearing children:
All 10 normally hearing E2L subjects responded to Block E, but only two passed the block. The others showed a variety of errors. This could indicate that this form of negative is not understood by these E2L children. In contrast, all 23 normally hearing E1L children responded, and 18 of these got all items right. The 5 who did not get it right made mainly grammatical errors. This could indicate that, in the main, this form of negative is probably understood by these children.

Blocks G and I: Personal pronouns
In item 1 of block G, the target sentence is "they are sitting on the table". The distractors are "they are sitting on the carpet" (lexical distractor); "he is sitting on the table" (grammatical distractor); and "they are drawing on the table" (lexical distractor).
In block I, the target sentence for item 1 is “she is sitting on the chair”, and the distractors are “she is sitting on the grass” (lexical distractor); “she is leaning on the chair” (lexical distractor) and “he is sitting on the chair” (grammatical distractor).

Table VII shows the number of responses from those subjects in each subgroup who responded to Blocks G and I (personal pronouns).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects in subgroups who responded to test items</th>
<th>Response class*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deaf E2L N=3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deaf E1L N=1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing E2L N=10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing E1L N=23</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Response class (from Bishop 1983 p.426)
  a=pass (all items correct)
  b=one or more lexical error
  c=grammatical errors on all items
  d=grammatical errors on some items

The deaf children:
There are only 4 responses from the deaf children, all of which show both lexical and grammatical errors. This observation is in keeping with the literature, as was mentioned in Chapter 1.

The normally hearing children:
The normally hearing E2L children show a wider spread of response, with only 1 response in class (a) and the rest showing both lexical and grammatical errors.
The normally hearing E1L group interestingly shows almost equal numbers of responses in class (a) and in class (d), indicating that in the main, if these children get the personal pronoun wrong. The error they make is mainly grammatical.

3.4 Conclusions

The results of the quantitative analysis based on total number of TROG blocks passed, show clearly that, as predicted, significant differences exist in the performance of deaf
children compared to that of normally hearing children. Significant differences are also shown in the performance of the normally hearing children whose first language is English, compared to the normally hearing children whose first language is Sylheti.

Although these are relatively strong effects, this data does not make it possible to discriminate further, or with any certainty, between the four subgroups, and particularly between the deaf E2L, normally hearing E2L and deaf E1L groups. The data therefore, is not helpful in addressing the research questions which were the object of the study. There are two main reasons for this. Firstly, the deaf children and the E2L normally hearing children performed so little of the test that analysis of the data was very limited. Secondly, in this study, with the subjects drawn from only two London schools, it was not possible to achieve large enough numbers in the subgroups to enable statistically weighty comparisons to be made.

Although this was a preliminary study, the resulting small, heterogeneous groups reflects a more generalised difficulty concerning the constraints of obtaining deaf and E2L subjects in order to compile sufficiently large, and sufficiently homogenous groups. Deafness is not a uniform condition, and its effects on children are immensely varied, as was discussed in Chapter 1. Equally, children who do not have English as their first language are not a homogenous group, with copious factors contributing to the variety, some of which were outlined in Chapter 2. Problems of this kind also beset group studies in the more general field of communication disorders and have motivated the shift of emphasis in research methodology from quantitative group studies to methodologies like single case studies (Wilmes 1995), which enable the heterogeneity of the subjects to be acknowledged and investigated thoroughly.

In considering the most effective way to proceed with addressing the research questions, it was therefore necessary to consider the value to be gained from further studies employing formal testing techniques. If large enough groups could be assembled within the given resources, group studies using appropriate tests would clearly have the added value of statistical reliability, of validity, and of generalisability.

However, for practical reasons, this strategy was not pursued. In the first place, constructing methodologically viable groups was not considered to be a feasible option given the constraints of the available population of deaf E2L children, and the limited resources
available for the study. In the second place, the results of the preliminary study contributed to the important question of whether using a particular formal comprehension test in English, with its individual strengths and limitations, was a useful way to proceed, given that spoken communicative interactions are the major focus of the research. Using the TROG as a means of tapping the language comprehension abilities of this group of deaf children who do not have English spoken at home was shown to be very limited. Undoubtedly, further tests in English, and tests in Sylheti would contribute to understanding the children’s linguistic abilities. However, as will be discussed further in Chapter 4, there are no available Sylheti tests that are standardised for a U.K. population that would be appropriate. At a more general level, it was clear from this preliminary study, that the results had also not been helpful in addressing the question of how language comprehension abilities may or may not impact on conversational interaction. Further studies using additional test-based procedures were unlikely to be any more helpful.

Hence, it was concluded that a quantitative approach making use of formal, standardised test procedures was not a viable way of addressing the main research question which concerns the spoken language interactions of deaf children who do not have English as their first language at home. This conclusion motivated the shift to an alternative methodological approach that is descriptive and 'single-case' focused rather than group focused. The original line of enquiry about the comprehension abilities of deaf E2L children which might have yielded quantitative, and therefore generalisable results, was abandoned in favour of a more direct examination of the children’s communication in a real environment. As will be fully discussed in Chapter 4, Conversation Analysis was chosen as a suitable qualitative methodology.
CHAPTER 4.

DESIGN AND METHOD OF STUDY

4.1 INTRODUCTION

The main aim of this research is to investigate the spoken language interactions between young deaf children and their family members in homes where Sylheti is the first language and English is an additional or second language. As will be detailed in section 4.2.1, the participants were both Sylheti-speaking and English-speaking deaf and hearing children and their families. The recordings made of their conversations at home were transcribed and translated when necessary as is described in sections 4.1.2, 4.1.3 and 4.1.4.

The method of study (section 4.2) was to use the procedures of conversation analysis (CA) to examine selected segments of data and so to describe the data. In this way, a new body of data concerning natural conversations between deaf children and members of their families was established: such interactions have not been researched and documented in this manner before.

As was discussed in Chapter 1, conversational interactions between parents and their children is considered to be one of the chief means through which a child acquires her/his spoken culture. In the literature, it is implied that the adult in these interactions is a competent speaker of the language in question, or at least is more competent than the child. The competent speaker engages in well-documented strategies which encourage the child to speak and to develop competence in the language. In the U.K., this proceeds more or less predictably towards the child achieving linguistic competence in English. If a child is deaf, this process is often observed to be considerably slower than for normally hearing children. As was indicated in Chapter 2, this process can be more complicated for families of deaf children who also are not speakers of English.

In the previous chapter, it was shown that research methods using the results of formal tests, or measures like mean length of utterance or other categories for the quantitative charting of linguistic competence are not very useful in discriminating between E2L and E1L deaf children. Neither are these methods suitable for the study of interaction. In
the study reported in Chapter 3, both the English and the Sylheti deaf children were shown to have limited skills as measured by the TROG, and not much insight into interactional aspects of their spoken communication was gained from such measures. Fulfilling the aims and objectives of the current study called for a qualitative method of investigation, and reasons for choosing CA as the method of study are given in section 4.2.

The wider objectives of this research are to contribute to the understanding of communication between deaf children and their families, and in so doing, to support the practical strategies used by professionals such as speech and language therapists, teachers, psychologists and others, both in direct intervention with deaf children, and in counselling their parents.

4.2 DESIGN OF STUDY

4.2.1 Selection of participants

In order to bring into sharp focus the particular characteristics of interaction involving deaf children from Sylheti-speaking families the study was designed to enable qualitative comparisons to be made between data from the following:

- prelingually deaf children from Sylheti families.
- prelingually deaf children from English families.
- normally hearing children from Sylheti families.
- normally hearing children from English families.

Following the preliminary study reported in Chapter 3, it became clear that the young (4-5 year old) deaf children who had taken part in that study, had a relatively tiny repertoire of spoken language with which to communicate. Hence in the main study, it was decided that older deaf children should be the focus of study, so that substantial data could in fact be gathered. Whilst it is of great importance to understand the early communicative efforts of younger deaf children, it was felt that data from 6-7 year old children would yield more productive material in this instance.
The children were selected from the two primary schools which had taken part in the preliminary study discussed in Chapter 3. As was mentioned, both schools have integrated Units for Hearing Impaired children. Permission to conduct the study was obtained from the appropriate inspectorate and management of the two schools. The parents of individual children were approached by letter for consent to include their children in the selection procedure (see Appendix 6).

The selection of children for the study was based, in the first place, on consultation with their teachers and speech and language therapists as to their suitability in terms of general school performance, and in terms of the anticipated level of co-operation from their parents. The choice of English-speaking deaf children was limited, as so many of the children in the two Hearing Impaired Units concerned came from homes where English is not the main language spoken. Once potentially suitable deaf children had been chosen, the task was then to choose normally hearing children with whom the deaf children could be paired so that qualitative comparisons of spoken interactions could be made. Since the main aim was to provide a description of spoken interaction between the participants in their home setting using the qualitative methodology of conversation analysis, precise matching of participants was not essential. Each deaf child was to be paired with a normally hearing child of the same age and gender. The rationale for this was to have data from children who were at approximately equivalent levels of cognitive and social development. Since the normally hearing peers were likely to have language proficiency skills well in advance of the deaf children, the deaf children were also to be paired with younger children of the same gender, who had broadly equivalent language ability.

Precise language matching of the pairs of candidates on the basis of measures of language ability was considered to be beyond the scope of this study. There are several factors which complicate 'precise' language matching procedures and which, in this particular instance, would be open to question. For example, there are no U.K. norm-referenced tests available in English which include children from the Bengali linguistic minority group in the normalisation sample. Tests aimed at English speakers also reflect not only the language but also the culture of the English-speaking majority, and when used with children from other language groups, the results would be difficult to interpret (Duncan 1989). It was also not possible to find appropriate U.K. tests which included deaf children in the standardisation sample. With regard to tests in languages
other than English, as was mentioned in Chapter 3, there are no standardised language proficiency tests in Bengali or in Sylheti. Whilst there are assessment procedures appropriate for children in a number of languages spoken in the U.K., there were none available in Bengali/Sylheti at the time of the current study.

There is work in progress on the development of two test procedures for Sylheti-speaking children: one is a procedure for assessing the expressive language of young Sylheti children was devised by Hassan and is used by the Speech and Language Therapy Department at the Royal London Hospitals Trust in Whitechapel. This procedure is known as the ‘Bengali Screening Assessment Test’ and is based on the work of Stokes (1989; 1990). There is collaborative work in progress to develop this assessment (Mahon, Madhani and Champaner 1997). There is also work in progress (Madhani 1996), in the Speech and Language Therapy Department of the Newham Community Health Services Trust, to translate into Sylheti and to standardise other assessments such as the Sandwell Bilingual Screening Assessment Scales for Expressive Panjabi and English (Duncan, Gibbs, Noor, and Whittaker 1988).

Notwithstanding the lack of Sylheti tests, it was nevertheless necessary to choose the younger normally hearing participants on the basis of comparable performance in some aspect of language ability. Since the speech production of the deaf children was so diverse, it was considered appropriate to use an assessment of receptive rather than expressive language ability. Even though a precise matching of children was not required for this study, the choice of appropriate procedures for assessing receptive language was nevertheless essential, and as was expected, proved to be problematic. The procedures had to be relatively quick to administer in order to meet the time constraints imposed by the schools. They also had to be valid measures of receptive ability, appropriate for both deaf children and for children who have English as a second language. As already mentioned and as shown in Chapter 3, and as has been discussed by Baker (1993) and Cummins (1984), norm-referenced procedures designed for English-speaking normally hearing children are not necessarily appropriate for either the E2L children or the deaf children. The English language and cultural references in tests such as these are in many respects inappropriate for some of the children in this study.
Consultation with speech and language therapists working both with deaf children, and with children from minority language backgrounds indicated that using many of the well-established tests such as the British Picture Vocabulary Scale (BPVS) (Dunn, Dunn and Whetton 1982) and the Boehm Test of Basic Concepts (Boehm 1986) would introduce complexities into the study that could be extremely hard to unravel. For example, there is no published work on the labels that deaf children give to certain pictures in the BPVS, and the reasons for deaf children failing this test are not yet fully explored. The Boehm test is frequently used with deaf children, but there are no reports of its use with E2L children. It was also not considered to be feasible to use detailed educational testing protocols such as the 'criterion referenced tests' suggested by Baker (1993), because of time and access constraints. However, following Baker's suggestions, information about each participant's language background was collected (see Appendix 3), and contributed to the profile for each participant.

The procedures that were finally chosen were a compromise, but were considered to be practical and adequate for the purpose of pairing the deaf children with younger and same age normally hearing children. Firstly, to ensure that none of the normally hearing children (peers and younger) had unusual overall non-verbal ability, two subtests of the Wechsler Pre-school and Primary Scale of Intelligence-Revised (WPPSI-RUK 1990), namely, the Block Design and Object Assembly subtests were administered to all potential participants. Although it has been argued that the use of such measures with children from cultural minorities is problematic (Baker 1993; Cummins 1984), it was decided to use them for the current study in the absence of more appropriate measures.

Secondly, it was decided that two screening assessments of receptive language ability in English would be used. The assessments were mainly used as the criteria for selection of the younger normally hearing children. As will be seen, one of these measures proved more sensitive than the other.

The first language measure was the Rapid Screening Test (RST) for receptive language from the Derbyshire Language Scheme (Knowles and Masidlover 1982). The Derbyshire Language Scheme assessments have long been used by speech and language therapists in their work with deaf children. The procedure was considered to be suitable for the other children in the study, in spite of there only being anecdotal
reference to its use with E2L children. Recently, a small pilot study using a Gujarati translation of the RST indicated that four year old Gujarati-speaking children who attended English nurseries performed equivalently on the Gujarati and the English versions of the test (Patel, 1996). In the event, in the current study, the RST proved to be sensitive enough to enable selection of suitable participants for the study.

The second assessment used was the E2L Toy Test. This is a screening test for identifying hearing impairment in E2L children (specifically those from Asian families) aged between 2-7 years (Bellman, Mahon and Triggs 1996; Mahon, Triggs and Bellman 1993; Bellman and Marcuson 1991). The names of the objects used in the test are taken from a list of words learned first in English by E2L children (Marcuson, Bellman and Chatterjee 1988). In the current study, the E2L Toy Test was used as a vocabulary test. However, this proved not to be sensitive for the children in the current study as most of them achieved ceiling scores.

12 normally hearing children in the same age range and of the same gender as the deaf children (6-7 years) and 10 in the age range 4-5 years were assessed. These all attended the same schools as the deaf children. They all fulfilled the initial selection criteria outlined above and, in addition, had no reported difficulties with speech, language or hearing (in particular, they had no history of chronic otitis media with effusion). The results of these assessments are presented in Appendix 2.

A number of practical problems beset the selection of participants. Firstly, all the deaf children whose families had agreed to take part in the study in the first place were boys, thus leaving only the normally hearing boys that happened to be in the appropriate classes in that particular school year available for inclusion. This considerably reduced the numbers from which children could be selected. For those children who were tested, and selected as being possibles, only a few parents gave permission for home recordings, further constraining the final choice.

In spite of these constraints, however, it proved possible to select children who answered the criteria of the study. As expected, the 6-7 year old normally hearing children all performed at ceiling level on the language tests. The younger normally hearing children selected were those whose scores on the RST were similar to the scores of the deaf child (that is, limited responses at the four information-carrying word
level), and who had average scores on the subtests of the WPPSI-R. Where possible, the socio-economic status of the families was taken into consideration (see Appendix 3 for details).

Two of the E1L deaf children, referred to in Appendix 3 as F and S, were not included. At the time, F was being fostered by his grandmother who had recently come to the U.K. from Jamaica, and it was felt that this added cultural dimension would introduce a level of complexity which could not adequately be attended to in the current study. There were some complications in S's family which made inclusion inadvisable at the time, although the family had initially been very keen to take part.

With regard to the normally hearing Sylheti children, although a Sylheti co-worker/translator, and the staff at the schools were closely involved in contacting the families, unforeseen difficulties arose, for example, some of the families did not have a telephone at home, or did not reply to written communications (sent out in both Bengali script and in English, see Appendix 6) This meant that permission to record the children at home was not received and many of the children who had been tested, and who seemed suitable, could therefore not be included.

Table VIII gives a summary of the test results for the 7 participants who were finally included in the study. As can be seen, the scores for A and Kh on the Block Design subtest of the WPPSI-RUK were very low. This was a cause of some concern. After discussion with their teachers, however, it appeared that these scores could be accounted for in terms of the children's poor concentration for tasks of this kind. On the teachers' recommendation, the children were included in spite of the low scores.
Table VIII: Summary of subjects included in the study (shaded rows indicate the deaf children)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and d.o.b.</th>
<th>Hearing status</th>
<th>Home language</th>
<th>Age at time of testing</th>
<th>Rapid Screening Test (Derbyshire Language Scheme)</th>
<th>E2L</th>
<th>WPPSI-RUK</th>
<th>WPPSI-RUK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1   2   3   4   5 Object Assembly Scaled Score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W 22/7/87</td>
<td>Deaf</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>6.11</td>
<td>6/6 6/6 2/3 1/3 1/4 12 9 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 21/10/89</td>
<td>Normal hearing</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>6/6 6/6 3/3 3/3 3/4 12 15 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J 20.10.87</td>
<td>Normal hearing</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>6/6 6/6 3/3 3/3 4/4 12 16 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 29/9/87</td>
<td>Deaf</td>
<td>Sylheti</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>5/6 6/6 0/3 0/3 0 11 6 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kh 19/9/87</td>
<td>Deaf</td>
<td>Sylheti</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6/6 6/6 3/3 2/3 2/4 11 8 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E 26/1/89</td>
<td>Normal hearing</td>
<td>Sylheti</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>6/6 6/6 2/3 1/3 2/4 12 15 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2.2 Data collection

In order to collect a corpus of conversational data for analysis from each participant, the researcher (accompanied by the interpreter in the case of the E2L families) visited the family home on two occasions, resulting in a recording of about 60-90 minutes duration. These samples of conversation were recorded using a semi-professional VHS video recorder (Panasonic M40) with simultaneous DAT audio recording (Aiwa HD-S100).

In the recording sessions, each child was filmed with their primary carer (mother/father/other) who was asked to ‘chat’ to the child. To facilitate this, the author suggested that they looked at a set of their own family photographs of a recent family event or holiday. Some picture books were provided. Discussion of a recent event at home or at school was also suggested, and the researcher brought a few toys which would be new to the children. After the recording session, the researcher (or the interpreter) conducted a structured interview with the carer/s to gather background information (see Appendix 3).

Due consideration was given to the potential hazards of collecting data that may not be typical or natural. However, as Heritage (1984 p.238) has noted, recordings do enable repeated examination of the data and provide other researchers with direct access to its “‘raw’ form” thus “minimising the influence of personal preconceptions or analytical biases”.

Some degree of contrivance in the collection of conversational data is unavoidable, as is widely acknowledged by researchers in this field. The way in which the data was collected in the present study is not uncommon. It represents a practical means by which conversational data can be collected, and, as will be seen below, did address some of the additional practical difficulties of eliciting and recording spontaneous, naturally occurring interactions that involve people with communication difficulties. Reported analyses of such conversations is often done with data collected in institutional settings like schools or clinics. Lesser and Milroy (1993 p. 159) have pointed out that the collaborative achievements between two speakers in conversation become apparent in data collected from a contrived conversational setting, such as a clinic, as they do from naturally occurring data. Although researchers do not always
explicitly detail their methods of data collection (Mathy-Laikko and West, 1992; Milroy and Perkins 1992; Wilkinson 1997), various techniques are used to ensure that the data collected in this way is as natural as possible. For example, the researcher may leave the room while the recording is being made (Wilkinson 1995a). In addition to leaving the room, Collins, Markova and Murphy (1996) interviewed their participants about the “typicalness” of video-taped conversations following the recording sessions, and discarded any sessions that the participants considered not to be typical. Researchers working with children have used the technique of asking the carers to be responsible for recording data, sometimes leaving the recording equipment in the home with some instructions as to the nature of what should be recorded. The data is then collected at the carers own convenience (Wootton 1990; Tarplee, 1993; Gardner 1989; 1995). Whilst this latter technique has some advantages, practical considerations made it untenable for the current study.

In this study, both the researcher and the interpreter had worked at the schools for some time, and were known to the deaf children and their families. The interpreter had made home visits to the families on separate occasions on other school business. Of course the presence of two outsiders (and their equipment) represented a considerable departure from ordinary activity in the household, and as McIlvenney (1991) has pointed out, potentially useful data could be interrupted and/or corrupted by the intrusive nature of the recording event due to observer paradox. In this case, an effect could have been due not only to the presence of the researcher, but also that of the interpreter, the video camera and the tape recorder. On the other hand, Wiemann (1981) has pointed out that subjects being filmed do accommodate to the videotaping fairly rapidly. It was hoped that the recordings made for this study were sufficiently long to allow the participants to accommodate to the presence of the camera.

A further consideration was the issue of privacy when recording in the homes of the families, particularly those from a culture different to that of the researcher. This was a source of considerable concern. However, the families had freely agreed and were reported to be keen to take part in the study. Two of the families were eager to take part in the study but for various reasons were disinclined to have cameras in their own houses. They agreed to be filmed in an alternative venue. The other families were filmed in their homes, and were extremely welcoming and co-operative. With the advice and encouragement of the interpreter and the teachers, the recording sessions
proceeded smoothly, often with expressed enjoyment on the part of the families. The presence of several onlookers when recording in some of the Sylheti homes was a feature of these sessions, and no attempt was made to change this, although the purpose of the exercise (i.e. to record the child in question) was explained (See Appendix 4 for details of the recording sessions).

4.2.3 Data selection for analysis

After detailed viewing of all the data sets, it became apparent that those sections of the recording sessions in which the participants looked at the family photographs or at the picture books were the most consistent activity across all the dyads (see section 4.3.2 in this chapter for a discussion of ‘activities’). During the course of this activity, the salient feature of the talk was the frequent occurrence of question and answer sequences. Hence it is these sections, or segments, which have been selected for the detailed analysis which is presented in the following chapters. This means of selection of data for analysis has been employed by other researchers in the field (see Wootton 1990; Ochs 1979). The segments, each consisting of a number of fragments of approximately 5 to 8 minutes duration, are analysed for each dyad. Each fragment is the sequence of turns at talk around the activity of looking at a new photograph or picture. A summary of pertinent information regarding the data sets is given in Table IX.
Table IX: Details of the eight dyads in the study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child's name</th>
<th>Child's age</th>
<th>Child's first language</th>
<th>Child's hearing status</th>
<th>Adult</th>
<th>Adult's first language</th>
<th>Language usually spoken when child and adult interact</th>
<th>Language spoken in sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>6.11 yrs</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Deaf</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>4.8 yrs</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Normal hearing</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>7 yrs</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Normal hearing</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>6.9 yrs</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Deaf</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Sylheti</td>
<td>M-&gt; Sylheti A-&gt;English</td>
<td>M-&gt; Sylheti A-&gt;English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kh</td>
<td>6.10 yrs</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Deaf</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Sylheti</td>
<td>M-&gt; Sylheti</td>
<td>M-&gt; Sylheti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kh</td>
<td>6.10 yrs</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Deaf</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Sylheti</td>
<td>M-&gt; Sylheti Kh-&gt;English</td>
<td>M-&gt; Sylheti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>5.4 yrs</td>
<td>Sylheti</td>
<td>Normal hearing</td>
<td>Sister (15 yrs)</td>
<td>Sylheti</td>
<td>Mixture of English and Sylheti</td>
<td>Mixture of English and Sylheti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jo</td>
<td>7 yrs</td>
<td>Sylheti</td>
<td>Normal hearing</td>
<td>Sister (22 yrs)</td>
<td>Sylheti</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.4 Transcription and translation

Procedures
As has been stated in the literature (e.g. Drew 1990a), the primary data for conversation analysis are recordings of interactions. Transcripts do not replace the original recordings to become the primary data. Both the “recording and the transcript are analysed in conjunction with one another” (Drew 1990a p. 4). Hence, relevant segments of data from each interaction were transcribed and these transcriptions can be found in full in Appendix 4. Appendix 5 provides an index of the smaller fragments of data which are quoted in the text.

Although the difficulties inherent in the process of transcribing conversational data have been discussed in the literature (for example, see Ochs 1979; Heritage and Atkinson 1984; Goodwin 1984), Some of the transcription procedures particular to this
study require further comment. The current data is complicated by two factors: it includes samples of the talk of deaf children; and importantly, some of the data from the Sylheti families had to be translated into English.

In keeping with the convention of conversation analysis, most of the transcriptions were made using an impressionistic notation employing standard orthography which is accessible to a wide range of readers, rather than phonetic notation (Psathas and Anderson 1990). The notational system used for the majority of the transcriptions is based on that suggested by Atkinson and Heritage (1984) and Levinson (1983), and can be found in Appendix 4. However, a more detailed phonetic transcript was made of some segments in order to explicate salient prosodic features of certain aspects of the talk. In order to portray the prosody in these segments as reliably as possible, two experienced phoneticians were asked to independently transcribe the relevant segments. The transcriptions used for the analysis represents the final consensus between the two phoneticians and the author. Full details of these transcriptions can be found in chapters 5, 6 and 7.

For three children, Kh, A and E, a significant amount of talk during the interaction was in Sylheti. In each of the families of these three children, there is a unique pattern of proficiency and use of both English and Sylheti for each member of the family, and for the interactions between them and the participating child (see Appendix 3 for details). Hence, the amount of Sylheti spoken in the current samples for each of these three children differs. In the main, the talk consisted of frequent but not exclusive use of Sylheti, mainly by the adults. The talk which occurred in Sylheti was translated into English in order that the analysis could be done, firstly because the researcher is not herself a speaker of Sylheti, and secondly to make the transcriptions accessible to a non-Sylheti-speaking readership.

It was not considered necessary to provide a transcript of the talk in either of the two scripts which can be used to write down spoken Sylheti. Recent research (Chalmers 1996) indicates that Bengali script (which is usually used) does not adequately represent the Sylheti language. To do so, many additional diacritics are required. Alternatively, Sylheti can be written in the unique and relatively uncommon Sylheti
Nagari script\(^1\), but this cannot be written or read by most Sylheti speakers in the U.K., including the translators involved in the current study. Since there was anyway considerable mixing of English and Sylheti, the translation and transcription of this talk was accomplished as follows:

Independent translations from Sylheti into English were made by two native Sylheti speakers. One speaker had not been present at the recording sessions, and the other was the interpreter who had been present at the sessions. The interpreters made three transcriptions each:

a) The Sylheti talk was written down in Roman script. Although there is a convention for the transliteration of standard ‘textbook’ Bengali (Chalmers 1996), there was no standard Roman transliteration convention for Sylheti at the time these transcriptions were made. Recently, Chalmers (1996) has made some suggestions as to how this can be achieved, based on the analysis of Sylheti phonology by Spratt and Spratt (1987). For the translations in question, therefore, each speaker used their own conventions for transliteration, in the same way as the Panjabi bilingual co-worker did in Moffat’s (1990) study of communication in Panjabi-speaking children.

b) For purposes of cross-checking between the two speakers, a word for word translation from Sylheti to English was made.

c) Lastly, a translation was made into colloquial English.

The transcripts used in the analyses are based on the colloquial translations agreed by the two translators. The practice of using an italic typeface to represent Sylheti utterances translated into colloquial English was adopted in the transcriptions. The translated transcripts can all be found in Appendix 4.

The issues involved in translating talk, transcribing that translation, and then analysing the translated data merit further consideration.

**Cultural diversity and amount of detail**

As Collins (1991) points out, the difficulties inherent in the transcription of conversational data become more acute when that data has to be translated into

\(^1\) Although Sylheti is commonly described as not having a written form, since the language does not have an official status in Bangladesh, nevertheless, the unique Sylheti Nagari ‘popular’ script has been documented as the written form of the language (Chalmers 1996). This script derives from Devanagari and Bengali scripts.
another language which is, in addition, culturally diverse from the original. This is clearly the case for translations from Sylheti to English, since the two languages and cultures are widely divergent, although there is very little published literature on such differences (see Chapter 2 above for a review). There are cultural conventions of spoken interaction in Sylheti which could potentially be lost if a translation lacked sufficient detail. Ochs (1979) points out that whilst any transcript of spoken language must retain sufficient information about the linguistic and cultural context of that language, there is also the danger that too much detail may obscure the data. The approach adopted in this study aimed to strike a balance between these demands.

**Selection of prominent features of data**

Another important aspect of the processes of both translation and subsequent transcription is the necessity to select and then transcribe those features which provide sufficient material for the focus of the analysis (Ochs 1979; Moerman 1988). In the present study, the focus is on sequences of talk occurring during the activity of looking at pictures, and in this talk there is a preponderance of question-answer sequences. In the transcripts which include translated talk, it was therefore crucial to represent those features which would enable this focus to be addressed. The translation of the Sylheti talk had therefore to be sufficiently detailed so as to permit in-depth analysis of aspects such as the structural design of spoken questions and answers; and it had to include details of non-verbal answers and questions, as did the transcripts of the English talk. The semantic content had to be preserved so as to permit checking for intersubjectivity and sequentiality (these topics will be pursued again later in this chapter). The word order of the utterances had to accurately reflect what the speaker said, in order to reflect their abilities, particularly with regard to the deaf children. Other features such as the beginnings and endings of utterances; places where utterances overlapped each other and phonetic features such as lengthening, loudness and stress had to be included in the transcription.

**Use of translated data in studies of this kind**

There is not a great deal of published work detailing the process of using translated data in analytical studies. Milroy and Wei (1990), for example, make use of colloquial translations, but do not comment specifically on the process of translation. In his studies of interactions in Finnish sign language, Mcllvenny (1995) employs a hearing interpreter who is native user of Finnish sign language. He also uses a deaf informant
and a second hearing interpreter. However, he does not detail the process of translating the signs into written English. Collins (1991) on the other hand, details the process of translation used in her study of Arabic conversation between competent adult speakers: she made a literal word-for-word translation to preserve the semantic content of the talk, providing the reader with a transcript which consisted of the transliteration of the Arabic in parallel with the English translation.

**Translated data in the current study**

Procedures such as those employed by Collins (1991) were not considered necessary for this study, since not all the talk is in Sylheti, and the content is, generally speaking, semantically simpler than that in the Collins data. As can be seen in Appendix 4, the transcriptions that were used in the analysis are presented in the manner which is usually found in the CA literature, that is, the turns at talk by each speaker are presented sequentially. The Sylheti talk which has been translated into colloquial English is printed in italic. Some Sylheti words which do not have English equivalents have not been translated, and are printed in bold, with an explanation provided in footnotes. These are, for example, the words used for the Sylheti family naming system, which words are not really translatable into English, for example, the Sylheti word *bibi* means 'an old woman or grandmother not necessarily related to the speaker'. The complexity of translating family naming systems from other cultures into English is indicated by Milroy and Wei (1990) who use 'social network' charts to represent the complex family relationships for the Chinese families in their study in Newcastle.

**Transcription of translated data**

Both Mcllvenny (1991; 1995) and Collins (1991) indicate the importance of the layout of the transcriptions on paper. Mcllvenny (1991) incorporates annotated photographs of the interactional situation into his transcriptions. In Collins' work (1991), the Arabic transliterations are side by side with the English translations, but are placed on the left of the page thus encouraging the reader to look at the Arabic first, so as to discourage any cultural bias. Since the data in the current study shows much mixing of the two languages, it was considered adequate to present the transcriptions in the conventional manner, with translated utterances indicated by the use of italics, as in the following example, in which the normally hearing boy, E, is talking to his older sister, S.
Fragment E7

S:* =*What’s this (2.5)
E: huh=
S: one country to another country don’t they go
E: yes=
S: =like us-London
E: =it goes high up in the sky doesn’t it
S: =mmm high they (.) um go above the clouds=
E: yes

English word order is used where correct Sylheti word order was used. Where the Sylheti word order is not standard, this is reflected in the English translation, since this may be a factor in the interaction. Where one utterance contains a mixture of English and Sylheti, as is frequently the case, the word order used in the translation is English, with the translated Sylheti words written in italics.

Finally, the issue of the competence of an analyst in analysing data from a community to which s/he does not belong can be raised here. In the current study, the researcher is an outsider both to the culture of deaf children, and to the culture of Sylheti speakers. As McIlvenny (1991) has commented about his own study, none of his researchers were competent sign language users, and he described their task as being akin to that of an ethnographer describing a strange culture as an outsider. Moerman (1988) is of the opinion that one way round this difficulty is to make use of a methodology which is inductive and data-driven, such as conversation analysis (this point will be discussed in detail in following sections).

4.3 METHOD OF STUDY

4.3.1 Introductory remarks

This research aims to describe and examine the conversational interactions which occur at home, between deaf children and adult members of their families, in the languages usually spoken by these participants. The objective of the work is to contribute to the knowledge which deaf people, parents and professionals have about the process of spoken language interaction between deaf children and their carers, and in particular, deaf children who are from families where English is not the first language. In practical terms, furtherance of this knowledge will inform the strategies for
promoting language development and use, and may enhance the communication between normally hearing people and deaf people.

The fulfilment of the aim of this work necessitates careful attention being paid to the linguistic forms used, and the meanings thus created, by the participants interacting in a sequence of talk, which occurs within a recognisable activity. As has been mentioned previously, the choice of a methodology by which this aim could be achieved had to be carefully considered. The following section will detail the reasons for choosing the procedures of Conversation Analysis (henceforth CA), which enable the analyst to focus directly on the interactive nature of talk - hence the use, in CA, of the term ‘talk-in-interaction’ (Clayman and Maynard 1995; Drew 1990a; Heritage 1988; Heritage and Atkinson 1984; Heritage 1984; Levinson 1983). Although, as will be demonstrated below, this study is not ‘conversation analysis’ in the strictest sense, the principles and procedures used by conversation analysts have been applied in order to describe conversations which are created by participants in interaction. In this section, key concepts in CA relevant to this study will be explicated, notably, ‘activities’, ‘turns’ and ‘question-answer adjacency pairs’. CA approaches to the analysis of question-answer sequences will be reviewed, as will be CA research into conversations in which one of the participants is less competent in communication skills than the other.

4.3.2 Conversation Analysis

CA methodology stems from an ethnomethodological sociological tradition, and is appropriate for this study for a number of reasons. In the first place, it derives from a research tradition which is expressly empirical and inductive. The method rejects reliance on intuitive assumption whilst advocating a careful and open-minded attention to detail. Secondly, CA differs from other approaches to the study of discourse with regard to the procedures employed for recognising and describing units of data. These units are conceived as social actions or interactions, such as verbal utterances and other vocal behaviours, non-verbal behaviours, and silences. Rather than imposing a preconceived and arbitrary system of taxonomy onto these units, the units are recognised and described by the same means as they are shown to be recognised by the participants in the talk-in-interaction. Thus, by paying careful attention to both the design and the sequential properties of talk, and by making recourse to the normative procedures by which the participants themselves interpret the talk which they
collaboratively construct, a particularly well warranted means of pragmatic analysis is made available. Clayman and Maynard (1995) conclude their discussion of the procedures of CA thus:

"...CA has developed a data-driven methodology that places high priority on working through individual cases to obtain a comprehensive analysis of the available data". (Clayman and Maynard 1995 p.9).

The objective of CA is, as Clayman and Maynard (1995 p.7) put it, ...

"to explicate the reasoning principles that guide, and are displayed within, interactional conduct".

4.3.3 'Activities' in Conversation Analysis

In a seminal paper in 1974, Schegloff and Sacks commented that their work on conversational material entailed the exploration of a means of

"achieving a naturalistic observational discipline that could deal with the details of social action(s) rigorously, empirically and formally" (Schegloff and Sacks 1974 p.233).

They regard conversation as a social activity in its own right. They also note that the way in which a conversation is “done” by the participants is “sensitive to the placement of that conversation in an interaction episode or occasion” (ibid p. 263). Other conversation analysts have commented on the notion of the occasion, or the "context" (Schegloff 1992b) or to use another term, the ‘activity’ in which the conversation occurs. Social anthropologists and sociolinguists such as Gumperz (1982) and Levinson (1992) suggest that activity or ‘activity type’ is the “basic socially significant unit of interaction in terms of which meaning is assessed” (Gumperz 1982 p.131).

This theory derives from Wittgenstein’s (1958) notion of language games, based on the proposition that language is embedded in human activities, and that understanding the language requires an understanding of these activities. Levinson (1992) describes activity types as a “fuzzy” category of goal-defined, socially constituted behaviour which is bounded and constrained by the participants, the setting, and by the contributions that are allowable in that particular context. In the tradition of Hymes (1972) and Gumperz (1972), Levinson (1992) suggests further that the activity can be subdivided into episodes, each of which has goal-determined structural attributes. These attributes (or properties, or in other words, the structure of the activity), constrain the verbal component of that activity. The structure, furthermore, contains inferences about the meaning of the activity, and sets up expectations about that meaning.
Beyond these inferences and expectations is the knowledge that underlies them. Such knowledge is, metaphorically speaking, relatively far removed from the empirical event of the talk in an activity, and also relatively inaccessible as an aspect of investigation in the current study. This knowledge is not the primary concern of the present study.

The simple conclusion that can be drawn from these theoretical formulations, as well as from common experience, is that talk is different in different activities. However, the recognition of any one such activity as an entity is not unproblematic, since activities become embedded within each other. It is open to question how one determines which activity is extant at any one point in an ongoing conversation, for example, when joking sequences occur within formal 'work environment' talk (Levinson 1992 p. 99n).

There are various means for recognising activities in different research disciplines, usually by the application of a system of categories such as in studies based on the ethnography of communication (Hymes 1972) and in studies involving discourse analysis of 'speech acts' (Grice 1975; Searle 1975). In contrast to these fundamentally categorical methods, Garfinkel (in Gumperz 1982 p. 158) argues that the recognition and description of activities in terms of preconceived categories cannot adequately characterise social knowledge. Interactants create their own social world, the mechanisms of which can only be described by careful documenting of naturally occurring activities. The contribution of conversation analysts to this latter mode of thinking is that conversation is just such a naturally occurring activity, and the CA procedures have evolved in an attempt to study it, without, as Gumperz (1982 p. 158) puts it, "...making a priori assumptions about the social and cultural background of participants".

In the current study, some aspects of the social and cultural backgrounds of the participants are known and are carefully documented, as are some details of their predicted communicative ability (such as whether they are deaf or normally hearing, and their proficiency in either English or Sylheti). In spite of what could in this instance be considered as a priori knowledge, this knowledge does not lead to the making of assumptions about the talk between the participants or to the attribution of intentions to the participants. Such background information is important for other purposes, such as the eventual interpretation of the research findings and for the contextualisation of those findings into practical applications. Having such knowledge does not necessarily
imply contamination of the analytical procedures of CA. In this study, every effort was made to ensure that this did not happen. To paraphrase Button (1992), it is necessary for the participants to display their sense of the social context of the activity in which their talk is located, in their talk-in-interaction, and it is then the job of the analyst to uncover how the participants do this, by careful analysis of the actual interactions. This process of discovery is made possible by the procedures of CA. The resulting analyses may then serve to illuminate our understanding of the social context in which the talk has occurred.

Thus from the careful documentation of every aspect of each participant’s contribution to the talk, the interactionally constructed meaning of the talk becomes accessible to the analyst. In the current study, the samples of conversation have been recorded during activities which as has been mentioned before, are not entirely ‘naturally occurring’ insofar as the interaction was set up by the researcher and was recorded on both audio and video tape. Nevertheless, examination of the talk during these not-quite-natural, but also not-quite-institutional activities using the CA procedures, enables a description of the interactional processes which each participant displays. This provides a unique insight into the interaction which is relatively free from preconceived notions, leaving open the possibility of achieving new insights into the talk.

With regard to the linguistic forms which the participants use, Gumperz (1982) argues that the CA approach may not pay sufficient attention to the means by which speakers demonstrate how their strategies of conversational management are integrated with their own linguistic knowledge. He also says that in order to find out what the speakers' linguistic knowledge is,

"...we must abandon the existing views of communication which draw a basic distinction between cultural or social knowledge on the one hand and linguistic signalling on the other" (Gumperz 1982 p.186).

Whilst it was possible to reach some conclusions concerning both the linguistic knowledge of the participants, and the social structures in which they find themselves, the purpose of the work is not primarily to illuminate these two aspects. As with other conversation analytic work, in this study the interactions are considered to be structures of social action, which, as Schegloff (1992b) states

95
"... suggests not only multiplicity of structure, but the empirical nature of the enterprise. The units are concrete activities, and the search for their "components" involves examination and description of empirical instances". (Schegloff 1992b p.105)

It was considered appropriate and important to make detailed descriptions of the talk between the participants in this study in the first place, since it is from these descriptions, that answerable questions about the linguistics and the sociology of the interactions may then be derived. These descriptions are made by applying the procedures of CA to instances of actual interaction. In Schegloff's words:

"...the relevance of social structure....needs to be converted into the hard currency of defensible analysis" (Schegloff 1992b p.106)

Having raised some of the theoretical issues concerning the notion of 'activity' in conversation analysis of talk, it is now necessary to discuss what is regarded in this study as the recognisable activity in which the talk occurred in the samples which will be analysed later. This activity (mutual looking at and talking about photos and/or pictures) was consistent across all the dyads, and hence these segments were selected for analysis, as has been detailed in section 4.2.3 above. Because the study aims to make broad comparisons between the sets of data which arise from this activity, it is also germane to examine here some aspects of the cultural and cross-cultural nature of this activity.

As has been argued above, CA attempts to study the management of conversation per se, without making a priori assumptions about the participants or the setting, even if details about these facts are known. It is possible to do this in CA, because the kind of organisation which is generic to talk-in-interaction (such as the organisation of turn-taking, of sequences and of repair) constitute the underlying "fundamental" of social organisation and social action (Schegloff 1988 p.98). This concept relates back to Goffman's (1981) notion of 'system constraints and ritual constraints'. Goffman (ibid) suggested that in any naturally-occurring conversation, the participants are not only attempting to achieve mutual understanding (by system constraints), but are also doing so by paying attention to the "social acceptance" (or ritual constraints) of what they are conveying. These ritual constraints are culturally specific.

"Observe that although system constraints might be perceived of as pancultural, ritual concerns are patently dependent on cultural definitions and can be expected to vary from society to society (Goffman 1981 p. 17).
Schegloff (1988) takes issue with Goffman here, suggesting that what defines a “vernacular culture” (ibid p.98) are the occasional violations of the fundamental organisational practices of talk-in-interaction, and the way in which such violations are treated by members of that culture. Interestingly, Schegloff (1988) goes further, indicating that the experience of these violations and the manner in which they are dealt with by competent members is one way in which new members become socialised into that culture. This idea has relevance to the current study, insofar as the adult in the interactions can be seen as the competent member of the culture, and the child as the ‘new’ member. These ideas will be explored further in Chapter 8.

For the moment, in summary, what is apparent is that recognition of cultural variety does not mean that similar patterns across cultures cannot be found. Evidence from the relatively few CA studies which specifically address the issue of cultural contexts bears this out. Moerman (1988) studied Thai and American conversation, and found that his Thai data revealed the same sequential organisation as did the American data, and that there were similarities between the two data sets concerning the organisation and repair of understanding with regard to preferences for agreement. Also working with Thai data, Bilmes (cited in Collins 1991) found similar basic organisation between Thai and English. Collins (1991) showed that there were remarkable similarities in the patterns of preference organisation between her Arabic data sets and the English data sets of Pomerantz (1984a). Collins discusses the cultural context of her findings in terms of the fact that the situational context (or activity) in which the conversations took place, was not restricted to a specific cultural setting: the conversations were between two women students in their college residence. In a similar way, the situational context or activity in the current study concerns talk between adults and children at home, a setting which is not specific to Western (British) culture. There are aspects of this activity which would probably have been very different had the talk occurred in, say, a small village in Bangladesh: ethnomethodologists de Boulay and Williams (1987) explored the interaction between situational context and cultural setting in their comparative study of their respective fieldwork (one had been working in a city in Scotland, the other in a mountain village in Greece), and showed that in these instances, the situational contexts for conversation were determined by and specific to the cultural setting.
In the current study, there are also likely to be differences in the activity of 'talk at home between adult and child' between the native English children (members of the 'majority' culture in the U.K.) and the Sylheti children (members of a 'minority' culture in the U.K.). Although there is no published research on this specific topic, Gregory (1994) has shown how there was a considerable difference between the Sylheti home culture and the English school culture in the matter of reading practice. The differences spanned the purpose for reading, the materials used and the way in which members of the family participated in the activity.

In addition to these types of difference, there will also be individual differences in the 'culture' of talking, so to speak, of each individual family. It is hoped that close analysis of the data will illuminate these apparent differences.

To return now to the discussion of the activity in the current study, which has been described as being both ordinary and institutional: the adults were asked to chat to their child, and it was suggested by the researcher that looking at photos or pictures may be helpful.

The description of the activity and the explication of various attributes of the children, and the deaf children in particular, are given mainly to provide a foundation for the comparisons between the data sets which will be made later. A further reason for this is so that the analysis of the data may lead to suggestions regarding practical applications in the field of 'communicating with deaf children'.

A useful framework within which to view this activity of 'adult talking to child at home' derives from the work of Heritage and Sorjonen (1994). They use the term 'activity' in talk to mean the work achieved over a sequence or series of sequences as a relatively sustained topically coherent or goal coherent course of action. In their study of the talk between health visitors and first time mothers (in the mother's home) they suggest that the participants in the talk enter into the 'activity' of gathering mother-baby health-related information. They show how the mother and the health visitor display an orientation to this activity as being a coherent course of action, and as something which they can depart from and return to, when intervening sequences of talk occur. Their data suggests that the health visitor implements the activity by asking questions. She then can establish and maintain the course of action of the talk (to get information)
by prefacing certain questions in a sequence with 'and'. They further suggest that linking the sequences of questions and answers in this way maintains them as expectable elements of the activity, or as components of an "agenda" which is managed by the health visitor in order to accomplish the 'business' of the interaction. In the current study, mutual looking at pictures and chatting about them is the activity in which the talk occurs. The 'business' of, or 'agenda' for the interaction, as far as was agreed between the researcher and the adult participant, was for the adult to chat with the child. The data shows a pattern of question-answer sequences usually initiated by the adults. This pattern can be viewed as a way in which the adults establish and maintain the activity, and in so doing, accomplish the 'business' of the interaction.

Heritage and Sorjonen's study is not unique. It is part of a growing trend, reflected in the burgeoning CA literature on the study of institutional talk in which the activity in which the talk occurs is readily recognised and identified. Heritage and Atkinson (1984 p. 15n) list the early work in this field and more recently, Drew and Heritage (1992a) and Ten Have and Psathas (1995) present collections of papers from researchers covering institutional talk in activities such as job interviews (Button 1992), courtroom proceedings (Atkinson 1992; Drew 1992; Komter 1995), doctor-patient interviews (Czyzewski 1995; Bergman 1992; Heath 1992; Maynard 1992), emergency calls (Zimmerman 1992). Much of the talk in these interactions is shown to consist of question-answer sequences. Since such sequences also characterise the current data, the next section provides some background as to the way they are viewed in CA terms.

4.3.4 Question-answer sequences in CA

In the current study the question-answer sequences which characterise the data are the focus of analysis. In this section, after outlining the fundamental concepts of turn and adjacency pair in CA, the discussion will concentrate on the CA approach to the analysis of utterances which function as questions, by discussing types of questions, the function of question-answer sequences and the structure of both the question turn and the response turn. Unless otherwise indicated, the examples given in this section 4.3.4 are all from data collected as part of this study. Details of the transcript notation used in these examples are given in Appendix 4.
Turns at talk

A turn is taken to be the utterance (or non-verbal equivalent) made by a participant in talk, at a time in the talk which is allocated to that participant in accordance with the systematic rules for the local and interactive management of turn-taking in naturally occurring conversations in English (Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson 1974). They characterise the local management of turn-taking by describing a system of ordered rules and their organisation, the aim of the turn-taking system being the organisation of speakers talking “one at a time while speaker change recurs” (ibid p 726).

Local management of the turn-taking system means that the operations in the system are ‘local’, in that, on a turn by turn basis, these operations are directed to the order of turns - ‘next turn’, ‘turn transition, ‘next turn transition’ ‘transition relevance places’ (points in talk where turn allocation can change) and so on - throughout the sequence.

Turn size is also locally managed: the unfolding of each turn is constrained by the preceding turn structure, and by the orientation to the next turn. Turn size is not fixed, and is described syntactically in terms of turn-constructional units which can be sentential, clausal, phrasal or lexical. Hence a turn can range in length from only one word to several sentences. An extended turn is usually one which comprises a number of turn-constructional units. In the analysis and discussion of the current data, an extended turn refers to a turn which is longer than one word or one short sentence.

Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson (1974) describe a further organisational feature of the turn-taking system which they call its interactional management. This has to do with the notion of conversational participants being sensitive to the context of each other’s conversations in order to ensure mutual understanding and intersubjectivity in their talk. The principle by which interactional management is achieved, is that of ‘recipient design’. By this is meant

“...a multitude of respects in which the talk by a party in a conversation is constructed or designed in ways which display an orientation and a sensitivity to the particular other(s) who are the co-participant(s)” (Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson 1974 p. 727).

An example of recipient design is in found in CDS, that is, the way in which mothers adjust their language to suit their conception of their child’s level of understanding. As will be seen in later chapters, the recipient design principle is a useful means of accounting for some features of the current data.
Question-answer adjacency pairs

Question-answer sequences are regarded in CA terms as 'adjacency pairs', with the question turn being the first part of the pair, and the answer (the response turn) being the second part, as is illustrated in Fragment K2 where the mother (M) is questioning the child (K):

Fragment K 2a

1 M:  =mm where was that (first pair part)
2 K:   uh in India= (second pair part)

The adjacency pair is a crucial concept in CA and forms the basis of what Sacks (1995a [1972] p.522) has called the "overall structural organisation of conversation". An adjacency pair is a sequence of two utterances which sets up certain expectations. These are that the two utterances will be adjacent, that they will be produced by different speakers, that they will be relatively ordered into a first and a second part, and that these parts are furthermore, discriminatively related or 'typed', for example, a question will expect an answer (and not a greeting); an offer will expect an acceptance rather than a refusal (Sacks 1995a [1972]). The rule of thumb is that in her/his turn, the current speaker will produce the first part, will then stop speaking and the next speaker in her/his next turn, must produce the second part.

The first part of an adjacency pair such as question and answer, sets up the expectation that the second part will follow. This illustrates the concept of 'conditional relevance', that is, the relevant response (the answer) is conditional on the asking of the question (Levinson 1983). In other words, the sequential implication of asking a question is that the next selected speaker is obliged to provide an answer in some form.

Furthermore, adjacency pair structure is a normative framework for actions, and its implementation is accountable (Heritage 1984). By this is meant that an utterance which is identifiable as a first pair part, (for example on account of a combination of its syntactic design, its position in the sequence and its conventional properties), selects a next speaker who should immediately produce the second pair part. This second part is "accountably due" (Heritage 1984 p. 247) on completion of the first part. That adjacency pairs are a normative feature in conversation is evidenced by the regularity with which they are shown to occur in ordinary conversations, and also, by the robustness with which the adjacency pair structure is oriented to by participants when
that structure is not fully implemented. For example, in the frequently observed instances when the answer is not given immediately in the turn adjacent to the question, that is, the second part may not be produced immediately after the first part, there may be a so-called 'insertion sequence' between the two parts (Heritage 1984 pp 251-2), but the question-answer adjacency pair is nevertheless completed. Fragment Jo4 illustrates this point.

Fragment Jo4

1  Jo: ...(.) what is that
2  L: which one
3  Jo: there
4  L: dunno (1.8)

In line 2, L’s utterance does not answer the question asked by Jo in line 1, but it does display relatedness to that question. It is this relatedness that warrants its occurrence in that turn. Jo’s turn in line 3 then acknowledges this relatedness between lines 1 and 2, and it provides L with another opportunity to answer the original question. Although L’s answer (line 4) and Jo’s original question (line 1) are not adjacent, the sequence has proceeded with the sustained expectation that the first pair part in line 1 will eventually receive its second part, in line 4.

The conditional relevance of a second action on a first has the property of permitting the participants in conversation (and, as Heritage (1984) points out, conversation analysts as well) to note when conversational events are absent, and to then embark on actions to bring about those events. This was illustrated in fragment Jo4 above, where it was shown that the question-answer adjacency pair was completed in spite of the insertion sequence. It is the accountability of the features of adjacency pairs which makes fine-grained analysis of more complicated conversational interactions possible. Analysis proceeds by examining how a current speaker’s turn projects a relevant turn by the next speaker. When the relevant next turn occurs, its normative characteristic indicates that it does not require any special explanation. If it does not occur, then its absence calls for more detailed accounting.

Thus far, in this section, the fundamental concept of the adjacency pair structure in conversation, and the central role which the normative nature of this structure plays in conversation analysis has been outlined. Questioners have a normative expectation which has the sequential implication that the question will be answered, that is, that the
selected next speaker (the answerer) is obliged to give some sort of response in the next turn. It is conditionally relevant for a first action, the question, to constrain the production of the second action, the answer.

There is another, vital issue, that of intersubjectivity, which underlies this discussion. What is meant by intersubjectivity - using the example of question answer sequences - is that by responding to the question the answerer manifests in their answer a matrix of understandings of the prior question turn. These understandings include: that it is the answerer’s turn to talk; that the prior utterance has been understood as being a question; that the grammar of that question was understood, and also, that the content of the question was understood. Furthermore, having received the answer, the asker of the original question then has the opportunity in the next turn to display their understanding of that answer. Schegloff (1992a) sums this up:

“Each next turn provides a locus for the display of many understandings by its speaker - understandings of what has immediately preceded or of what has occurred earlier or elsewhere that nonetheless figures in the turn’s talk.” (Schegloff 1992a p.1300)

In whatever way the recipient of a first utterance has interpreted that utterance, some evidence of this interpretation will be displayed in the recipient’s next turn. Schegloff and Sacks (1974) summarised this notion as follows:

“What two utterances produced by different speakers can do that one utterance cannot do is: by an adjacently produced second, a speaker can show that he understood what a prior aimed at, and that he is willing to go along with that. Also, by virtue of the occurrence of an adjacently produced second, the doer of a first can see that what he intended was indeed understood, and that it was or was not accepted. Also, of course, a second can assert his failure to understand, or disagreement, and, inspection of a second by a first can allow the first speaker to see that while the second thought he understood, indeed he misunderstood. It is then through the use of adjacent positioning that appreciations, failures, correctings, et cetera can be themselves understandably attempted.” (Schegloff and Sacks 1974 p.240)

The way in which the second speaker ascertains whether or not their turn was an adequate assessment of the prior, is by reference to the next turn that the first speaker makes. This third turn is an important locus where, after the second turn, the first speaker is given a systematic opportunity\(^2\) to attend to any misunderstanding of their first turn which was displayed in the second. When problems in understanding of either the first or the second turn are made apparent, the third turn position becomes the

locus for attending to the problem - either by repair, or repair initiation, or other such procedures (see Schegloff 1992a for a detailed discussion of this topic). This locus is also important for other procedures, particularly in the talk between young children and adults (Tarplee 1993; 1996), as will be discussed in detail in Chapter 5.

This three part structure is a pervasive phenomenon in conversation, not only for question and answer sequences, and as Heritage (1984) suggests, a ‘third’ action which achieves “some ‘normal’ onward development or trajectory for a sequence” (ibid p. 258) that will tacitly display mutual understanding. In using this framework, conversational participants do not have to overtly confirm and reconfirm their understanding of each others actions. The sequential organisational aspect of talk, or, in other words, its local and interactional management (Sacks Schegloff and Jefferson 1974) provides for displays of mutual understanding, and also for any problems in understanding. Sacks et al (ibid) suggest that the organisation of turn-taking partially controls the understanding of utterances insofar as a willing next speaker must listen to and analyse the utterances of a first speaker in order to know if or when he is being selected as next speaker. This is particularly relevant for question-answer sequences, since a first-pair part such as a question constitutes a major class of the “current selects next” technique of turn allocation.

The question-answer adjacency pair also demonstrates another basic concept in CA, that of the ‘preference structure’ of conversation (Sacks 1995b [1972]; Pomerantz 1984a; Levinson 1983). This is not the psychological concept of preference, but a concept which characterises conversational events in which alternative but non-equivalent actions are possible for the participants (Heritage and Atkinson 1984). Questions, for example, are constructed so as to receive expected answers rather than unexpected answers. Weber (1993) notes that preference structure is indicated lexically and syntactically in the structural design of the question turn; it is the question that prefers the response, not the questioner. To illustrate this simply, Weber (1993) quotes examples from Quirk, Greenbaum, Leech and Svartik (1985) to show how an assertive form used in a positive yes/no question is conducive to, or prefers, an affirmative answer:
Question: Has the boat left already?  
Answer: Yes

By the same token, a negative yes/no question prefers a negative response:

Question: Aren’t you joining us this evening?  
Answer: No

These two simple examples illustrate how the preference structure of question-answer adjacency pairs is collaboratively managed, that is, the design of the question by the asker influences the design of the answer made by the answerer. The examples also illustrate how the preference structure is indicated sequentially across speaker turns (Weber 1993; Levinson 1983).

Preference structure is also clearly apparent in the structure of tag questions illustrated in the following two examples of talk (from the current study) between the child J and his mother M. Here it is again clear how the design of the question ‘prefers’ the answer (Weber 1993). Firstly, in Fragment J2, the positive statement, followed by the negative tag in line 2 (underlined) prefers the positive response given in line 3 (underlined):

Fragment J 2
1 M: That's before we had any grass in the garden as well
2 isn't it (negative tag)
3 J: I know and there's Pete and (positive response)

By the same token, in Fragment J3, the negative statement followed by the positive tag in line 1 prefers the negative response given in line 2.

Fragment J 3
1 M: =You didn't want your photo taken there did you (positive tag)
2 J: No (...)* there's Hank (negative response)
Types of questions

Schegloff (1984) commented that whilst a complete, neat linguistic account of questions may not be available, there are nevertheless syntactic, prosodic and other attributes in the construction of certain utterances which allow them to be recognised as being questions. By implication, these utterances indicate that a questioning action is being performed, thus supplying "a ready bridge ...for us to cross from language to social action " (Schegloff 1984 p. 30). However, it can be misleading to consider these utterances as a category of social action, based only on their lexical or syntactic structure, without due regard to their placement in the overall organisation of the conversation. The design (that is the structure or syntax) of many types of questions has been described in linguistic terms in the literature (see Weber 1993; and Hargie, Saunders and Dickson 1994 for a recent formulation of categories of question types). In CA terms, the design of an utterance should always be viewed in terms of its sequential placement, and, in order for that utterance to be recognised as 'doing' questioning in the first place, its syntax must interact with its sequential positioning (Weber 1993 p. 15). Utterances in the linguistic form of a question may not be doing the work of questioning in the sequence of talk in which they occur. What seems to be important in conversation is that an utterance is treated interactionally as being a question, as was shown, for example in Fragment K2 line 1, earlier in this section. This example can be considered as a clear case of an utterance doing the work of questioning, or, to use Schegloff's phrase, the utterance is an "interactional" question as opposed to a "linguistic" question. An utterance like this "...lays constraints on the next slot in the conversation of a sort special to the question-answer pair type of adjacency pairs" (Schegloff 1984 p. 34)

Similar clear cases of interactional questions are frequently found in the current data. These are so-called 'test' questions to which there is arguably a 'right' answer which is known by the asker. When a question is a 'test' question, the evidence that this is so is to be found in the ensuing sequence of turns: when the 'right' answer is given, the asker will acknowledge (give a receipt to) that answer. This is illustrated in the example below, in which K and his mother are talking about a photograph. The receipt occurs in line 3 that is, in the third turn of the sequence.
The evidence that a test question has been asked does not always occur in the third turn, as the next example (fragment W2i) from a conversation between W (a deaf boy, aged 7 years) and his father illustrates. In line 2, F asks a test question, and then pursues the right answer which he finally gets in line 9 and receipts in line 10.

In some instances, when the right answer is not given, the asker provides it. An example of this is found by returning to Fragment K2, where K’s mother pursues the ‘right’ answer to her test question (line 3), and when K does not give it, she provides it for him in line 7:

The ‘test’ question sequences illustrated above appear to be a relatively robust question-answer adjacency pair sequence type in the current data.

It is tempting to suggest a clear distinction between ‘test’ question sequences, and what could be called ‘real’ questions, that is, other questions to which the asker does not know the answer, or might not know the answer. However, this distinction does not always stand up to scrutiny, especially when there is demonstrable empirical ambiguity...
in the ensuing sequence as displayed by the participants. An example is given in fragment J1a, where J is talking to his mother (M). The question asked by M in line 4 is shown, as the sequence proceeds, not to have been a test question, because J’s answer in line 5, is not receipted by M in the way that receipts to the test questions were made in previous examples given above. M's utterance in line 7 indicates that she probably did not know the answer to her question.

Fragment J1a

4 M: Magic stones what were they called=
5 J : =but magic what they don I don know
6 (1.5)((M and J look at each other))
7 M: I can’t remember what they were called=
8 J : =No I can't remember=

For reasons explored further below, it has proved useful in this study to regard test questions as a recognisable question-answer pair type from which identifiable actions follow. However, it was not considered to be useful to label any other types of questions, or to try to narrow down exactly what sort of questioning function other utterances designed as questions, may be fulfilling.

Function of the question-answer sequence

The use of question-answer sequences and test questions in particular allows specific interactional ‘work’ to get done. For example, question-answer sequences are used by teachers as essential devices for instruction in classroom settings. Parents/carers also use them for instruction (as was pointed out in Chapter 1), for example, when teaching their children politeness routines, or helping them with school work. Two other types of interactional work done by questions are relevant to the current research, and will be discussed in more detail here:

a) Question-answer sequences can function as a language teaching/learning device;

b) They are useful as a means of encouraging children to talk.

a) With regard to language teaching/learning, Tarplee (1993) has shown that question-answer sequences which do the work of labelling are important for young children in their acquisition of lexical and articulatory knowledge. The adult knows the answer to the question s/he is asking of the child, but chooses to use a test question structure in order to prompt the child into a labelling answer. Such sequences usually follow the pattern elicitation, label, third turn receipt, as in the example below, similar to the
pattern of turns shown in the examples of test question-answer sequences such as Fragment K2 above. In fragment K3, K is again talking to his mother, M.

Fragment K3
1 M: what’s it called=  (elicitation)
2 K : =u::m (.4) wagon  (label)
3 M: wagon yeah that’s right  (third turn receipt)

Not only do such question-answer sequences do the interactional work of ‘teaching/learning’ labels for things, but they can also do repair work in which the adult is able to guide the child in attaining an appropriate lexical and phonetic label. An example of this can be seen in fragment K7 (K and his mother)

Fragment K7
1 M: and who was that with you  (elicitation)
2 K: ma ma Monnen  (label)
3 M: and who is Mullen  (receipt, elicitation and embedded correction)
4 K: my my: (. ) cousin  (label)
5 M: Yeah  (receipt)

In line 3, M receipts K’s answer to her first question in line 1. She does this by asking another question which is designed to include a correction of K’s mispronunciation (in line 2) of his cousin’s name. M’s turn in line 3 also functions as an elicitation of K’s next utterance, which, as can be seen from line 4, is an answer to the question. M’s receipt in line 5, indicates that the whole sequence can be characterised as a test question-answer adjacency pair sequence, which is also functioning as a sequence to teach an appropriate label.

b) Question-answer sequences can do the work of encouraging talk: This can be considered as a style of interaction between adults and children, and is of interest not only because, in western culture, it is an ordinary way in which adults and children interact, but also because in rehabilitative or remedial contexts, techniques to ‘elicit language’ from children are used by adults, be they parents, or professionals such as speech and language therapists, teachers or psychologists. As has been mentioned in section 4.3.2 above, the setting for the current data (a pre-arranged recording session in the family home) is both ‘ordinary’ and ‘institutional’. Indeed, there are aspects of this talk which are rather more like institutional talk than like ordinary talk. The ‘activity’ in which the adult and the child talk about photos or pictures, however, seems to span the
domain of both ordinary and institutional talk, since looking at pictures together is an ordinary way for parents to interact with their children, and this activity is also ordinary in institutional contexts.

That the child-centred activity of 'encouraging talk' in the way described above may be an identifiable feature of our western English-speaking culture, and may possibly not be a feature of Sylheti-speaking culture, will be pursued further later (see Chapter 8 section 8.2.3).

Structure of the question turn and of the response turn

Turns which are shown to be functioning as questions in a sequence can be designed in a variety of ways, as was discussed above. When considering the response turn, it is interesting to do so with further reference to Sacks' (1995b [1972]) notion of the preference structure mentioned above. This concerns the assertion that a particular question can 'prefer' a response only one answer long, or it can 'prefer' a response more than one answer long. An example of the former is the 'clear case' question such as suggested by Weber (1993):

Question: Has the boat left already?
Answer: Yes

On the other hand, Sacks (1995b [1972]) suggests that if a question prefers a response more than one answer long, that question can be thought of as a topic opener. One way of opening a topic (and there are many other ways of doing so) is to ask a question which is so designed that the response to it can be more than one answer long, although a single answer will suffice. An example of this, given by Sacks (1995b [1972] p. 567) is the question “how have you been” to which either of the following answers are possible: “fine” or “really really rotten you can't imagine what's happening...” (speaker then continues to talk on this topic). The latter answer shows that the answerer has treated the question as a topic opener. In the analysis of the current data that follows, the distinction between a response turn that is only one answer long and a response turn which is more than one answer long is important. Turns of only one word or one short sentence are considered to be a response turn only one answer long. Response turns more than one answer long are turns of longer sentences or several sentences. These are called extended turns in the analysis.
Given that the purpose of the activity, as explained to the parents in the study, was to record the talk between them and their child, it is possible that the parents would design their talk so as to encourage responses from the children that were more than one answer long, in effect encouraging extended turns at talk from the children. The data shows that the parents mostly use the question as a device for opening a topic for talk, and that this device has varying degrees of success. Some extended turns at talk are seen, but there are many instances of response turns only one answer long. These responses depend, naturally, on the exact design of the question, as will be discussed in detail in the analysis. Interestingly, some questions while not resulting in an extended response turn, do result in an extended topical sequence of short turns.

4.3.5 CA studies of talk in which one participant can be considered to be less competent than the other.

CA studies with children

Much of the CA literature relates to conversations between competent adult speakers who are normally hearing. There is however, an increasing number of reported studies using CA to analyse conversations other than those between such adults. Several studies address the issue of talk between normally hearing and speaking children and adults. Schegloff (1989) uses the detailed analysis of a segment of ‘dinner-table talk’ between a mother and child to illustrate his discussion of the joint production of talk, and the ensuring of mutual understanding, to which the developing child has to become attuned. Schegloff address the issue of the repair of utterances, where repair, in this instance is seen as a means of checking that a reference in an utterance has been mutually understood.

In the early 1980’s, having moved from a more traditional sociolinguistic framework (Wootton 1974) to a framework regarding adult:child interactions in CA terms, Wootton pointed out that CA procedures had not been used, at that time, to make claims for the development of interactional strategies by children, but that as with adult data, the procedures were being used to trace the “systematics in the management of interactional matters” (Wootton 1981 p. 106). He discusses, for example, the possibility that children may not display the same range of turn types as adults do, when they respond to conversational organisations such as preference structures. In his later work, Wootton explored the relationship between ‘systematics’ and the child’s
developing interactional skills by using CA procedures. For example, he showed how a very young child displayed development of sequential skills associated with intersubjectivity over a period of eight months (Wootton 1994). His findings indicate that throughout this period of time, in sequences initiated either by the child requesting an object or the adult offering an object, when the request was refused, the child managed this interactional contingency by re-requesting the object. Wootton relates this analysis to the development of displaying reparitive action in the third turn position of a request sequence.

Other researchers using CA procedures to analyse adult:child interaction focus on question-answer adjacency sequences. The work of Tarplee (1993; 1996), which has relevance to the current study (see section 4.3.4 above), focuses on the language learning/teaching nature of adult:child interactions. Tarplee (1996) studied the characteristics of talk between adults and young children (aged between 1.7 years to 2.3 years) during the activity of picture labelling. A labelling sequence has a three part structure: starting with an elicitation turn from the adult, followed by a labelling utterance from the child, which the adult then follows with a receipt turn. Using the procedures of CA, Tarplee distinguishes the particular shape of the receipt turn, and shows how different shapes of this turn have different consequences for the subsequent talk. For example, a receipt turn which is shaped as an exact repetition of the child’s labelling utterance (both in its phonetic realisation and in its prosody) serves to end the labelling sequence and accomplishes the work of affirming the child’s choice of label. On the other hand, a receipt turn which is shaped differently from the child’s preceding turn serves to elicit another labelling attempt by the child, and effectively serves a reparitive function. Tarplee shows that what appears to be a single linguistic object in a particular sequential position - a repetition following a labelling attempt - can be seen as fulfilling different functions in terms of the interactional accomplishment achieved.

Drew (1981) also addressed the issue of adults’ corrections of children’s mistakes in adult:child talk. Some of his findings concern the design of the turn in which the correction is made. He shows that this depends on the sequential placement of that turn, and subsequently, a particular design results in a specific interactional achievement. For example, turns designed as corrections per se necessitate an
acknowledgement of the correction by the prior speaker. Turns designed as invitations for the prior speaker to self-correct tend to be followed by a correction.

As was mentioned in the sections on language input in Chapter 1, evidence from the vast literature on child-directed speech indicates that the use of questions is a robust general feature of adults’ speech to children in a Western, English-speaking setting. It must also not be forgotten that the children ask questions too, in the hope that the adults will respond. As Wootton (1974) has commented,

"...interrogation constitutes one of the major means by which children themselves attempt to attach meaning to their worlds" (Wootton 1974 p.277).

Given that questioning is a feature of conversations with deaf children, as was also shown in Chapter 1, albeit for different reasons, it seems appropriate that in this study, the analysis of conversations with deaf children focus on the examination of the question answer sequences found in the data.

**CA studies with participants who have a communication disability**

There is a rapidly expanding area of research into conversations in which one participant is an ordinary or "natural" speaker (Collins and Murphy 1994) and the other can be regarded as being extraordinary or even as less competent because of a communication disorder of one kind or another. Wells (1997) has pointed out an inherent paradox in ‘doing CA’ on data where one participant may, by definition, not be orienting to the normal conventions of interactions, (on account of her/his communication disorder), since the CA analysis depends on the participants orientation to these conventions. Motivated by the intrinsic challenge of such data, by the insights into normal talk which could be gained from investigating ‘disordered’ talk and by the need for more knowledge about disorders which can inform therapeutic intervention, researchers have addressed their attention to interactional issues in different types of communication disorders, such as ‘aphasic talk’ that is, talk in which one of the participants has aphasia (the language disorder acquired as a result of brain damage caused, for example, by a cerebro-vascular accident); talk in interactions with adult users of systems for augmentative and alternative communication (AAC). There is a small body of work on conversations with children whose communication is disordered. Some of the findings of these research endeavours will be outlined here.
Wilkinson (1997) and Lesser and Milroy (1993) in their studies of talk between an aphasic participant and a non-aphasic participant, focus on what the two participants themselves treat as problematic in their talk, rather than on what a researcher (or a therapist) might assume to be problematic. Wilkinson (1995a; 1997) studied the problems arising in aphasic talk when the participants show that there is not mutual understanding of turns, and repair strategies are initiated. Using the normal conventions of interaction which concern the repair of misunderstood turns (Schegloff 1987a; 1993; Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks 1977), Wilkinson examines how the misunderstandings arise, and how they are signalled as being problematic either by the participant whose turn was the trouble source, or by the interlocutor. He also shows how, once the repair has been initiated, the participants then deal with the problem. Among his many findings, he demonstrates clearly how the problems signalled by the non-aphasic speaker relate to the aphasic speaker’s particular disorder, for example, when a particular word in an utterance of an aphasic speaker with phonemic paraphasia is not understood by the non-aphasic interlocutor, the latter initiates a lengthy repair sequence in order to clarify the misunderstanding. Lesser and Milroy (1993 p.212) also comment on the extremely lengthy repair sequences resulting from word finding problems which are tolerated in aphasic talk, compared to the relative shortness of repair sequences observable in non-aphasic talk.

Both Wilkinson (1995b) and Lesser and Milroy (1993) have also investigated similarities and differences in repair sequences in aphasic talk both in institutional settings (such as between the aphasic speaker and a speech and language therapist) and in a more natural setting (such as between the aphasic speaker and her/his spouse). Based on their findings concerning the repair strategies in aphasic discourse, Milroy and Perkins (1992) suggest that closer investigation of the cognitive neuropsychological abilities of aphasic speakers can be related to their conversational abilities, and that this, in turn will eventually inform both pragmatic and direct approaches to therapeutic intervention with aphasic clients. Perkins (1995) clearly demonstrates how the specific impairment in single word processing in her three aphasic subjects impacted on their conversations both with family members, and with a speech and language therapist. Using CA, Perkins was able to uncover the way in which the manifested linguistic impairments were managed in the interactions by both participants. She suggests that the level of detail which the CA analysis provided is required to achieve workable and relevant procedures for rehabilitative intervention.
Goodwin (1995) demonstrates this point too, in his detailed analysis of one aphasic man's communications using only three words: 'yes', 'no' and 'and'. He shows that although this vocabulary is extremely limited, it nevertheless is used to "co-construct meaning" between the man and his interlocutors.

Collins and Murphy (1994) and Collins, Markova and Murphy (1997) have addressed conversational issues in interactions between natural speakers and users of AAC systems. One such issue is the particular difficulty represented by the management of closings in interactions between these participants. Using their admirable and intricate system for the detailed transcription of these interactions, Collins, Markova and Murphy (1997) demonstrated that difficulties are apparent when either the natural speaker, or the AAC user, initiates closings. Most often, the natural speaker initiates the closing, but this is unilaterally accomplished, because of the difficulty in ensuring the AAC user's collaboration. When the AAC user initiates closing, s/he often uses a gesture, and relies on the natural speaker to infer that that gesture indicates closing. The difficulty here is in making the natural speaker understand the intention. Alternatively, the AAC users initiate closing by switching off their AAC system, thus abruptly ending the interaction. Collins et al (ibid) conclude their remarkable study with several practical suggestions for the development of interactional skills of both AAC users and their interactants, and also for the future design of AAC systems.

Mathy-Laikko and West (1992) investigated the way in which AAC users and natural speakers negotiated a topic for conversation. Using CA, they showed that the pre-topical question-answer sequences (Maynard and Zimmerman 1984) which are typical in the talk of natural speakers, are also found in the interaction between AAC users and their interlocutors. In this way, (Mathy-Laikko and West 1992) demonstrated how CA may be "an effective tool for evaluating what is regular and irregular in conversations involving AAC users" (ibid p. 126)

McKinlay and Newell (1992) addressed the issue of AAC users employing computer-based communication aids. They used the normative conventions of turn-taking which CA has delineated (Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson 1974) to explore ways in which
AAC systems could be better designed. The findings from their study using simulated non-speaking conditions with non-disabled subjects, indicated that without an explicit turn-requesting mechanism, the turn-taking of participants in the interaction was chaotic. Their recommendations from this work are addressed not only to the designers of AAC systems to incorporate turn-requesting devices into the machines, but they also point out the need for training AAC users in the necessary turn-taking skills. Linell (1991) points out that approaching communication with AAC users from the basis of CA underlines the fact that using technology to aid communication does not only substitute or add single components, but implies a whole new integrative pattern of communication.

Rather fewer researchers have turned their attention to children with communication disabilities. Wootton (1990) studied the initiation of interaction by children with Down's syndrome. He focused on interactional sequences initiated by the children by pointing to a target location when looking at picture books with their parents. He showed that by their use of pointing (to a particular picture, or part of a picture), the children topicalised the target for talk.

Wells and Local (1993) use CA procedures to analyse the relationship between prosodic detail and interactional behaviour in a child whose speech and language development is delayed. Their findings show that in order to maintain conversational interaction, the child used prosodic resources to clearly indicate the ends of his turns, and that he did this at the expense of using prosody to highlight focused informational items in his utterances.

Drawing on the considerable number of CA studies concerning 'topic' management between natural speakers (for example, Button and Casey 1984; 1985; Jefferson 1984), Radford and Tarplee (1995) addressed the issue of collaborative management of topic shift in the peer interactions of a 10 year old child with a specific language impairment (SLI). They found that, unlike natural speakers who use a variety of strategies for initiating, maintaining and changing topic, the boy displayed consistent use of one strategy irrespective of the communicative setting. The insights provided by their analysis revealed features of the boy's conversation that offer tangible clues to factors which contribute to his social difficulties.
Gardner (1995; 1997) has investigated interactional issues in young children with SLI, and with phonological disorders in particular. Using the procedures of CA, she demonstrates how children with phonological disorders display competence at an interactional level. For example, she examined the repair strategies used during speech therapy tasks aimed primarily at addressing the children’s phonological ‘errors’ (Gardner 1997). Her findings indicated that the way in which the child was interpreting the adult’s prior (which was a repair initiation or request) affected the next turn. In this next turn, what appeared to be the child’s apparent ‘failure’ to correct a phonological ‘error’, had, in fact, been interactionally determined by the design of the therapist’s repair initiation. Gardner points out that using CA to examine this data enabled her to depart from describing the deficits in the talk of phonologically disordered children and to illustrate the interactional skill that they use to manage repair strategies.

Local and Wootton (1995) have analysed interactional aspects of the prosody of an autistic boy aged 11 years. Their findings indicated that the boy showed different types of ‘echoing’ speech behaviour which were interactionally and prosodically distinct. Some of these were used in ways appropriate to communication, and some, although not altogether appropriate, were nevertheless used systematically as "...moves in some language game..." (ibid p. 182). The authors further described a particular ‘unusual echo’ in the boy’s repertoire which had no counterpart in the verbal behaviour of non-autistic children. From the analysis, they were able to address some key questions about the boy’s communicative behaviour, such as the role played by echoing in his verbal interactions. They suggest that because his repetition skills were sophisticated, echoing was a successful way to deal with replies to questions from adults.

With regard to deafness, there is no published work using a CA approach with deaf children whose main means of communication is spoken language, but the evidence of the studies outlined above is encouraging, and shows that using this approach may yield much information.
4.3.6 Appropriacy of CA for the study of data from deaf children

As can be found in the work with other categories of communication disability cited above, there are compelling reasons why CA is a suitable choice of methodology for investigating interactions with deaf people and with deaf children in particular. First of all, CA enables the examination of the collaborative nature of interaction, which has crucial implications for language development and use. Knowledge at this level informs the practice of any professional working with deaf people and their families. Secondly, from CA analyses of ordinary interactions between competent adult speakers, it becomes clear that during the interaction, the participants are displaying how they deal with

"the moment to moment contingencies of life in interaction, and with the details of language use and conduct" [within that interaction] (Schegloff 1989 p. 23).

When examining data from deaf children talking to normally hearing adults, the level of detail provided by CA allows for the reflection of how these contingencies are displayed by both parties. The detail makes it possible to examine very carefully how, for example, question-answer sequences are shown to be doing the work of labelling (Tarplee 1993), or to be doing the work of ‘testing’ (Heritage 1984). Once again, such descriptions can inform practitioners involved in encouraging spoken language in deaf children. With data collected over time, it may be that such detail could suggest how the ‘contingencies’ of interaction may be being learned by the deaf child and being taught by the adult. This would provide a different type of insight than is provided, for example, by group studies which investigate the development of various aspects of deaf children’s skills in using ‘linguistic’ question forms (Lartz 1993; LaSasso 1990; de Villiers, de Villiers and Hoban 1994)

With regard to deafness, it is interesting to relate the sensory impairment per se to the following extract from Schegloff’s 1989 paper which focuses on child language development:

“one need not actually hear a fully articulated, acoustically pure signal conveying an unambiguous message in order to know what someone is saying, or what they are doing in saying whatever they are saying. Regularly, an orientation to a projectable next action or course of action, an orientation to a domain of mutual relevance, allows a recipient to “hear” and to grasp what is being said and done from a partial uptake of a partially flawed ‘signal’. What some utterance is, and is doing, is assembled from
both its content and its context, its position and its composition, the acoustic and visual 'signals' and the textures of relevance with which they interact" (Schegloff 1989 p. 19)

The acoustic signal which deaf children receive will be considerably different to that received by normally hearing children, for example, they will probably not hear (or lip-read) the unstressed grammatical elements of speech, such as tense markers and inflections. In the light of this, it would be of interest to pursue further Schegloff's observation about making use of a partial signal. Studies investigating the issue of how adults talk to deaf children indicate that the adults usually make an effort to present their utterances in the clearest possible manner - by using shorter sentences, simpler grammar, and vocabulary, good lip patterns, frequent repetitions and louder delivery. In other words, the adults modify their talk not only to match their perception of the child's ability to understand, but also her/his ability to hear the talk in the first place. In Chapter 8, this line of argument will be taken up again. As will be seen, the detailed analysis of the current data casts some light on this point.

Another finding reported in the literature is that when talking to deaf people, it is necessary to make frequent checks that the 'topic' of conversation remains shared by the participants during the course of that conversation (Wood et al 1986). In CA terms, the notion of shared topic can be regarded as what Schegloff (1991b; 1992a) has described as 'intersubjectivity', by which he means the maintenance of a "world" which is mutually understood by the participants to be the same world. CA offers a view of conversation as being structurally organised in such a way that there are opportunities to detect and to repair any problems that the participants may encounter with the achievement and maintenance of intersubjectivity. Analysis of data involving the talk of deaf children will allow for the careful unpicking of how sequences in which misunderstandings are signalled, and then how the talk proceeds until the misunderstanding either is or is not, clarified or repaired (Drew 1981). Whilst the analyses presented later do not directly address the issue of repair per se, intersubjectivity is an important underlying focus.

A further reason for the appropriacy of using CA procedures for examining data from deaf children is the fact that this data-driven approach emphasises the description of observable behaviour. Having been observed and recorded, this behaviour can repeatedly be viewed by different analysts with "evidence of communicative success or failure being sought in a sequential context" (Perkins 1995 p. 373). This allows the
analyst to depart from prescriptive, and subjective judgements of 'normalcy' and 'deviance'. Such an approach may enable a move away from the 'deficiency' model (Webster 1986) within which deafness is often regarded. From a practical point of view, it can be said that CA descriptions of conversations with deaf children may provide an understanding of the underlying components of the communication difficulties that exist when deaf children and normally hearing adults converse, without prejudice, and that such understanding can feed into more effective rehabilitation strategies.
INTRODUCTION TO CHAPTERS 5, 6, AND 7

The process of scanning the audio and video recordings from each dyad and of selecting segments of talk (as detailed in Chapter 4 section 4.2.3), resulted in the following data sets for each dyad:

- audio and video clips of the selected segments from the original recordings
- transcriptions (and translations where appropriate) of the talk in those segments;

Thereafter, analysis of these data sets was embarked upon and completed. In order to sensibly consider the analyses in a contrastive manner, and in the hope of being relatively succinct in doing so, the dyads were grouped, in the first place, according to the first language of the deaf children. Hence the analysis of the data from the English-speaking deaf boy, could be contrasted with data from the English-speaking normally hearing boys. It was the intention that data for the Sylheti-speaking families could be similarly grouped and contrasted, so that the next grouping would enable the data from the deaf boys from Sylheti-speaking families to be contrasted with data from the normally hearing boys also from Sylheti-speaking families. A complication arose with this latter grouping, when it became apparent that in the talk between the deaf boys A and Kh and their mothers, that the boys were speaking English and the mothers, Sylheti. It was considered to be important therefore, to further divide the data from the Sylheti-speaking families into two separate groupings, that is, dyads from Sylheti-speaking families where different languages were spoken in the interaction and dyads where the same language was spoken in the interaction.

The three chapters which follow therefore reflect this organisation of the data sets into the following three groupings:

- first language English, speaking the same language in the interaction;
- first language Sylheti, speaking the same language in the interaction;
- first language Sylheti, speaking different languages in the interaction.
From this organisation of the data, further contrasts could then be made: between the data from all the deaf children; from the younger normally hearing children; and from the older normally hearing children.

The analyses of the selected segments of data enabled discussion of the interactional accomplishments of the talk to be made across these dyads. It will be shown in Chapters 5, 6 and 7, that there are similarities and differences in features of talk in the dyads involving the deaf children and those features observed in dyads involving the normally hearing children, as demonstrated by the trajectory of talk in which these features occur. When consideration of the first language of each of the participants in the dyads, and of the language which is spoken in any one interaction, is added to the contrast, further similarities and differences in the interactional context of the talk become apparent. As will be shown, it would appear that whilst the fact of deafness and its impact on the spoken language of the deaf child is crucial in the talk, the actual language spoken by each participant in the interaction, and to a somewhat lesser extent, each participant’s first language, are equally important in accounting for the collaborative accomplishment of talk by the participants. It is hoped that the order of presentation of the analyses will reflect this main finding.

It was considered that the most effective description of the analyses (and thus of the data) would be to present and discuss fragments of talk which illustrate the characteristic features of the talk. Where appropriate, line by line, fine-grained analyses of fragments is presented.

ORDER OF PRESENTATION OF THE ANALYSES

The presentation of the analyses is arranged primarily according to the first language of the deaf children, and the language spoken in the interactions between the deaf children and their adult interactants. Within this arrangement, the interactions of each of the deaf children is the main focus of the analyses, but these interactions are integrated with analyses of the data from the normally hearing children.
Given the notion, as was discussed previously in the Introduction and in Chapters 1 and 2, that talk between children and adults is an expression of 'culture' which may show differences depending on the language spoken, it was considered to be logical to present first the most familiar category of participants, that is, the English-speaking participants, whose language and culture is, by and large, shared by the researcher, and to proceed thereafter to the Sylheti-speaking participants. Furthermore, the relevant CA and interactional research on which the approach used in this study is based, is overwhelmingly about interaction in western cultures. By demonstrating that the CA approach can handle data from English deaf interactions, as will be shown in Chapter 5, extending the approach to the Sylheti data is warranted.

Chapter 5 concerns the talk between the deaf boy, W, aged 6 years 11 months, and his father, both of whom speak English during the interactions, and for whom English is their first language. Salient features of their talk are contrasted with the talk between the other participants who are native English speakers who speak English during the interaction. These are the younger normally hearing boy, K, aged 4 years 8 months, and his mother, and the normally hearing boy, J, aged 7 years, and his mother (see Table IX below).

Chapter 6 concerns the talk of one of the deaf boys whose family's first language is Sylheti. This is Kh, aged 6 years 10 months, who in the interaction analysed, is talking to his father. The language they speak in this interaction is English. Salient features of their talk are contrasted with the talk between the two normally hearing boys from Sylheti-speaking families. In the interaction between the younger boy, E, aged 5 years 4 months, talking to his 15 year old sister, the language used by both is a mixture of English and Sylheti. The talk between Jo, aged 7 years, also talking to his sister, who is 22 years old, is in English (see Table IX below).

In Chapter 7 the talk between the deaf boys Kh and A (aged 6 years 9 months, and their respective Sylheti-speaking mothers is examined. The reason for dealing with these interactions separately is that the boys and their mothers spoke different languages during the interactions: the boys spoke English, and the mothers spoke Sylheti. These interactions are contrasted with the talk between the normally

---

1 This is the same boy whose interaction with his father is analysed in Chapter 6.
hearing boys and their carers from both Sylheti-speaking and English-speaking families, and with the talk between Kh and his father (see Table IX below). Table IX (previously given in Chapter 4) is reproduced here for quick reference to the participants in the study.

Table IX: Details of the eight dyads in the study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child's name</th>
<th>Child's age</th>
<th>Child's first language</th>
<th>Child's hearing status</th>
<th>Adult</th>
<th>Adult's first language</th>
<th>Language usually spoken when child and adult interact</th>
<th>Language spoken in sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>6.11 yrs</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Deaf</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>4.8 yrs</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Normal hearing</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>7 yrs</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Normal hearing</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>6.9 yrs</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Deaf</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Sylheti</td>
<td>M-&gt; Sylheti A-&gt;English</td>
<td>M-&gt; Sylheti A-&gt;English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kh</td>
<td>6.10 yrs</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Deaf</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Sylheti</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kh</td>
<td>6.10 yrs</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Deaf</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Sylheti</td>
<td>M-&gt; Sylheti Kh-&gt;English</td>
<td>M-&gt; Sylheti Kh-&gt;English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>5.4 yrs</td>
<td>Sylheti</td>
<td>Normal hearing</td>
<td>Sister (15 yrs)</td>
<td>Sylheti</td>
<td>Mixture of English and Sylheti</td>
<td>Mixture of English and Sylheti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jo</td>
<td>7 yrs</td>
<td>Sylheti</td>
<td>Normal hearing</td>
<td>Sister (22 yrs)</td>
<td>Sylheti</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TRANSCRIPTION NOTATION AND NOMENCLATURE OF THE FRAGMENTS

Appendix 4 provides details of transcription notation used in the fragments quoted below. Note that in the transcriptions, an asterisk, *, indicates that the subsequent talk is with reference to a new picture or photo which the participants are looking at.

The fragments of talk are labelled with a letter and a number, such as 'K9' (the uppercase letter refers to the name of the child). Sometimes selected lines from a fragment are re-quoted in the course of discussion, ( for example, when phonetic
details are added to illustrate points concerning prosody). In these subsequent
versions a lowercase letter is added to the label, e.g. K9a. The transcription of each
fragment quoted or referred to in the text can also be found separately in Appendix
5.

THE ACTIVITY OF TALKING ABOUT PICTURES

It is important to bear in mind the nature of the activity in which the children and
their carers were engaged. They had agreed to be recorded, at home, talking to
each other, so that their talk could later be analysed. The adults had been asked to
chat to the child. Underlying this request was the expectation that the adults would
encourage the child to talk as much as possible.

The fact that question-answer sequences are such a prominent feature of the data
is not surprising. As was mentioned in Chapter 1, frequent use of questions is a
well-reported phenomenon in the talk between children and adults. However, the
prevalence of question-answer sequences in this data could, in part, be attributable
to the nature of the data-collection exercise: the adults were asked to chat to their
children in front of recording equipment. To facilitate this rather unusual situation, it
was suggested that the parents looked at and talked about family photographs or
pictures. Using these might have encouraged the adult to initiate frequent question-
answer sequences. There is also the chance, as has been pointed out by Cheskin
(1981) that the high incidence of questions from parents could have been due to
some possible need of theirs to ‘perform’ or to demonstrate their children’s abilities
for the camera. These are unavoidable risks in data collection of this kind, but it was
considered that neither of these factors would significantly lessen the value of
analysing the question-answer sequences in the data.

FEATURES OF THE TALK

The outstanding characteristic of the talk in all the interactions analysed, as has
been mentioned previously, is the frequency of occurrence of question-answer
sequences. It is the analysis of these sequences and the prominent features which
recur in them that will be discussed in detail in each of the following three Chapters.
By way of introduction, a brief outline of these features is given here.
A typical question-answer sequence in this data usually has three turns. The first turn is taken by the adult who designs it in such a way that when analysed sequentially, this turn is shown to function as a test question\(^2\). In the second turn, the child usually answers the question. The adult is then shown to take the turn following the child’s answer, and to use it to receipt or acknowledge that answer. This receipt turn is often the actual third turn in the sequence. However, since the receipt turn can sometimes occur in later turns (and not only in the actual third turn), it is more accurate to describe it in terms such as the “third position receipt” (Weber 1993 p.50) or the “third position receipting turn” (Tarplee 1996 p.409).

In the current data, this turn is a locus of some considerable interest since it would appear that what occurs in the ‘third position receipting turn’ can help to account for the differences in the interactional accomplishment in what appear to be very similar question-answer-receipt sequences.

For example, in some sequences, if the answer to the test question is judged to have been the ‘right’ answer, the adult uses this turn to acknowledge the ‘rightness’ of that answer and to end the sequence. Evidence that the receipt in such a turn does indeed affirm the answer can be found in the actual words used (repetitions, affirmatory utterances such as ‘that’s right’, or ‘yes’, etc); the timing between the answer turn and the receipt turn (there is no gap), and also from similarity in the pitch contour between the answer and the receipt.

If, however, the answer is deemed ‘wrong’ by the adult, s/he is then shown to use the third position receipting turn to acknowledge the ‘wrongness’ of the answer. This is done in various ways: by saying something negative like ‘no’ or by correcting the ‘wrong’ answer for example by providing the right answer, modelling a more appropriate phonetic realisation of the answer or initiating repair, etc. The timing between, and prosodic features of the answer and the receipt are further clues to that answer being ‘wrong’. Furthermore, following a ‘wrong’ answer, the adult often then pursues the ‘right’ answer by reformulating the question one or more times.

\(^2\) See Chapter 4 section 4.3.4 (types of questions and function of question-answer sequence).
By using a typical test question sequence, the adult institutes the talk, and maintains control of it. The analysis shows how the adult structures the third position receipt turn so as to select her/himself as next speaker. S/he then takes the next turn, designs it as another question (often prefaced with 'and'), and thus the sequence recurs. The questions asked in these sequences do not function as topic openers, and very little extended talk from either participant is observed.

Although more turns at talk are in evidence when the adult is shown to pursue the 'right' answer to a question by reformulating that question, extended turns at talk are not observed, and the adult essentially keeps control of the talk. When the answer is wrong, the typical sequence can function as a language learning/teaching device in a way not dissimilar to the labelling sequences described by Tarplee (1996)\(^3\).

The analysis will also examine those sequences which are not typical in the manner described above and in which the initial turn is either not a question, or if it is a question, it is shown not to have been a test question. The interactional accomplishment of such sequences is substantially different from that which is achieved in the typical sequences. The analysis shows how these sequences can sometimes work to encourage talk by functioning as a topic opening device. Talking about a topic opened by a question seems to be accomplished when that question prefers, and gets, a response that is not only a single answer long, but is more than one answer long, as was discussed in Chapter 4 section 4.3.4. The analysis demonstrates the interactional contexts in which what have been called 'extended turns' and 'extended topical sequences of turns' (see Chapter 4 above) are found. When these sequences occur, it would appear that the adult and the child jointly institute and maintain the talk.

\(^3\) Tarplee's work in this field will be discussed later in this chapter, see section 5.2.1.
CHAPTER 5

ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION OF TALK IN THE ENGLISH-SPEAKING DYADS

5.1 THE PARTICIPANTS

The data analysed in this Chapter is from the English-speaking dyads, as summarised in Table X:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child's name</th>
<th>Child's age</th>
<th>Child's first language</th>
<th>Child's hearing status</th>
<th>Adult</th>
<th>Adult's first language</th>
<th>Language usually spoken by child and adult</th>
<th>Language spoken in sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>6.11 yrs</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Deaf</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>4.8 yrs</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Normal hearing</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>7 yrs</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Normal hearing</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2 THE ANALYSIS

5.2.1 Examples of typical (test) question-answer-receipt sequences in which the right answer is given.

In the first instance, to illustrate the typical three turn test question-answer-receipt sequence in which the right answer is given, fragment K9 from the talk between K and his mother (M) is presented.

Fragment K9
1 M: wha what were you doing there
2 K: I w’z on a (.9) I w’z on a pony=
3 M: =mm where was that
M shows K a picture from their recent trip to America, and takes the first turn to ask
the question in line 1. In line 2, K answers the question, and in line 3, M
acknowledges the answer by saying "mm". She uses this same turn to immediately
go on to ask a further question about the same picture. There is no pause between
K's answer in line 2 and M's receipt in line 3, in fact, as is shown in the transcription,
these utterances are latched. As can be seen in fragment K9a, closer examination
of the pitch contour of M's receipt utterance "mm" in line 3 shows a rise-fall with a
low starting point, which can be considered as an attempt to by M to match K's pitch
contour on the word 'pony'.

Fragment K9a
1  M: wha what were you doing there  _ _
2  K: I w'z on a (.9) I w'z on a pony= _ _
3  M: = mm where was that

The timing between the answer and the receipt turns and the similarity of the pitch
contours between the answer and the receipt can be taken as one indication that
K's account of himself on the pony was an adequate answer to the question, and
was also the right answer.

The idea that the timing between turns and the matching of aspects of the prosody
of the child's answer by the adult in the receipt turn are indications of 'adequacy' or
'rightness' of the answer, is advanced by Tarplee (1996) in her recent work on talk
between adults and young children. In her discussion of the sequence of three
turns, which she terms 'elicitation-label-receipt', and which have an analogous
function to that of the typical test question-answer-receipt sequence in the current
data), Tarplee (1996) shows that when the receipt turn is designed to indicate that
the label turn was adequate and that the conversation can proceed to the next
stage (whatever that might be), it has an identifiable prosodic pattern: the adult's
utterance (usually one word, often a repetition of the child's label) as a whole
mimics that of the child's label (also one word) in terms of features such as pitch
contour, voice quality, rate, lengthening. Tarplee (1996) also suggests that if there is
no pause or only a minimal pause (< 1 second)\textsuperscript{4} between the child's label and the repetition, that this is a further indication that the repeat is serving as an affirmation.

In the current data, when the receipt turn is so designed that it indicates that the right answer was given to the question (and that the conversation can then proceed), features in the answer and receipt turns are comparable to those in Tarplee's data: specifically, there is matching of some aspects of the prosody of the answer turn in the prosody of the receipt turn, notably the pitch contour, and there is no gap between the answer and the receipt, as was illustrated in fragment K9 quoted above. These features thus display that the question was indeed a test question, that the answer was 'right' and that the talk can proceed.

It is characteristic of this data, that the subsequent talk proceeds in a particular way, also illustrated by fragment K9. After her receipt in line 3, M then continues the turn and asks another question immediately. There is no pause between M's receipt and her next question, incidentally providing further evidence that by affirming the answer, her receipt had ended the sequence which started with her question in line 1. By asking another question, M starts the questioning sequence again. As will be discussed in section 5.2.4, in this way, M keeps control of the talk, but does not encourage extended turns from the child.

This typical sequence also characterises the talk between the deaf boy W and his father, as an examination of fragment W1 illustrates.

Fragment W1

\begin{verbatim}
6  F: ... * what did we used to do (0.6) because
7    we were playing against Peter (0.7) and Peter
8    couldn't hit the ball
9    (2.75)
10  W: because if you need to throw it under= ((mimes
11    an underarm throw))
12  F :  =underarm (0.6) but then when you get a big boy
13  what do you do with the ball (1.6) what was we
14    practising
15  W: you go o:ver= ((mimes overarm throw))
16  F:•over an and you ran faster
17  W: ((nods))
\end{verbatim}

\textsuperscript{4} See Jefferson's (1989) suggestion that there exists a 'standard maximum' silence of about 1 second which speakers will tolerate. Silences which extend beyond this time will be treated as signalling potential problems
In line 6, F asks the test question (which he goes on to explain in lines 7 and 8). After a long pause of 2.75 seconds, W answers the question (line 10). F's receipt of this answer, in line 12, is given immediately and there is some prosodic matching of this receipt, "under" with the answer, as can be seen in fragment W1a below. The timing between the answer and the receipt, and the similar pitch contours shows that the question in line 6 was a test question, and that the answer W gave in line 10 was the 'right' answer.

Fragment W1a

\[\text{10 W: because if you need to throw it} \underline{\text{under}}= ((\text{mimes an underarm throw}))\]

\[\text{11} \underline{\text{F: =underarm (0.6)}}\]

There is a further issue worth noting here, which is that F's receipt "underarm" is a modified repetition of W's answer "under". This phenomenon is discussed in more detail in Chapter 6, section 6.3.1.

In line 12, F continues after a minimal gap, with a next question (which is reformulated, as will be discussed in the next section), and in line 15, W answers the question, which is receipted with an exact repetition, in line 16, with no pause and with some pitch matching as can be seen in fragment W1b.

Fragment W1b

\[\text{15 W: you go} \underline{\text{over}}= ((\text{mimes overarm throw}))\]

\[\text{16 F: over an and you ran faster}\]
In the fragments presented thus far, the talk between W and K and their respective fathers has been shown to be rather similar, although K is much younger than W. In contrast, in the conversation between J and his mother, (J is the same age as W) only two instances of the typical test question sequence were observed. One of these, fragment J6, seems to function in a similar fashion to the sequences described above, but it is notable that J’s mother uses the third position receipt turn only to acknowledge J’s answer to the question, and not to ask another question.

Fragment J6

1 M: What’s this ( . ) you’ve got one of these it’s a car
2 J: remote control=
3 M: =yeah ( . ) remote control
4 J: I got a remote control car and this is a remote control aeroplane

J answers M’s question (line 1) in line 2, in overlap, and M latches her receipt to the answer in line 3. Once again, as with the examples for W and K given above, M’s in fragment J6 contains some prosodic matching, as can be seen in fragment J6a

Fragment J6a

2 J: remote control=
3 M: =yeah ( . ) remote control

Fragment J6 differs from the fragments quoted for W and K insofar as it is a rare phenomenon in the talk, rather than being a characteristic sequence of the talk. As will be shown later in this Chapter, although the talk between J and his mother is characterised by question and answer sequences, these do not follow what has been described as a typical sequence thus far in the discussion.

Furthermore, in fragment J6, following her receipt of J’s answer to what appears to be a test question, M does not immediately ask another question. It is J who takes the next turn, in line 4 and he uses this turn to extend the topic of remote controlled
vehicles. In effect, then, the question asked in line 1 has functioned as a topic opener, highlighting another difference between this sequence and the typical sequences found in the W and the K data. As will be shown later, for the typical sequences in the talk between other participants, there is considerable evidence to support the notion that test question-right answer-receipt sequences do not usually function as topic openers. What does appear to be the case, is that a typical sequence can lead to a longer sequence of turns when, for example, the ‘wrong’ answer to the test question has been given and when the question is reformulated in pursuit of the ‘right’ answer. This phenomenon and its consequences can be seen in the fragments discussed below.

5.2.2 Examples of typical (test) question-answer-receipt sequences in which the ‘wrong’ answer is given and the ‘right’ answer is then pursued.

Fragment W2 contains two illustrations of this phenomenon.

Fragment W2

1 F: William just come and tell me about these (.8)
2 before we go (1.4)* where did we go on holiday (1.5)
3 wha
4 W:hotel
5 F: Yeah but what was the name of the country
6 (2.9)
7 W: ((shrugs))
8 F: ((looks at him quizzically))
9 W: Austria
10 F: Austria (.) and how did we go to Austria (1.1)
11 How did we get there did we fly in an aeroplane
12 W: No (.8) we went in a car and then in a boat and
13 then in a car
14 F: In the car to the boat (.5) then in the boat
15 that’s right we did (.8) What did we do on the boat
16 °wha° did you go in the playroom
17 W: Yeah
18 F: Was there other children in there
19 W: Yeah::
20 (2.0)
21 W: ((plays with a toy car)) brrm brrm

Attending to lines 1 to 5 in the first place, it is shown that this sequence starts with a question from F in line 2: “where did we go on holiday”, referring to a photo which F has put down in front of W. When W does not respond after 1.5 seconds, F then
starts to say what could be a question word: “wha” in line 3, but W overlaps this with his answer "hotel" in line 4. This single answer is acknowledged by F at the start of his turn in line 5, "yeah". This serves as a receipt of W's answer, and by saying "yeah" (rather than "no") immediately, F is displaying that "hotel" is a possible right answer to the question. However, there is evidence that F has considered it to be the 'wrong' answer , as will be shown in fragment W2a.

Fragment W2a

4  W: hotel

5  F: Yeah but what was the name of the country

Firstly, examination of the pitch contour of W's "hotel" and F's "yeah" shows that F is not trying to match the pitch contour of his receipt to that of W's answer. In this sense, the "yeah" is not doing the work of an affirmative receipt in spite of there being no noticeable pause between it and the prior answer. Tarplee (1996) points out that the pitch contour of repetitions which do not function as affirmations is substantially different to that of the child's utterance. In these cases, the adult can use the third position receipt turn to correct or to initiate repair on the child's utterance.

Secondly, although F asks another question without any pause between it and the receipt, this second question (line 5) is shown in the analysis to be a reformulation of the original question, and not a next related question. By designing his reformulated question as "... but what was the name of the country" F has displayed that he had a particular answer to the original question in mind, and that he is not accepting W's answer 'hotel' as the right answer. This is further supported by his use of 'but...'. Furthermore, the reformulation narrows the question down by asking specifically for the name of the country, and can be seen as serving the purpose of showing W a 'route' to the acceptable answer. Further implications of this narrowing of the question in pursuit of a 'right' answer are discussed again in section 5.2.3 below.

^This could possibly be the start of a reformulation of the question in line 2.
W's non-verbal response to the reformulated question is expressed as a shrug (line 7) which is treated by F as a 'no response', equivalent to "I don't know", since in his next turn, F also responds non-verbally by giving W a quizzical look (line 8). This can be taken to indicate that he wishes to pursue the original question, and can be construed as a restatement of that question. It is treated as such by W, who, in his next turn, gives another answer "Austria" (line 9), which, as F's receipt turn shows, is taken to be the right answer. "Austria" is immediately receipted by F in line 10, with a repetition which shows matching of the pitch contours (see fragment W2b) indicating that this was the answer F had had in mind from the start of the sequence, and that the original question in line 2 had been a test question.

Fragment W2b

9 W: Austria

10 F: Au: stria: ( . ) and how did we go to Austria (1.1)

Following the receipt in line 10, F then carries on to ask another question in the same turn, after only a minimal pause. It may be that F's design of this next question to incorporate the right answer, "Austria" again: "...and how did we go to Austria (1.1)"

Reformulation of the test question in pursuit of a right answer, turns out to be a major feature of the talk between W and his father as further analysis of fragment W2 illustrates.

In line 10 F asks what proves to be a test question, as evidenced by the reformulations of that question until the required answer is given.
Fragment W2c

10 F: Austria (.) and how did we go to Austria (1.1)
11 How did we get there did we fly in an aeroplane
12 W: No (.8) we went in a car and then in a boat and
13 then in a car
14 F: In the car to the boat (.5) then in the boat
15 that's right we did (.8) What did we do on the boat

When W does not respond to F's first question in line 10 "and how did we go to Austria" after 1.1 seconds, F reformulates the question twice in line 11, firstly by rephrasing the question into "how did we get there" and secondly he changes the previously general "go" (line 10) and "get there" (line 11) into a specific yes/no question which prefers the answer "no". This yes/no question, "did we go in an aeroplane" can also be viewed as being challenging or provocative: the answer must be "no". W gives the 'right' answer in line 12/13 "no (0.8) we went in a car...". F then uses the third position receipt turn (lines 14 and 15) to correct® W's extended answer and to acknowledge that answer as having been 'right' by saying: "that's right we did " (line 15).

5.2.3 Using reformulations to ensure mutual understanding

The reformulations discussed above could also be indicative of F's expectation that, on account of his deafness, W may not have understood the initial question, especially when W has not responded after a noticeable pause to that initial question, as shown, for example, in fragment W2d lines 10 and 11.

Fragment W2d

10 F: Austria (.) and how did we go to Austria (1.1)
11 How did we get there did we fly in an aeroplane

It is possible that in line 11, F designs his reformulations thus, in order to check that W has understood what the current topic of the talk is. To display this understanding, W has to indicate, by his response, that he has understood. F's provocative question is an effective way of establishing that the topic is shared. F does not have to check that W shares the knowledge on which the talk is based: it is unlikely that W would have forgotten such an interesting event as flying to

® See section 5.2.4 below for further discussion of these corrections.
Austria. If W, instead of being deaf, had learning difficulties, for example, then checking his knowledge and memory of the event might have been relevant. F’s final reformulation therefore, serves to clearly define the topic as being about their mode of transport to the holiday venue, and no longer the holiday venue per se. F’s reformulations of his questions appear to be overwhelmingly in the direction of narrowing the questions down so that a specific response can be obtained. Hence, in W’s case, this questioning strategy can be viewed as being appropriate, in the sense that it serves to provide F (and W) with an ongoing check that they are not misunderstanding each other, although this ‘control’ of the conversation by F appears to be at the cost of not encouraging extended turns at talk from W.

F’s reformulations in these fragments can also be seen as being appropriate, in terms of W’s deafness, since the words ‘go’ and ‘get’ are not easily lipreadable whereas the word ‘aeroplane’ is not only easy to lip-read, but using it also serves to focus W’s attention on the content of the question (mode of transport) more readily. This is similar to the reformulation in line 5 discussed above, in which F expressly asks W to tell him the name of the country in which they had their holiday. As was mentioned in Chapter 1, there is an emphasis in the literature of the need for hearing partners in conversation with deaf people to clearly signal even the slightest modification of topic so as to avoid misunderstandings (Wood et al 1986 p75-76). Equally, it is crucial that intersubjectivity (see Chapter 4) is collaboratively established, and F’s reformulations can be seen as fulfilling this function.

5.2.4 Pauses between reformulations

It has been argued so far that in the talk between W and his father analysed above, W’s father often reformulates his test questions within the same turn, sometimes after receiving ‘no response’ to the question, and sometimes when a ‘wrong’ answer has been given. F appears only to require a right answer to the final reformulation of the question. Evidence for this contention comes from the observation that F often does not give W a chance to respond to earlier versions of the question, since there are no pauses between his reformulations as was clearly illustrated in fragments W2 line 11 and lines 15 and 16. The lack of any pause between the reformulations displays that F is pursuing a specific response to the test question. When that answer is given, it is acknowledged in the way that has been described above.
Analysis of data from K and his mother also shows a pattern of reformulated test questions similar to that in the W data. But on closer examination, some differences in certain features of K's mother's reformulations become apparent. In contrast with W's father, for example, K's mother allows significant pauses between her reformulations. These pauses seem to occur as a result of K not responding to either her original question or to subsequent reformulations. The outcome, however, is similar to that in the conversation between W and his father, that is, extended turns at talk are not achieved, and it is M who keeps the talk going by using the questioning strategy. This is illustrated in fragment K5.

**Fragment K5**

1. M:*Oh what are you doing here
2. (4.4)((both look at the picture))
3. M: what's that=
4. K:=e:::r ((looks at photo))
5. (1.5) ((M smiles at K))
6. M: What are you dressed up as
7. K: A CLOWN
8. (3.8) ((M smiles, nods and looks at the next photo))

The pattern of reformulated questions starts in line 1 with M asking a general question: "oh what are you doing here". The significant pause of 4.4 seconds indicates that M treats this silence as a 'no response'. She then follows up her first question with a more specific question: "what's that" (line 3). When K hesitates (line 4), she allows another pause of 1.5 seconds (line 5) and then asks a third specific question (line 6): "what are you dressed up as". He responds with a single answer. That this is an appropriate answer to the question is evidenced by her smile and nod, and by the fact that she moves on to the next photo.

5.2.5 *Sequences in which the ‘right’ answer is pursued but not obtained.*

Thus far, the fragments have shown how the adults obtain a ‘right’ answer by pursuing a questioning strategy. There are also occasions when using this strategy does not work in the ways described above. When a sequence is examined in which the ‘right’ answer does not actually materialise, the trajectory of the talk is quite different from that in the sequences hitherto described. In fragment W4, for example, F is seen to ask the test question and to do the reformulations, but
ultimately, the misunderstanding that occurs is only resolved by appealing to a third party.

Fragment W4

In line 1 F asks the test question, “and what was in our room”. When W asks for clarification in line 2, F reformulates this to “what did you used to watch of a morning” in line 3 and when W does not answer in line 4, he reformulates again to “what did you turn on every morning” in line 5.

After a non-verbal exchange in lines 7 and 8 following the long pause in line 6, F deals with W’s candidate answer of “have a shower” in line 9 by acknowledging (line 10-12) that indeed W did have a shower, but by saying “no::” (line 10) he indicates to W that this was not the right answer to the question originally asked in line 1.

---

7 A similar instance of this phenomenon was discussed above in fragment W2 lines 4 and 5 (see section 5.2.2)
Having thus displayed that W's answer was not the required one, F then gives the right answer "no we used to watch the television" in line 12. W does not take a turn after the 2.4 second pause (line 13) following this 'right' answer. The length of this pause seems to indicate that F expected W to take a turn. F then asks another question "but we couldn't understand it could we" which he immediately reformulates into "why couldn't we understand the television" (lines 13-15), as discussed in section 5.2.4 above. W's answer to this question, "we we have to put a machine in" (line 16) is clearly not what F expected, as is evidenced in F's repetition of that answer in line 17. Closer examination of the prosody of this answer and the receipt provides further evidence, as can be seen in fragment W4a, that this receipt is different to those discussed before, which match aspects of the prosody of the answer and hence indicate that the answer was 'right'.

Fragment W4a

16 W: we we have to put a machine in

17 F: had to put a machine in

In line 17, by not matching the pitch contour of 'machine' to W's, F displays that he is puzzled by W's answer. W appears to treat F's receipt in line 17 as a clarification request, and he provides clarification in line 18, in overlap. F acknowledges this in line 19. W's following turn displays that this receipt by F is not final, and that the clarification provided in line 18 requires further explanation, which W gives in lines 20 and 21. The subsequent progression of turns displays how F receipts W's explanations with partial repeats. F does not return to reformulate this question, in spite of having indicated to W that the answer was not 'right'. W appeals to his mother to finally confirm the explanation he has given of his answer in line 16 to the question in line 14-15. By the time she has done so, W has turned his attention to something else, and the talk is ended.

8 In the interview with F following the recording of this conversation, F mentioned that the answer he had been hoping W would give was that the television broadcasts in Austria were not in English.
Fragment W4 has demonstrated that there are instances in which the typical sequence of test question-answer-receipt does not appear to function as either a topic-opening strategy, or as a language learning/teaching strategy.

In this case, it does not function as a means by which the adult can keep control of the talk either. The typical sequence here has resulted in a sequence of turns concerning the resolution of a misunderstanding in the course of which the original line of questioning was abandoned, and the talk ended. It will be shown later that such sequences were often observed in the talk between the other deaf children and their carers, but were not observed in the talk involving the normally hearing children.

Examples of ways in which the adult is shown to use the typical sequence to keep control of the talk are discussed in the following section.

5.2.6 Keeping control of the talk.

Fragment W2e below provides a clear case in which F takes back control of the talk by returning to a typical question-asking format in spite of receiving an extended response to a previous question.

Fragment W2e

10 F: Austria (. ) and how did we go to Austria (1.1)
11 How did we get there did we fly in an aeroplane
12 W: No ( .8 ) we went in a car and then in a boat and
13 then in a car
14 F: In the car to the boat (.5) then in the boat
15 that's right we did (.8) . . .

In line 11, F makes it conditionally relevant for W to provide at least a single negative answer to the reformulated question. In the event, W makes a response which is more than one answer long, supplying an extended answer in lines 12 and 13. This answer could indicate that W has responded to the question in line 11 as being the start of topical talk about the mode of transport. However, when F acknowledges this extended answer in lines 14 and 15, he incorporates three embedded corrections (underlined) into his receipt turn as shown in line 14 of fragment W2e:
14 F: In the car to the boat (.5) then in the boat

F corrects “a car” to “the car” suggesting, possibly, that it was the family car that was used and not a hire car. He also corrects “and then in a boat” to “in the car to the boat” indicating the progress of the journey presumably by car to a car ferry. The third correction is from “a boat” to “the boat” which could be explained in terms of its being the second mention of this particular boat.

F’s receipt in lines 14 and 15 has functioned not only as a receipt, but also as a correction of W’s prior turn, making the sequence work as a language teaching/learning device, but not as a topic opener, even though W had given a response more than one answer long in lines 12 and 13. F’s receipt also lets him keep the turn, and thus allows him to ‘keep control’ of the conversation by asking another question.

Although F ends the receipt with a confirmation “that’s right we did” (line 15), and he pauses briefly after this receipt, he nevertheless does not allow the talk to proceed on the topic of the mode of transport, since he then asks a next question, “what did we do on the boat”, and thereby starts another questioning sequence, as can be seen in fragment W2f:

Fragment W2f

15 F: . . (.8) What did we do in the boat ⁰wha⁰ did you go
16 in the playroom
17 W: Yeah
18 F: Was there other children in there
19 W: Yeah::
20 (2.0)
21 W: ((plays with a toy car)) brrm brrm

In lines 15 and 16, F reformulates his original general question “what did we do in the boat” to the more specific yes/no question “did you go in the playroom” to which the relevant minimal response “yeah” is given by W in line 17. F then asks another question in his next turn, “was there other children in there” (line 18). In line 19, W gives his single affirmative ‘right’ answer, which F does not acknowledge. It is followed by a 2.0 second pause. That F designed his question in line 18 to elicit further talk is evidenced in this pause during which F could be waiting for an
extended response from W. However, W does not give an extended turn, attending instead to a toy car and effectively ending the talk about the holiday.

When F designs his turns as test questions, these test questions do not function as topic openers, even when W responds with an answer more than one turn long: in such cases, F nevertheless returns to ask another test question. The questions have not encouraged extended turns at talk from W, but they are the means whereby F has kept the talk going.

One of the most striking consequences of the adults adopting a strategy of asking questions with or without reformulations, when ‘chatting’ with their child, is that this strategy does not, in the main, lead to extended turns on the part of the child. Whilst a reformulation may sometimes lead to an extended turn from the child, (as was shown in fragment W2 line 12), in responding, the adult returns to the questioning strategy. This gives the impression that the adult is controlling the talk. This impression of control is reinforced when, as frequently occurs, the adult prefaces the question turn with “and”. Fragment K6 illustrates this point:

**Fragment K6**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>M: Let me see if there's anything else what about</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>when you were oh I know what you would like to look</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>at (1.3) when you went on holiday last year tell me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>about <em>this</em> (.9) where's that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>K: <em>h in America</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>M: Where is that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>K: <em>h (1.6) um somewhere somewhere um where where</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>you want to look for what you want for Christmas=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>M: =Yes Christmas World or something isn't it=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>K: =Yeah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>M: And who was that with you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>K: ma ma Monnen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>M: And who is Mullen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>K: My my my: (. ) cousin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>M: Yeah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>(1.7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Having reformulated her opening statement (lines 1-4) into the question in line 4, and then reformulated that question (line 6) until an adequate answer was given (lines 7 and 8) K’s mother does not respond to K’s extended answer turn by further extending the topic. Instead, she acknowledges this answer by providing the ‘right’
words, and then she prefaces her next two questions (lines 11 and 13) with 'and', indicating that typical sequences are to follow.

In this way, M could be considered to be re-establishing and maintaining an 'agenda' of encouraging talk as Heritage and Sorjonen (1994) suggest their health visitor did (see Chapter 4 section 4.3.3). M does not ask a next question in line 11 which pertains to 'Christmas World' to extend the talk on that topic, nor does she use that turn to comment on the topic. She asks: "and who was that with you" (line 11), indicating that a single right answer is required. K's response is indeed, a single 'right' answer (line 12). In her next turn, M then asks a further question (line 13), this time based on K's answer "ma ma Monnen". She again prefaces this question "and who is Mullen" with 'and', indicating that she could be moving forward her 'agenda' to have a chat with K and to encourage him to talk. In his next turn, K gives the 'right' answer9. M receipts his answer, and the sequence ends with a silence.

'And'-prefacing appears to be employed by K's mother mostly to move the talk along, or to maintain her 'agenda', and is not often used to initiate talk. As can be seen in fragment K8, this is evidenced by the fact that M's initial questions in a sequence are not prefaced with 'and' (line 1), neither does she "and' preface her repeated questions given in response to a clarification request from K (line 8).

Fragment K8

1 M: all right who's this
2 K: (hhhhh) (1) me (1.2) who do you think that
3 is
4 M: I think that's Rory
5 K: Rory Saoirse
6 M: And who's Saoirse
7 K: Huh
8 M: Who's Saoirse
9 K: My sister ((looks up at camera))
10 ( M nods briefly at camera)
11 (2.2)

9 It is interesting to note that K's turn in line 12 is disfluent, "ma ma Monnen", which could signal that he is unsure of some aspect of M's question, perhaps the change of topic from the place of the photo to the people depicted in it - this change has been effected by M with her contingent 'and' prefaced next question. In her next turn, M could be making an embedded correction (Drew 1981) of K's pronunciation of his cousin's name, which is 'Mullen', not 'Monnen'. K neither contests nor acknowledges this possible correction, but his disfluent response in line 13, "my my my: (.) cousin" could indicate that he recognises that repair work is being done.
W’s father is also seen to ‘and’-preface questions, and that this device serves a similar function as it does for K’s mother, can was seen in fragment W2 line 10

Fragment W2e

10 F: Austria (.) and how did we go to Austria (1.1)
11 How did we get there did we fly in an aeroplane

Fragment W4b contains a further example:

Fragment W4b

1  F: * and what was in our room (1.2) what=
2  W: huh
3  F: =did you use to watch of a morning

It has been suggested thus far, that in the data for W and K, the adults can be said to have an agenda in the activity, which is to encourage talk from their children. The predominant way in which they do this, is to use the strategy of asking questions as a way of opening a topic. As was shown above, these are often test questions to which the adults have a specific answer in mind, which answer, if not given, is pursued by successive reformulated questions. An enduring impression of these two conversations is that the adults persevere with questioning routines even though these routines are shown not to encourage extended turns from the child and in spite of the ‘agenda’ being to encourage just such extended turns.

5.2.7 Sequences in which extended turns are observed.

In contrast to the sequences described above, when the adults, in pursuing a response, vary the design of their question turns, the child’s turns at talk tend to be extended. An example of this was seen earlier in fragment W2, and is quoted again here, in fragment W2g: F elicits an extended turn at talk (lines 12 and 13) from W when he varies his reformulations and designs a question in a ‘challenging’ or ‘provocative’ way in line 11.
Extended turns also result when the adult departs from the typical sequence altogether: although a question is still being asked, it is shown not to be a test question, as in fragment W5 line 1, in which F asks W for his opinion about who is best at basketball. Even though F has his own ideas about the answer, there is no ‘right’ answer. As it turns out, they disagree with each other’s opinions in an extended sequence of turns, which ends, however, in agreement about the pleasure of the basketball game.

It seems, therefore, that in W5, F’s initial question in line 1 has served as a topic opener. In this instance, F has encouraged more extended turns at talk than he did when using the strategy of a typical sequence, with or without reformulations. As can be seen in fragment K6 in section 5.2.6, this is also the case for the talk between K and his mother.
Nevertheless, in the data for W and K, examples of sequences in which extended talk is observed are relatively infrequent. More commonly found are those typical sequences in which extended turns are not evident. In contrast, analysis of the talk between J and his mother indicates that extended turns at talk are common.

5.2.8 Extended turns in the talk between J and his mother.

Even more talk results when the adult departs from the typical sequence altogether, for example, although a question may be asked, it is subsequently shown that this was not a test question because a 'right' answer is neither given nor pursued, or because the adult is shown not to know the answer. This is the case in the data from J, who is the same age as W but has normal hearing. The talk is mostly in extended turn sequences with many extended turns. The data shows that the activity of talking about the photos is established and maintained by both J and his mother, and they design their turns in a variety of ways as both questions and comments to initiate sequences of talk about a particular photo. Although J's mother asks questions, the sequence of turns which follow, indicate that the question was not a test question. The consequence is, as shown in fragment J5, extended turns at talk.

Fragment J5

1 M:*=What's this
2 J: this is:: (. ) that I'm doing (1.6)
3 M: Where is it
4 J: Is in is in our house=
5 M: =is it=
6 J: =Look ((points to photo))
7 M: You were stripping wallpaper
8 J: Yeah (. ) I'm doing it there=
9 M: =What's that
10 J: I had a cut on my lip look
11 M: D'ya remember how you got that
12 J: No I can't no (hhhh) no I can't=
13 M: =can't remember=
14 J: =No
15 (1)
16 J: Oh I hit myself on the lip actually but=
17 M: Hit yourself on the lip
18 19 J: =Yeah (hhh) hit myself on the lip (1) no I was trying to do (1.6) get enough off and I hitting it
20 on on there on the wall it scratched my ((points to his lip))
21 M: Oh I don't remember that (you go)
In line 1 M asks a question about a new photo: "what's that". J's two-part reply in line 2 is not clear to the transcriber but appears unproblematic for M since no clarification request is made. It is also incomplete: "thas (e::) (.) thas me doing (1.6)". M waits for 1.6 seconds, possibly to give J the opportunity to elaborate, but when he does not, she asks him a further question: "where is it" in line 3. This could be seen as a reformulated question (it is asking for more specific information). When J answers: "is in is in our house=" in line 4, M immediately rephrases the same question in a tag format: "=is it=". This could indicate that she might genuinely not have known where it was (in the photo) or that she wants a more precise answer, perhaps about which room in the house. J answers by pointing to the 'evidence' in the photo and drawing her attention to it: "=look" (line 6). In line 7, M acknowledges the verity of his answer by extending the topic with a comment about what J is doing in the photo: "you were stripping wallpaper". This could be displaying that her previous three questions were in fact test questions and that this is the 'right' answer since she appears to be very clear about what he was doing and where. However, the way in which J responds to this is different from the typical sequences described above: he responds to M's turn in line 8 by agreeing with her: "yeah (.) I'm doing it there=" and by adding a further comment. This may be because, even though this might have been a test question, the picture in the photo is not clear (to him or to her), and J could have interpreted the original question as being a genuine inquiry. This could account for the extended talk in the sequence. In her next turn, in line 9, M then asks a further question, pointing to a section of the photo: "what's that". J's explanation in line 10: "I had a cut on my lip" prompts her to ask him a further question in line 11: "d'ya remember how you got that" which she designs so that he can offer a 'no response' in reply. Indeed, in his next turn, J does offer a 'no response' in line 12 by saying that he cannot remember. He restates this in line 14 following M's clarification request: "=can't remember=" in line 13, but after a pause during which M does not take a turn, J offers an explanation for his cut lip, in line 16. M makes another clarification request in overlap, lines 17 and 18, and this elicits an extended turn (lines 19-22) in which J explains how he cut his lip. M's original question about the lip in line 9: "what's that" could have been a test question, but the following six turns in which J explains how he cut his lip, which end with M's final turn in line 23 where she acknowledges that she did not remember the incident makes it evident that the original question in line 9 had not been a test question.
The asking of the question has functioned as a topic opener, and has led to extended turns at talk.

In a similar way, in fragment J1 M's question opens the topic of magic stones, but in spite of a collaborative word search, neither J nor M comes up with the desired word. M does not start this sequence with a specific question, but she invites J to comment on the photo in line 1, ending her turn saying "...remember this"

Fragment J1

1  M:*oh this is one when we were in France remember
2          this
3  J: oh yeah, (unintelligible)
4  M: Magic stones what were they called=
5  J: =but magic what they don I don know
6  (1.5) ((M and J look at each other))
7  M: (I'm) not sure what they were called=
8  J: =No I can't remember=
9  M: =There was a a big circle wasn't there
10 J: (hu)
11   (3.0)

In line 4, M asks the question: "magic stones what were they called" In lines 5 to 8, M and J then collaboratively try to establish the name of the magic stones. That this is a collaborative word search is evidenced by the contiguous sequence of turns (including the silent turn in line 6 when they look at each other), and by the way both M and J design their turns. J repeats the word 'magic' in line 5, but then states that he does not know the specific word. After the pause in which they have looked at each other, M then also states in line 7 that she is not sure what the word is. In line 8, J confirms that he cannot remember the word, and finally, in line 9, M offers a suggestion about the magic stones which is a candidate answer to the word search, and to which J's grunt in line 10 could be a receipt. The sequence ends with a 3 second silence in which they look at a new photo.
5.3 Summary and Conclusions

The analysis has shown that, in these adult:child interactions, in the activity of looking at family photos, when the adult participant designs her/his turn as a test question, extended turns at talk are not encouraged from the child. However, it is not simply the fact of adults asking questions that leads to unproductive talk. It is the design of the question turn, and the sequential implications of that turn that are crucial to understanding why this is so. Test questions which are designed with a single ‘right’ answer in mind prefer just such an answer, and in effect, discourage extended turns at talk and do not serve as topic openers, as was seen in fragments W2 and K5. Test questions which are designed to maintain an ‘agenda’ to encourage talk, such as ‘and’ prefaced questions, as shown in fragment K7, equally discourage extended turns at talk. On the other hand, when the adults vary the design of their question turns, the response from the child tends to be extended turns at talk, as was seen in fragments W5, K6 and J5.

A large proportion of the talk between W and his father and between K and his mother consists of sequences which start with a test question asked by the adult. This gives the talk an overall impression of having frequent topic starts (Sacks 1995b [1972]). The adults appear to be encouraging the child to tell a story about a chosen photo, but they do so by asking test questions which prefer single ‘right’ answers. The answers which the child provides either immediately adjacent to the question, or after an insertion sequence, are then treated by the adult as being ‘closing relevant’ (Schegloff and Sacks 1974). Following the child’s answer, the adult takes up the next turn, thus stopping the child’s flow. Turns at talk become limited to simple single answers to the questions and responses more than one answer long are not evidenced. On the relatively few occasions in the talk between these dyads, when the adults do not design their turns as test questions, the children respond with extended turns. The design of a question as a challenge, for example, (as in fragment W2 line 11) prefers and gets an extended answer. Fragment W5 demonstrated how asking for an opinion, rather than asking a test question, made extended turns, and an extended sequence of turns sequentially relevant.
The talk between J and his mother was shown to be distinctively different from that between K and his mother and W and his father. The overall impression is of extended turn sequences with extended turns from both participants, characterised by the collaborative nature of the talk. J and M's turns are often contiguous and frequently overlap. Both J and his mother initiate sequences and design their first turns in a variety of ways, asking real questions, using question tags, offering comments and making clarification requests. J's mother does ask questions, to which she knows the answer, but as was seen in fragment J5 above, these are not always immediately recognisable as such. The talk does not follow the typical pattern in which a third position receipting turn is identifiable, and the result is extended sequences of talk. J and M jointly establish and maintain the activity of chatting about the photos.

Although W is the same age as J, W's conversation with his father has more similarities with that of K and his mother. This is in keeping with other findings which indicate that adults' spoken interaction with deaf children is moderated to fit with the perceived language ability of the child (Wood Wood, Griffiths and Howarth 1986; Bench 1992) and appears to be more like that of younger children. W's father could be designing his turns at talk in keeping with his perception of W's linguistic ability. As several researchers have pointed out, deaf children's ability to respond to questions in talk is commensurate with their understanding of the question (Ervin-Tripp 1970; Tyack and Ingram 1977; Cairns and Hsu 1978; McTear 1985). In W's case, comprehension of a spoken question has to do with lip-reading the speaker as well as with understanding the content or cognitive demand (Wood et al 1986) of the question. Because they have similar lip-patterns, "wh" questions, for example, can be easily confused, and can lead to uncertainties and ambiguities that may not be easily resolved. The reformulation of questions by W's father to be successively narrower can be seen as being appropriate in this regard. That it has the effect of curtailing the talk is probably secondary to the effect it has of lending coherence to a conversation that may otherwise quickly become difficult to sustain. W's father did not leave any time between his reformulated questions within which W could make a reply, indicating, possibly, that he was pursuing a response only to the final question (as was seen in fragments W2 and W4). F's final question tended to be linguistically less complicated than the priors, for example, designed with a simple grammatical structure, in keeping with F's perception of W's abilities. It could be said
that this is a way in which W is exposed to a rather restrictive language input, as was discussed in Chapter 1. By way of contrast, K’s mother was also shown to reformulate and narrow down questions, but there was a pause between her reformulations, indicating that she was expecting K to answer. Whilst, like W’s father, she is also apparently modifying her questions to fit her ideas about K’s understanding, she only does so when K clearly demonstrates, by not responding, that such modification is called for.

In Chapter 6, the talk described is between participants who are not native speakers of English and who belong to a different culture. Whilst it becomes rather more tricky to relate aspects of this talk to published work about English-speaking children and adults in a western culture, it is nevertheless of great interest to note two singular properties of talk. Firstly, most of it is in English, in spite of Sylheti being the first language and the culture of the participants. Secondly, and probably not surprisingly, there are many ways in which the talk is very similar to that of the English-speaking participants described above.
CHAPTER 6

ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION OF TALK IN THE SYLHETI-SPEAKING DYADS WHERE THE SAME LANGUAGE IS SPOKEN BY BOTH PARTICIPANTS

6.1 INTRODUCTION

At the outset of this section of analysis the question of interest concerned the possible similarity between the Sylheti interactions and the English interactions, particularly with regard to the interactions involving the deaf children. The talk observed in the Sylheti-speaking dyads in this chapter is characterised by question-answer sequences, as was the case for the English-speaking dyads in Chapter 5. It was predicted that the features of sequences in the talk between Kh (the deaf boy) and his father would be shown to be similar to those demonstrated for W (the deaf English boy) and K (the normally-hearing younger English boy). Indeed, the analysis showed that there are many instances of question-answer sequences where the initial question is asked by Kh’s father. As was the case in the interaction between W and his father, this question is also shown to be a test question in the Kh data on account of Kh’s response (e.g. a single ‘right’ or ‘wrong’ answer), and on account of the way in which his father acknowledges that answer in the third position receipt turn. As was also shown for W and K, when Kh’s father does not design initial turns in a sequence as test questions, the trajectory of the talk is different.

In contrast to the English dyads, where the deaf boy W’s talk in interaction was shown to be similar to that of the younger normally hearing boy, K, the talk involving E (the normally-hearing younger Sylheti-speaking boy) does not show many characteristic similarities to the talk involving Kh. E’s conversations are rather more like the talk between Jo (the normally hearing Sylheti-speaking seven year old) and his sister. Jo and E have conversations that are largely collaborative and in this respect the talk is more similar to the talk between J (the normally hearing English seven year old) and his mother.

The analyses presented in this chapter are arranged in a broadly similar way to those in Chapter 5, starting with a discussion of typical sequences in which a test question is asked by the adult, and sequences which appear to be ‘typical’ but which are shown not to be so. There follows a discussion of how specific answers are pursued by
reformulated questions; how mutual understanding is ensured; how the conversations are 'controlled' and lastly, ways in which extended turns at talk are achieved

6.1.1 Participants

This analysis relates to the three dyads detailed in Table XI.

Table XI: Details of the Sylheti dyads where the same language is spoken by both participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child's name</th>
<th>Child's age</th>
<th>Child's first language</th>
<th>Child's hearing status</th>
<th>Adult</th>
<th>Adult's first language</th>
<th>Language usually spoken by child and adult</th>
<th>Language spoken in sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kh</td>
<td>6.10 yrs</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Deaf</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Sylheti</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>5.4 yrs</td>
<td>Sylheti</td>
<td>Normal hearing</td>
<td>Sister (15 yrs)</td>
<td>Sylheti</td>
<td>Sylheti or mixture</td>
<td>Mixture of English and Sylheti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jo</td>
<td>7 yrs</td>
<td>Sylheti (fluent English)</td>
<td>Normal hearing</td>
<td>Sister (22 years)</td>
<td>Sylheti (fluent English)</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.1.2 Transcription notation

In the transcripts of fragments of talk quoted here, details of the notation used is given in Appendix 4. This data however has an additional feature which is that some of the talk has been translated into English from Sylheti. As was discussed in Chapter 4, the translation into ordinary colloquial English was chosen to be used in the analysis. Where utterances have been translated thus, they are printed in *italics*. The full transcripts of both word-for-word and colloquial translations are given in Appendix 4. Appendix 5 provides an index of the fragments quoted in the text.
6.1.3 An additional note about data collection and selection.

Although the procedures for the collection of data for these Sylheti-speaking participants were in the main the same as for the English-speaking participants (see Chapter 4), there were a few differences:

- In all the data-collection sessions, the researcher was accompanied by the interpreter, Mrs H. who facilitated the recordings.
- During the sessions, there were always a number of other people present - family, friends and onlookers. Although the point was made that the object of the exercise was to record the child talking to one adult, it was not considered appropriate to change the setting in any way. Hence there are more interruptions, and there is more background noise. The details of each data collection session are given in Appendix 4.
- In the data collection sessions for Jo, the family did not have an album of photographs available, and so picture books\(^1\) were used in the activity.
- Although a recording was made of E and his sister whilst they looked at a family photo album, E only said one or two words during this activity. When the picture books (the same as used for Jo) were produced, he was much more interested and lots of talk was recorded. It is the talk around the picture book activity that has been used for analysis.

6.2 The analysis

In the first instance, examples of typical (test) question-answer-receipt sequences in which the right answer is given, are presented. These sequences were frequently found in W and K's talk, and are a characteristic of the talk between Kh and his father.

\(^1\) The picture books used were: *Sainsbury's Book of Aircraft* and *Sainsbury's Book of Prehistoric Animals*. (1987) London: Walker Books
6.2.1 *Examples of typical (test) question-answer-receipt sequences in which the right answer is given*

In the talk between Kh and his father, many typical question-answer sequences are found. Whilst in several respects they display the same features as were noted for such sequences in the talk involving W and K in Chapter 5, there are also some consistent differences. These similarities and differences are discussed in the first instance with reference to fragment Kh1 below.

Fragment Kh1

1 F: .... (0.9) who got the jacket (1.3)  
2 Kh: daddy  
3 F: daddy (0.8) ((F nods)) good boy (1.0) * what else  
4 there (1.0) what this  
5 Kh: this  
6 F: mm  
7 Kh: flowers  
8 F: flower (. ) what colour is (. ) look  
9 Kh: Red green (1.3)  
10 F: Red and green  
11 Kh: u::im  
12 (2.8) ((Kh and F look closely at the photo))

In lines 1-3 there is an example of the typical sequence starting with a question asked by Kh's father (line 1) in pursuit of a single 'right' answer. When Kh gives this answer in line 2, F then uses the third position receipt turn to acknowledge the answer (line 3) as being 'right'. F's immediate repetition of the answer matches the pitch contour, as seen in fragment Kh1a.

Fragment Kh1a

```
  -
2 Kh: daddy
  -
3 F: daddy (0.8) ((F nods)) good boy (1.0) what else
```

Although the timing and the prosody of this receipt affirms the answer, F also provides Kh with a non-verbal affirmation in the form of a nod, and with praise. With this rather lengthy receipt, F has selected himself to continue. Unlike W's father, who reformulated his question without waiting for a response, Kh's father does so after a 1
second pause, asking another question about a new photo. This pause is an 
opportunity in which Kh could respond, but he does not. F then reformulates the 
question. After the intervening clarification request in lines 5 and 6, Kh gives his 
answer, and F acknowledges it immediately, matching its pitch contour, as shown in 
fragment Kh1b.

Fragment Kh1b

```
7 Kh: flowers

8 F: flower (. ) what colour is (. ) look
```

It is clear from this analysis that the questions asked by F in line 1 and lines 3/4 were 
test questions. The manner in which the sequence then proceeds in these instances is 
the same as was seen in fragments W1 and K9. A further similarity with W1 and K9 is 
that, in Kh1, after F's receipts in line 3 and line 8, he has selected himself to take the 
next turn, and he does so by asking another question, which turns out to be a further 
test question. As with W's father and K's mother, in this way, Kh's father is keeping 
control of the talk, but is not encouraging extended turns.

In fragment Kh1 it can also be seen how F not only affirms Kh's answer as being the 
'right' answer, but also takes the opportunity to provide a modification of that answer. 
In line 8, discussed above, F receipts Kh's answer, "flowers" by saying "flower". It is a 
characteristic of F's receipts in these typical sequences, that he designs them as 
modified repetitions of Kh's answers. A similar modification of a subsequent answer is 
seen in line 3, in fragment Kh1c.

Fragment Kh1c

```
1. F: *.flower (. ) what colour is (. ) look
2. Kh: Red green (1.3)
3. F: Red and green
4. Kh: u::m
5 (2.8) ((Kh and F look closely at the photo))
```
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Closer examination of the pitch contours of the answer and the receipt show some matching, indicating that F acknowledges the answer as being right, as in fragment Kh1d.

Fragment Kh1d

2 Kh: Red green (1.3)

3 F: Red and green

The pitch contours can be considered as being 'equivalent' in the sense that a step-down over two syllables, as F does, (given that 'red' and 'green' are each pronounced as two syllables), is equivalent to a fall over one syllable (as in Kh's 'red'). Further, a fall and a rise-fall (as in Kh's 'green') are functionally closely related. However, the 1.3 second pause between the answer and the receipt, the lengthening of the words and inserting "and" between "red" and "green" indicate that F found it necessary to modify Kh's answer.

Fragment Kh2 provides another illustration of F using the third position receipt turn to modify Kh's answer.

Fragment Kh2

1 F: * who are them (1.7)
2 (sound of sister's voice)
3 Kh: Dad and mum
4 F: Your mum and dad (.) where your mum (3.2)

Although there is no pause between the answer in line 3 and the receipt in line 4, the pitch contours are similar, as shown in fragment Kh2a, the answer has been modified.

Fragment Kh2a

3 Kh: Dad and mum

4 F: Your mum and dad (.) where your mum (3.2)
Accounting for the work accomplished by these modifications is speculative. A possible explanation is that F’s repetition is serving as a repair initiation. Tarplee (1996) discusses the phenomenon of repetitions doing reparative work in labelling sequences. Simply put, she suggests that in such instances, the adult modifies their repetition of the child’s label so that their own version becomes a model for the ‘correct’ realisation of that label, thus giving the child an opportunity to repair their realisation. The child may not take up this option to repair, but the adult’s modification could indicate that repair work is being projected. It seems that in fragments Kh1b, Kh1c and Kh2a, F’s receipts could be accounted for in this way. Kh however, does not take up the opportunity to repair. An interesting feature of the repair aspect of this dyad’s interaction is that Kh’s father frequently omits the morpheme /s/ in his speech, for example, when /s/ is a plural, and for /s/ as copula and auxiliary. Some of the ramifications of this observation will be discussed later in Chapter 7 section 7.2.5. In a similar way, in the talk between W and his father, the father’s modified receipt could be construed as repair initiation, for example in fragment W1a (Chapter 5 section 5.2.1), the father modifies his receipt (line 12) of W’s answer in line 10.

Fragment W1a

10 W: because if you need to throw it under= ((mimes an underarm throw))
11 F : =underarm (0.6) but then when you get a big boy
12 what do you do with the ball (1.6) what was we
13 practising

W’s father only pauses for 0.6 seconds before continuing, and W does not repair his realisation of ‘underarm’.

To return to the presentation of typical question sequences, there was one clear example of a typical test question sequence in the talk involving Jo (the seven year old normally hearing Sylheti-speaking boy), of which fragment Jo1 is an illustration. [Note that Jo’s sister is designated as L in this transcription]

Fragment Jo1

1 L: Okay go on Jo what’s happening in this picture
2 Jo: That (is)
3 L:* Don’t read it jus see what’s coming from the picture what’s happening
5 Jo: I don know they might be (1.0) they walking around
6 L: Well how many dinosaurs are there
7 (7.0) ((Jo counts the dinosaurs))
8 Jo: Seven
In line 6, L asks the test question: "well how many dinosaurs are there". Having counted the dinosaurs in the picture, Jo then gives the right answer in line 8, which is receipted by L in line 9 without a pause, and as shown in fragment Jo1a, with matching of the pitch contours.

Fragment Jo1a

---

8 Jo: Seven

---

9 L: Seven

The function of the "well" in line 6 is speculative. Heritage and Sorjonen (1994) indicate that "well" is sometimes found to precede a turn in which an assessment is being made, but this does not apply here. It could, in this instance, be displaying a recognition of the beginning of Jo's answer when he professes not to know what is happening in the picture, and it then precedes L's next question which could be designed to encourage Jo to talk more about the picture.

When the talk involving E (the younger normally hearing Sylheti-speaking boy) was analysed, no clear examples of the typical test question sequence were observed. It is in this respect that the talk involving Kh and E is dissimilar. Where there is a similarity, as will be shown in section 6.2.4, it is with respect to the way the adults keep control of the activity in which the talk occurs. Characteristics of the talk between E and his sister will be described in more detail in the sections 6.2.2 and 6.2.5.
6.2.2 Sequences which appear to be 'typical' but which are shown not to be so.

There are several sequences of the talk between Jo and L which appear to look like typical test question sequences because L is shown to use the third position receipt turn to acknowledge an answer Jo has made to a prior question. However, closer examination shows that these sequences are different, as demonstrated by the analysis of fragment Jo1b.

Fragment Jo1b

10 (2.4)
11 L: how many like can you see what they're all doing
12 ( ) what they doing
13 Jo: The:: ( ) one's eating a gra: um (. ) tree ( .
14 another one eating (0.9) they all eating grass
15 L: They're eating grass=
16 Jo: =°Yeah° ((turns the page))

L asks a question in line 11. Her first attempt at this question is about the number of dinosaurs, but she immediately rephrases it to be about what the dinosaurs are doing, designing this version in such a way that Jo could choose not to respond: "can you see what they're all doing" (line 11). She then reformulates this question without waiting for Jo to respond: "what they doing" (line 12). The design of this final question has not narrowed it down in the way that reformulated questions found in the talk involving the deaf children are narrowed down. L does not seem to be pursuing a specific answer. In the event, Jo gives a response which is more than one answer long (lines 13 and 14). L acknowledges this answer in the third position receipt turn, designing her receipt as a modified repetition of his last few words, with all the hallmarks of being part of a typical test question sequence, (including a repair projection in the modified repetition ) as fragment Jo1c shows.

Fragment Jo1c

14 Jo: another one eating (0.9) they all eating grass
15 L: They're eating grass=
16 Jo: =°Yeah° ((turns the page))
L’s question in line 11/12 has encouraged an extended turn from Jo, and she receipted his answer in the way illustrated above. Jo then acknowledges L’s receipt by saying “yeah” (line 16) and by turning the page. This “yeah” could serve here as an acknowledgement from Jo that L’s modified repetition was doing reparative work on his “they all eating grass”. It also could be an indication that Jo responds to L’s receipt turn as functioning to indicate that she has understood his prior turn. Jo’s “yeah” displays that he interprets her prior in line 15 as requiring an acknowledgement. In this way, L’s turn in line 15 has served to select Jo as next speaker, and not L (the latter was the case for third position receipting turns described in section 6.2.1). These two turns are evidence that L’s question in line 11/2 was not a test question, and that these sequences are not test question-answer-receipt sequences as were described for fragment Jo1a. In the typical sequences, it is the adult who takes the next turn after her/his acknowledgement of the child’s answer to the question. There are several more examples in the talk between Jo and L in which L repeats the last few words of Jo’s turn, particularly when that turn was extended, Jo then acknowledges the repeat with an affirmative, and then continues. This can be seen in fragments Jo 5 and Jo 6

**Fragment Jo5**

L: *an there what=
Jo: u::h
L: =they doing
Jo: in they’re flying about
L: ((turns the page)) they’re flying about
Jo: yeah (.)((turns back to a previous picture)) there none here

**Fragment Jo6**

L: ((turns the page)) *have a look at these ones Jo whas these ones=
Jo: these are (.) these are the swimming ones=
L: =swimming ones
Jo: yeah ( ) this is a dinosaur oh that one=

As in Jo1b, the questions asked by L seem to be functioning as topic openers and not as test questions in pursuit of a specific answer. The function of a question as a topic opener (Sacks [1995b] 1972) was discussed in Chapter 4 (section 4.3.4: structure of the question turn and the response turn). That this is the case for L’s questions in the examples given above, is shown by Jo’s answers in which he pursues the topic, and thereby shows that he is treating the question as a topic opener.
Another way in which a sequence initiated by a question is shown to function in this way concerns those instances where the adult does not use the third position receipting turn to acknowledge an answer to her/his prior question.

For example, Jo's sister's questions which are answered in the next turn, are not always receipted in the third position receipting turn. The absence of such acknowledgement seems to lead not only to extended turns, but also to extended topical sequences of turns. This is illustrated in fragment Jo2

Fragment Jo 2

1  L:* =What's this
2  Jo: This is (. ) kind of starry air um (. ) air line
3     look
4       (1.5)
5  L:  Where is it
6  Jo: Goes to into rthe a
7  L:  (whats this)what is it
8  Jo: (rainbow)
9  L:  Where are they
10 Jo: In the airport
11 L:  and that is
12 Jo: That's in (. ) near where it comes from (. ) near
13     (. ) the: helicopter
14 L:  Uhum ( (turns the page) )

After Jo's response (lines 2 & 3) to L's question in line 1, L does not use the third position receipting turn to acknowledge that answer. Instead, after 1.5 seconds, she asks a next question (line 5). Jo's response to this in line 6 is incomplete and whether or not it is the answer L had in mind is not made evident, since she overlaps his response with another question in line 7. He gives the answer to this in overlap in line 8. L does not receipt this answer, and instead in her next turn (line 9), she asks him another question. He gives his answer (line 10); again, in line 11, she does not acknowledge this answer, but asks yet another question. This one is prefaced with 'and', with which she indicates that she is continuing the activity of questioning him about the picture. He gives an extended reply (lines 12 & 13), and this time, in her next turn, L receipt his reply (line 14) thus ending the sequence. In short, in segment Jo2, L and Jo mutually achieve an extended sequence of turns. A significant contribution to this achievement is the absence of acknowledgements by L in the third position receipting turn throughout the sequence.
Similarly, in the talk between E (the normally hearing younger Sylheti-speaking boy) and his sister, although E's sister asks questions, and these questions are answered by E, there is no evidence of a receipt in the third position turn. S also does not appear to require a specific response, since there is no pursuit of the 'right' answer. It will be shown that her questions function as topic openers. These points are illustrated by fragment E1.

Fragment E1

1  S:*  Ujol\(^2\)  what is this
2  E:  Helicopter
3  S:*  What uh kind of 's this
4  E:  uh:  (2.1) rocket
5  S:  no:  nearly=
6  E:  uh
7  S:*  =wha are these these fighter planes innit(1.0) the
8    war planes (1.2) they shoot people down=
9  E:  =there front gun ((points to gun))
10 S:  gun
11  (6.7)

In line 1, S asks a potential test question, to which E replies with a single answer in line 2. Whether or not this is the 'right' answer, is not possible to say, since S does not use the third position receipt turn to acknowledge the answer. Instead, in line 3, she goes on to ask another question. E responds to this after 2.1 seconds, with a single answer which is clearly not what S had in mind, since in her next turn she says "no: nearly=" (line 5). This utterance is evidence that in line 3, she had asked a test question in line 1 with a specific answer in mind. She does not, however, supply that answer, nor does she pursue an alternative answer, even though E could be trying to give one in line 6, in overlap. S does not allow him to interrupt here, going on immediately to ask another question in line 7, to which she promptly provides her own candidate answer.

Continuing in this turn, the sister then gives another candidate answer after 1 second. After another pause of 1.2 seconds, she then extends the topic of fighter planes (line 8). E does not take a turn at any of these transition relevance places. In line 9, however, E does take a turn and comments on the topic, and S receipts his contribution in line 10. Following this, the long pause (6.7 seconds) in which they look at another picture, indicates that this talk has been completed. Although a typical test-

\(^2\)"Ujol" is E's family nickname.
question - receipt device is not observed in this segment, the timing and design of S’s turns could indicate that she is nevertheless controlling the talk.

This section has described the way in which sequences starting with a question differ in the E and the Jo data, from the typical test question sequences observed in the Kh data described in section 6.2.1. Discussion of the extended turns which are observed in the E and the Jo data and were mentioned here will be continued in section 6.2.6. In the next section, 6.2.3, examination of the typical test question sequence is pursued.

6.2.3 Examples of typical (test) question-answer-receipt sequences in which the ‘wrong’ answer is given and the ‘right’ answer is then pursued by use of reformulated questions.

Pursuit of the right answer to a question by reformulating that question is a prominent feature of the talk between Kh and his father, as was the case for the deaf English-speaking boy, W, and his father. This is illustrated with reference to fragment Kh3 below.

In fragment Kh3 F asks a series of questions to get Kh to give the right answer to an original question. During the course of this sequence, F is observed to reformulate his questions, narrowing them down in pursuit of a specific answer. Some of these reformulations give Kh the option of not responding. F also asks further questions which initiate an insertion sequence (see Chapter 4, section 4.3.4), but eventually he returns to the original question and the specific answer that he is pursuing.

Fragment Kh3

1 F:* Whe where is this picture (0.7) can you tell me ((F picks up the album, shows Kh, looks at Kh))
2 Kh: Hmm ? ((looks at F))
3 F: Where is that ((puts album down))
4 Kh: By his (not) in a sand ((looks down at album, points down))
5 F: (unintelligible)
6 S: (unintelligible)
7 F: In the sand (.) where is it ((looks at Kh))(1.5)
8. ((looks down at photo)) you remember that
9 Kh: ((nods))
10 F: ((picks album up again, but continues to look down at photo))
11. (1.5) where you are (1.1) did you find where the
12 Kh: (points to himself in the photo and looks up at F))
13 F: oh yes it is you it is
14 Kh: (looks up towards it))
15 ((telephone rings; Kh looks up towards it))
16 F: Sea (0.9) seaside ((looks up at Kh and nods)) (1.1)
17 Kh: ((nods))
18 F: yeah (1.3) seaside
19 Kh: Same like say it same like that (0.8) one 20
     ((points behind him))
21 F: Where=
22 Kh: Finton
23 F: In Finton . yes ((nods emphatically)) nice=
24 Kh: Same
25 F: Finton ((looks down at album))
26 Kh: Sister under in the water ((points to a particular
27 section of the photo of Finton))
28 F: You been there haven’t you ((looks at Kh)) (0.8)
29 Kh: ((nods))
30 F: you been (0.7) did you ((nods))= 2
31 Kh: ((nods)) two times
32 F: Two times . twice you been twice (1.9) good

In line 1, F asks the first question (which turns out to be the test question) “where is this picture” and very quickly, after 0.7 seconds, he reformulates his question to “can you tell me” giving Kh the option of not responding. Kh asks for clarification in line 3, and F reformulates his initial question in line 4 to “where is that”.

In line 5 Kh gives a candidate answer, some of which is not intelligible to the transcriber, but F does not appear to have a problem with it, or if he does, he does not specifically ask for clarification, acknowledging Kh’s utterance by repeating the last phrase with some modifications: “in the sand”\. As can be seen in fragment Kh3a, the prosodic agreement on the repetition could be displaying that Kh’s response is not actually wrong, but is on the ‘right track’.

Fragment Kh3a

5 Kh: By his (not) in a sand ((looks down at album, points down))
6 S: (unintelligible)\(^4\)
7 F: In the sand . where is it ((looks at Kh)) (1.5)

\(^3\) This contains an embedded correction of Kh’s “in a sand”, but F does not give Kh the opportunity to acknowledge the correction, going on immediately with a reformulation of the question.

\(^4\) The sister’s unintelligible contribution in line 6 is not attended to by either Kh or F.
However, that Kh’s answer in line 5 is not completely the right answer is evidenced by F continuing in this turn (line 7), to reformulate again the question originally asked in line 1: “where is it”, displaying that he has a more precise answer in mind. He also looks up at Kh, and then looks down at the same photo again during the 1.5 second pause\(^5\). The structure of F’s utterance in line 7 differs from the way in which he structures an outright rejection of what he takes to be a wrong answer from Kh. This can be seen in fragment Kh6 line 7, where the design of the rejection includes a definite negative.

Fragment Kh6
1  F: this is Rosi (1.9) * that ?
2  (2.5)
3  Kh: daddy (1.8) you ((points to F))
4  (2.4)
5  F: 's me ?
6  Kh: hmm
7  F: is not me (0.9) somebody else

It could also be the case that the rejection of a not completely right answer in line 7 of fragment Kh3a is structured in line with the general dispreference to disagree overtly, as suggested by Pomerantz (1984a).

When there is no response from Kh after 1.5 seconds, in line 8, F says “you remember that (1.8)” to which Kh's responds by nodding his head (line 9). These two turns can be seen as an insertion sequence which could function as an understanding check. However, F does not receipt the nod, probably because he has not seen it since he continues to look down at the photo throughout the talk in lines 7 to 12.

Having seemingly had no answer to his question about the place depicted in the photo, F now changes tack, and asks another question (line 11) about a different aspect of the photo: “where you are”. It would seem that by asking this question he is no longer pursuing the ‘right’ answer to the question asked in line 1. However, as will become apparent, this question in line 11 is the start of a second insertion sequence, as shown in fragment Kh3b.

\(^5\) This phenomenon of the adult acknowledging a ‘not completely right’ answer, and then continuing to pursue the right answer was also shown in the talk between W and his father (see fragment W2 line 5 (Chapter 5 section 5.2.2)).
Fragment Kh3b

11 F: (1.5) where you are (1.1) did you find where the
12 Kh here (2.0) no (.) can’t see it
13 Kh: (points to himself in the photo, looks up at F))
14 F: oh yes it is you it is

When F does not get a response to the question “where you are” (line 11) after 1.1 seconds, he reformulates it, referring to Kh by name, thus drawing Kh’s attention to the question “did you find where the Kh here” (line 11/12). During the 2.0 second gap in line 12, Kh points to the picture of himself in the photo and looks up at F. This non-verbal response is also in overlap with F’s candidate answer to his own question in line 12. However, F finally acknowledges Kh’s non-verbal answer in line 14, thus ending what has been shown to be an insertion sequence. Further evidence that this is an insertion sequences can be seen in Kh3c below, where, after the interruption of the phone ringing, F continues with the original question sequence by giving a candidate answer (line 16) to the question he had asked in line 1:

Fragment Kh3c

14 F: oh yes it is you it is
15 (telephone rings; Kh looks up towards it))
16 F: seaside (0.9) seaside ((looks up at Kh and nods)) (1.1)
17 Kh: ( (nods)) ( (nods))
18 F: yeah (1.3) seaside
19 Kh: ( same like say it same like that (0.8) one 20 
( points behind him ))
21 F: Where=
22 Kh: =Finton
23 F: In Finton (. ) yes ((nods emphatically)) nice=
24 Kh: =Same
25 F: Finton ((looks down at album))

F offers a candidate answer (line 16) to the original question asked in line 1. Kh overlaps this with a nod. F repeats his own answer twice, with pauses between each repeat, and Kh nods in overlap each time. Kh overlaps the final repeat with his own answer, “same like say it same like that one” (line 19/20) the design of which shows evidence of a word search: he is not fluent, and he points vaguely behind him possibly to a memento of the seaside place. F does not receipt Kh’s turn, but in line 21, he reformulates the original question again, using only the question word “where”, and finally, in line 22, Kh supplies the right answer “Finton” which F then receipts in line 23, indicating that this is indeed the right answer. Fragment Kh3d illustrates this.
Fragment Kh3d

22 Kh: =Finton

23 F: In Finton (.) yes ((nods emphatically)) nice=

F's receipt of the 'rightness' of this answer is reinforced by his emphatic nod, and his praise. It is notable that F's lengthy receipt in line 23 does not serve to end the talk. In line 24, Kh says "same", possibly referring again to the memento he had pointed to earlier, but this time, F responds in line 25 by repeating the name of the seaside place. Kh's continuation here can be seen as his acknowledgement that the entire sequence had taken a long time, was 'problematic', but has finally been resolved.

It is also noteworthy that in his next turn (line 26) following F's final receipt of the right answer to the original question, Kh then comments on another aspect of the photo when F looks down at the album again as in fragment Kh3e.

Fragment Kh3e

24 Kh: =Same
25 F: Finton ((looks down at album))
26 Kh: Sister under in the water ((points to a particular section of the photo of Finton))
27 F: You been there haven't you ((looks at Kh)) (0.8)
28 Kh: (nods)
29 F: you been there (0.7) did you
30 Kh: (nods)
31 Kh: two times
32 F: =Two times (.) twice you been twice (1.9) good

Although Kh points to the picture, and appears to be trying to extend the topic, F's response in his next turn (line 27) is not to pursue the topic of Kh's sister in the water.

In the course of fragment Kh3e, F is shown to reformulate his original question not only to pursue a correct answer, but also, it would seem, to pursue a verbal answer. This is the only instance in the data where Kh's father uses question tags. Since F is changing

---

6 Kh uses the Sylheti word "affa" (sister) in this utterance. This is one of the few times he uses Sylheti in the talk with his father.
the topic in line 28, using a question tag here serves to create a first pair part, (Sacks 1995a [1972]), and to select Kh as next speaker. This warrants a second pair part response from Kh. Kh gives this by way of a non-verbal response - a nod (line 29). F does not acknowledge this, but reformulates the question, again using a tag “did you” (line 30). Arguably, changing the syntax of the tag question here may be confusing to Kh. However, Kh’s response is again non-verbal (line 31) and is in overlap. It would seem that F is reformulating his question to prompt not only a correct answer, but a correct verbal answer. Although Kh has answered the question tags non-verbally, F only receipts Kh’s spoken answer (answer given in line 31, receipt given in line 32). F’s nod in overlap with this spoken answer could be seen as an acknowledgement that indeed it was the verbal response that was being pursued.

It has been shown that fragment Kh3 as a whole is an example of an extended sequence of turns resulting from Kh’s father pursuing the single right answer to his original test question. Whilst this can be accounted for on the one hand by the reformulations of questions in pursuit of a ‘right’ answer, a further consideration could contribute to accounting for the extended sequence. This is that the answer to the original test question in line 1 did not occur in the turn following that question, that is, the answer was not given in the turn adjacent to the question. The answer is eventually given, in line 22, and is receipted in line 23. After this receipt, however, the sequence continues, unlike those sequences where the question-answer-third turn receipt are adjacent and the receipt in the third turn ends the talk (e.g. fragment Kh1 and Kh 2). It would seem that a non-adjacent answer of this kind makes more turns at talk sequentially relevant when the questioner is pursuing a particular right answer. Other examples of this are to be found in the current data, such as in fragment K5 quoted in Chapter 5 section 5.2.4, and fragment E2 quoted later in this Chapter in section 6.2.6.

Throughout this analysis of fragment Kh3, reference has been made to the reformulation of question turns. Reformulations were also a feature of the talk between W and K and their respective carers (see Chapter 5). Two aspects of reformulations were singled out in the previous analysis of those two dyads:

- the placement of the reformulations in a sequence with respect to the timing between reformulated questions;
the design of the reformulations, which tended to be in the direction of narrowing down the question by simplifying its content and syntax (to ensure a specific answer).

In the interaction between Kh and his father, the placement of the father's reformulated questions is such that they are separated by gaps of more than 1.0 seconds, indicating that F is giving Kh time to answer them (see fragment Kh 3 lines 7-15). In fact, it could be said, that as was the case for K (the younger normally hearing English-speaking boy) and his mother (see fragment K5 in Chapter 5 section 5.2.5), the reformulations are done when the adult treats the pause as an indication that the question is not going to be answered. This is different from the case for W whose father more often was shown to reformulate his questions without giving W a chance to respond (see fragment W4).

In the W data, the final version of the reformulated question invariably was a narrowed version of the original. It was postulated that W's father did this in order to steer W in the direction of making a specific response, using the appropriate strategy of modifying the design of the question so that W's chances of answering are optimised. Examination of Kh's father's reformulated questions, indicates that he too makes his questions more specific, although he does not necessarily simplify his syntax. In some instances, the reformulated questions contain grammatical errors (these are errors common to Asian speakers of English, (Jackson 1980; 1987). For example, lines 11 and 12 in fragment Kh3f.

Fragment Kh3f

11 F: (1.5) where you are (1.1) did you find where the
12 Kh here (2.0) no (.) can’t see it

The reformulated question “did you find where the Kh here” is syntactically more complex than the initial question “where you are”, and it contains some errors. Nevertheless, it does specify the topic (Kh himself) by mentioning Kh by name. It also serves to point the way more explicitly to the right answer, since it includes the words ‘find’ as well as ‘where’ (which was the original question word) both of which have clear lip-patterns. As was the case with W and K mentioned previously, Kh’s father redesigns his questions so that Kh can give the correct answer. The fathers of W and
Kh may also be designing their turns in accordance with their perception of their deaf sons' abilities in spoken language, as was discussed previously.

F’s level of proficiency in English, and the possible effect of this on his interaction with Kh will be discussed more fully in Chapter 7 (section 7.2.5).

6.2.4 Ensuring mutual understanding

It has been shown that for the deaf boys W and Kh, questions were reformulated so that they could be understood, therefore enabling W and Kh to answer appropriately. It would appear that another means of ensuring mutual understanding in these dyads can be found in certain aspects of the design of the adults’ turns. As can be seen in Fragment Kh4, F includes in both his question turns, and his third position receipt turns, a repetition of all or part of Kh’s prior turn. In addition to the other functions served by these repetitions, as have been described in the preceding sections, they also appear to serve to keep track of the topic.

Fragment Kh4

1 F:* what this (1.0)
2 Kh: sister
3 F: what’s: (. ) she got (1.6)
4 Kh: a ball
5 F: what she got a ball
6 Kh: mum (. )
7 F: your mum
8 Kh: and me (1.6) I got a ball =
9 F: =you got a ball too (0.9) big ball
10 Kh: yeah

This fragment of talk is shown to be a series of typical test question sequences during which there is no apparent misunderstanding between Kh and F. It could be argued that F has ensured that this would be so, by carefully controlling the talk (insofar as it proceeds by way of the typical test question sequence) and also, by including repetitions of some key words in his receipt turns. In line 5, F includes the word “ball” in his third position receipt turn. When Kh comments further on the picture in line 6 saying “mum”, F’s response is to include the word “mum” in his acknowledgement turn in line 7. This happens again in lines 8 and 9.
A similar pattern was seen in W. In fragment W4c, (see Chapter 5 section 5.2.5 for a full discussion of fragment W4), W’s father was also shown to include in some of his turns a repetition of all or part of W’s prior, which, in addition to the other functions they served, also displayed that W’s father was trying to keep track of W’s topic.

Fragment W4c

20 W: like at home°oh we rent a video and and they hadn’t
21 had it (we) got to wait for the lorry come
22 F: they got to wait
23 W: [idn’ it
24 F: for the lorry to come
25 W: yea (1.3) idn it mum ((looks to mother for
26 confirmation))
27 M: for a long time you got to wait for a long time
28 (1.5) That’s for the caption machine
29 W: what’s that ((gets up to attend to something
30 else))

That F’s turns which include repetitions of W’s priors in lines 22 and 24 are indications that F is trying to keep track of the topic is evidenced by the fact that W appeals to his mother to intervene and re-establish the common ground, since mutual understanding has momentarily been lost.

It seems to be the case, from these examples, that whether or not they achieve mutual understanding, the fathers of these deaf boys do attempt to do so, and that one way of doing so is by including repetitions of some part of the prior. It is noteworthy that this similarity exists in spite of the fact that the first language of one father is English, and that of the other is Sylheti. In these interactions, both fathers and sons are speaking English. This point will be returned to in Chapter 7 with further discussion of the issue of how participants ensure mutual understanding when they do not speak the same language during the interaction.

Thus, it would appear that in the talk between the deaf boys W and Kh and their fathers, two strategies are used by the fathers to ensure mutual understanding. They control the conversation by the use of a typical test question sequence (often with reformulated questions), and by the way they design their turns within that sequence.

Ensuring mutual understanding in this manner is not apparent in the talk between the normally hearing Sylheti-speaking boy E and his sister. Here reformulations are observed, but they do not appear to be functioning to ensure understanding so that the
child can give a specific answer or to keep track of the topic. As fragment E3 shows, it is rather that E’s sister reformulates her questions until E displays that he has understood her use of an English word. In order to do this, her reformulations do becomes narrower, but there is evidence to show that she has not designed them to pursue a specific answer.

Fragment E3

1 ((S turns the page and then looks at E))
2 S: d'ya wanna be a pilot Ujol
3 E: hm
4 S: d'ya wanna be a pilot
5 E: hmm
6 S: when you grow up d'ya wanna fly a plane
7 E: yeah
8 S: d'ya want to fly high: in the air
9 E: yes
10 S: yes why
11 E: u::h (1.2) I don't really know it looks nice
12 S: you like it
13 E: I could be able to see if there was anything nice

In lines 4 and 6 S reformulates her question until E displays understanding of the vocabulary, and answers the question in line 7. Her next question in line 8 is more than a reformulation of line 6, possibly suggesting something exciting about ‘flying high...’.

E’s switch to Sylheti (line 9) may be an indication that this is so. Once S acknowledges that he has understood by repeating ‘yes’ in Sylheti (line 10), she asks him a next relevant real question: “why” to which he gives an extended reply in line 11. She acknowledges this in line 12 and encourages further comment in her turn: “you like it”. She has picked up on his “it looks nice” comment (line 11) as a way of inviting him to elaborate further. E does so in his extended turn in line 13. This sequence is similar to fragment E2c:

Fragment E2c

17 S: hundreds and hundreds isn't it
18 E: (hhh) fire engine ((points to picture))
19 S u:::(0.9) haven't you seen fire on television
20 suddenly it catches fire=

In line 19, S also invites E to elaborate on the topic of ‘fire’, and by designing her invitation as a question, she selects E as the next speaker.

\footnote{Fragment E2 is discussed again in detail in section 6.2.5 below.}
A further example of how E’s sister ensures that misunderstandings on account of English vocabulary do not occur is shown in fragment E4. It would appear that in the way the turn sequence unfolds here, that S is addressing the issue of the relative proficiency she and E have in English. E’s sister does not overtly correct mistakes in E’s English. She engages in explanations about vocabulary, or reformulates question in order to accommodate E’s lack of a vocabulary item. This can be seen in Fragment E4 below.

Fragment E4

1 S: mm (1.3)* what are these ((points to hot air balloons in picture))
2 E: do you mean these
3 S: mm
4 E: uh you have done something haven’t you
5 S: here the balloons (.) a airship
6 E: eh but (.) these are something hard names isn’t it=
7 S: =no see they like a little basket in a balloon they
8 go really high they so big look (1.0) they not small
9 like this balloons they bigger
10 E: more (.) they more big than this one isn’t it=
11 S: =mm they take people up higher and higher (.8) little
12 people like you stay below *that big*
13 E: ((looks up, away from book)) yeah=

This talk is noteworthy in several respects. Firstly, E designs all his turns as questions. He uses a question in line 2, and question tags in lines 4, 6 and 10. By doing this, he selects S as next speaker, making it sequentially relevant for her to answer his questions, and to expand on the topic. It is clear from the sequence in lines 1 - 5 that E was not familiar with the vocabulary and could not answer the original test question in line 1. His subsequent use of question tags can be seen as a rather sophisticated way of obtaining further information from S about these objects in the picture.

6.2.5 Keeping control of the talk

There are no examples in the talk between Kh and his father where F does not either immediately get an answer to his questions, or does not pursue such an answer. In a similar way as was shown for W and K in Chapter 5, in this way, Kh’s father achieves control of the talk. He designs his turns as test questions which prefer a single right answer, and when this answer is given, he receipts it, often accompanying the receipt with
praise, thus closing the talk and selecting himself as next speaker, for example, as was illustrated in fragment Kh3.

Another aspect of the interaction is also potentially ‘controllable’. This is the doing of the activity of talking about pictures. As was discussed in Chapter 4, the activity in this data is ‘doing talk about pictures’. To establish the activity at the start of the talk the adult introduces the task and then the first picture to talk about is chosen. In the data sets discussed here, the first picture is chosen by the adult. As the interaction proceeds, new or next pictures are chosen by either the child or the adult.

The selection of the next picture to talk about is one way of maintaining the activity, or, when required, of re-establishing the activity if the participants have become distracted. In the talk involving the older normally hearing children, this role is taken on by both child and adult. In the other dyads, although it is the adults who are usually observed to choose the next picture, the children sometimes do so too. In these instances, however, it is frequently observed that the adult will overrule a bid from the child, and will choose an alternative picture instead.

In the data from Kh, there are several occasions when Kh chooses the picture to talk about, and initiates the talk. The response from F in these cases is generally not to elaborate the topic initiated by Kh, but to return the talk to the three turn question-answer sequence by asking a test question, (as seen above, in fragment Kh3 lines 26-32). This is also illustrated in fragment Kh5a and Kh5b.

Fragment Kh5a

1 Kh: *Where that where uhr see it (. ) water (0.8) a boat=
2 F: What is this
3 F: =what is is what is is this Kh
4 (4.2)
5 Kh: Bridge
6 F: Bridge a bridge good boy (1.0) well done is that
7 (2.8)

In line 1, Kh asks a question, repeats it and then offers a candidate answer. However, F overlaps the candidate answer with his own test question (line 2) which he repeats twice, and in using Kh’s name after the second repeat, calls attention to his question and makes an answer to it imperative. Kh only answers in line 5 after 4.2 seconds. This pause could be due to his having to take time to scan the picture, but could also be
evidence that he is responding to the change in topic. F receipts the right answer in line 6, and ends the sequence by praising Kh.

An interesting exchange of ‘control’ from Kh to F occurs later in this fragment, in line 8.

Fragment Kh5b (cont)

6 F: Bridge a bridge good boy (1.0) well done is that
7 (2.8)
8 Kh: My mum (1.2) (kgi) (0.8) standing up wi water wi wi
9 sand
10 F: Mummy
11 (7.2)
12 F: Who is she (.) your teacher (.) say your teacher for
13 me
14 Kh: (Ah mi::d) say say
15 F: Who who who is she who is she
16 Kh: Miss Door
17 F: Miss Tool
18 (15.6) ((K turns over a few pages; sister walks into picture))

After the long pause (line 11) during which Kh does not self-select, F restarts the talk by asking a test question. He immediately supplies the answer, and then instructs Kh to say the name of the teacher. Kh tries to do this in line 14. It is not clear whether F understands this. He does not ask for clarification, but overlaps this response with a non-fluent, repeated question (line 15). In line 16, Kh says the name of the teacher (he pronounces it wrongly) which is the required answer to F’s question in line 12. In line 17, F receipts this answer with his own interpretation of the name.

In Kh5a and Kh5b, Kh has tried to initiate a topic in line 1, but F has responded by returning the talk to the patterns of test question/answer/third turn receipt. Kh then restarts the talk in line 8, and this time, F makes a clarification request leaving the way open for Kh to pursue the topic. Kh does not do this, and after a considerable pause (7.2 seconds) F has to restart the talk; he does so by asking a test question (line 12). His instruction to Kh to say the name of the teacher could be a strategy to prevent the talk from stalling again. Such requests for repetition of a word or phrase, or instruction to say something specific is a tactic seen fairly often in conversations between deaf children and their teachers (Wood, Wood, Griffiths and Howarth 1986).

Control of the activity within which the talk is happening, by the adult, is also a feature of the talk between E and his sister, as shown in fragments E2 and E5. In this respect,
the E data shows some similarity with the Kh data in that S sometimes does not allow E to choose the topic for talk.

Fragment E2d

1  E: that looks wicked isn’t it ((points to picture))
2  S: ((turns the page)) Plane look=

In line 1, E has drawn S’s attention to an aspect of the picture and thus initiated a possible new topic, but S’s response to this is to turn the page and attend to a different picture. Even though E uses a question tag in the design of his turn in line 1, S does not respond to it. She interrupts E, overlapping his tag question with her exclamation “plane”, after she has turned the page, thus directing his attention to her choice of picture.

By not responding to E’s utterance in line 1, S seems to be taking back control. Another example of this is given in fragment E5.

Fragment E5

1  S: uh (0.7) look *(0.8) ((points to a different part of the picture)) the rescue planes (. ) see (. ) when people crash (0.7) ships (1.4 ) they (. ) save people from the sea
2  E: that that two and that’s one=
3  ((pointing to the same picture))
4  S: =mm
5  E: one day I bought something you know (0.8) those two things (. ) the helicopters that I bought
6  S:* look ((S turns the page and points to a different picture)) on that plane they can fly
7  towards the air and they can go in the water

Here, within a sequence of talk, E makes reference to something that is not in the picture (lines 8 and 9). In the next turn (lines 10, 11, 12) his sister turns the page and redirects his attention to a new picture.

However, elsewhere in the data there is evidence that S is also willing to allow E to take charge of the activity. This is shown clearly in the first few lines of fragment E6.

Fragment E6

1  S: uh let me find something else (0.9) um (1.6) u:m
2  E: is this
3  S: is it a (. ) Concorde u:::
4  E: =if this crack will come isn’t it
5  S: yeah this burst will go and:::=
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In line 1, S is clearly trying to find something about which to ask the first question, but E interrupts her and he asks the question in lines 2 and 3. After answering his question in overlap, they continue to expand the topic in the turn sequence that follows.

In the examples quoted thus far in this section, the analysis showed that one of the participants has the potential to 'control' the conversation by selecting the topic for talk. In most cases, this was achieved by choosing the picture.

Another way of controlling the conversation lies in the actual design of turns. One way of achieving this control is to preface the question with 'and'. For example, in Chapter 5, the mother of K (the younger normally hearing English-speaking boy) indicated that she was either re-establishing or maintaining the activity of talking about pictures by preface her next question turn with 'and'. Kh's father also designs his turns so that he is the one to maintain the activity. A key factor in this control appears to be the design of the third position receipting turn which follows the answer to the test question. This turn serves to end the sequence of talk and seems to be functioning as a 'select self as next speaker' strategy, effectively enabling that speaker to keep control of the interaction. The effect is, that following the third position receipting turn, the talk then has to be restarted by the asker of the initial test question. This control has the added effect of not encouraging extended turns at talk from the child.

As will be shown in section 6.2.6 which follows, when the control achieved by the typical test question sequence is relinquished, more turns at talk and more extended turns are observed. For example, in the E data, both S and E frequently use tag questions, and in so doing, warrant the resulting responses. When seen as a strategy to select the next speaker, these tag questions enable the talk to be continued (Sacks 1995a [1972]). In contrast, the three turn pattern of test question/answer/receipt which, as has been shown, can end the talk and keep the adult in control. It will also be shown that when an answer is not receipted in the third position turn, more talk ensues.
6.2.6 Examples of extended turns and extended turn sequences

In the talk between Kh and his father, there are no examples of instances where F does not depart from the typical test question strategy, nor are there instances where he fails to obtain an answer to his questions. As illustrated in fragments Kh1 and Kh2, the typical pattern of test question followed by a right answer acknowledged in the third position receipt turn does not allow extended topical sequences of turns nor does it allow for extended turns. These fragments showed, furthermore, that Kh tended to respond to test questions, but not at other transition relevance places, for example, when the test question was reformulated. This pattern was also seen in the data for W and his father. For both of these deaf boys, furthermore, it was shown that they responded with a single answer to the final reformulation of the test question.

In contrast, in the data involving E and Jo (as was also the case for J in Chapter 5) extended turn sequences are built around questions which serve as topic openers. Both the children and the adults routinely use questions to open a topic and then to talk about that topic in following turns. It would seem that in these conversations, the absence of an acknowledgement in the third position receipt turn contributes to enabling the extended topical sequence (as was discussed in section 6.2.2). It was also noted that in extended topical sequences of turns for these dyads, questions did not always receive an adjacent answer and sometimes, no answer was given at all. Furthermore, the questions were asked in such a way that they did not necessarily prefer a single adjacent right answer in response (Sacks 1995b [1972]), and hence did not function as test questions. This is illustrated in the following fragments. Fragment E2, where an answer to the question is not given, and neither is it pursued, will be discussed first.

Fragment E2a

4 S:* =What’s this
5 (2.5)
6 E: huh=
7 S: =one country to another country they go isn’t it
8 E: °yes°=
9 S: =like us/=Lon
10 E: =it goes high up in the sky isn’t it
11 S: =mmm high they (.) um go above the clouds=
12 E: =”yes”
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In line 4, S asks the initial question. After 2.5 seconds, E says ‘huh’ which could be a clarification request (line 6). S could be treating it as a clarification request by commenting about planes in line 7 ‘they go isn’t it’. By using a tag question at the end of this turn, she then makes E’s response in line 8 sequentially relevant. This enables E to give an answer to the question asked in line 4, and keeps him involved in the talk. Examination of the immediately following sequence (fragment E2b), shows how S again designs her turns as questions which then serve to continue the talk.

Fragment E2b

11 S:  high they (. ) um go above the clouds=  
12 E:  =’yes’  
13 S:  *and (. ) what do they do= ((points to picture))  
14 E:  ((points to same picture)) we have seen in television=  
15 S:  =um: how many people are there  
16 E  (hhh)  
17 S:  hundreds and hundreds isn’t it  
18 E:  (hhh) fire engine ((points to picture))  
19 S  u:::(0.9) haven’t you seen fire on television  
20 suddenly it catches fire=  
21 E:  =after that it goes under the water=  
22 S:  =hm you see there is a bonfire in the water (1.9). .

In line 13, S prefaces her question turn with ‘and’ (this could be to indicate to E that they are still doing the activity of talking about the pictures). E’s reply in line 14 is acknowledged by S in line 15. She then continues without a pause in this turn to ask another question “how many people are there”. E does not respond immediately, and S then gives a candidate answer in line 17 “hundreds and hundreds isn’t it” ending this turn with a tag question. E does not respond directly to the tag question, but in line 18, he points out the fire engine in the picture. S displays orientation to ‘fire’ as the topic that E has introduced and she elaborates on it. Again, she uses a question form (line 19), to make sequentially relevant a next turn by E on the ‘fire’ topic. In the next two turns, E and S respectively pursue the topic further using extended turns at talk. S ends the talk about the topic with a 1.9 second pause in line 22.

In the sequence of turns in fragment E2, E and S have talked about the topic of aeroplanes without either of them having obviously provided a ‘right’ answer to the question in line 4. This seems quite natural, since they are both looking at the picture of the airline, and they have both mentioned the word in previous turns (lines 2 and 3). The absence of the typical test question sequence in these fragments contributes to the impression that S is not
‘controlling’ the conversation in the way that Kh’s father did. As was shown in the example of E2a and E2b, S uses the question form to facilitate a collaborative elaboration of the topic.

The next fragment, Jo3, from the talk between Jo and his sister, also illustrates this point. Here a collaborative sequence is built around an initial question. Some way into the talk, L asks what could be a ‘test’ question (lines 7 and 9). The remainder of the talk can then be seen as a collaborative effort by both L and Jo to achieve the right answer to that question. It is interesting to note how Jo finds and uses an additional picture (lines 15/16) to contribute to the final answer.

Fragment Jo 3
1 L: That’s it (.)* what about this air plane Josh
2 have you
3 Jo: That will come (.) that’s an older one
4 L: *where’ve you seen have you
5 been in one it’s an older one
6 Jo: Oldest
7 L: What kind of airline did we get on= ((turns page))
8 Jo: We got on
9 L: =to come to London
10 Jo: Kuwait airways
11 L: Is that an old airl no
12 Jo: ^no it’s a new one
13 L: ^It’s a new one
14 Jo: Look at that one (0.7) we’ve seen those ones
15 (1.8) ((turns the page)) * the these these (.) are the
16 kind (.)that’s the one (.) look= ((he shows L a
picture of a plane which illustrates his point))
17 L: =that kind of airline
18 Jo: Yeah
19 L: But not on Concorde we didn’t get on Concorde
20 Jo: no Concorde’s are too fast ((turns the page))

In line 1 L initiates the talk about the planes by asking a question which she starts to reformulate in line 2, but Jo interrupts her, overlapping her incomplete reformulation with his answer in line 3. She overlaps this in line 4, continuing with her reformulation, but also responding to his answer with a clarification request in line 5. He provides the clarification in line 6, this answer is referring to the question in line 1. In line 7 L starts to reformulate the question first started in line 2: “what kind of airline did we get on to come to London”. Jo overlaps this with his answer, which does not get a receipt from S, but in line 11 she asks a further potential test question which continues the topic of this particular plane. He answers (line 12), and she receipts his answer (line 13). In line 14, Jo, who has turned to a different picture, continues to talk about the topic of
the plane on which they came to London (lines 14 -16). Jo shows L the additional picture of a plane just like the one in which they had travelled. In the remainder of the talk, Jo and L mutually agree about the plane: it looked like the plane shown in the picture, and it was not Concorde.

It has been shown that extended topical sequences of talk, and extended turns at talk are seen when the typical test question sequence is not followed repeatedly, for example, when the acknowledgement is not given or when the answer is not given adjacently or is not given at all. In fragment Kh3 it was shown that an extended sequence of turns results from the pursuit of a right answer to a test question, when the answer is not given adjacently. Fragments E1, E2, Jo1, Jo2, and Jo3 illustrate extended sequences of turns at talk which are not the sequential result of pursuing a single right answer, although test questions are avoided within the progression.

Furthermore, these extended topical sequences of turns in which a stepwise progression of topics is made, with one or both participants designing their turns as next relevant question and response respectively, often start with an initial question so designed that it opens the topic.

6.3 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

In the interaction between Kh and his father, the analysis points to the conclusion that when the adult initiates talk with a question which is later shown to be a test question, this does not serves as a topic opener. When the test question is followed by a ‘right’ answer and then by a receipt, the talk not extended. Extended turns in response to a question are also not seen, the test questions ‘prefer’ a response only one answer long. The three turn pattern: test question-‘right’ answer-receipt, serves, furthermore, to allow the adult to control the talk. When the receipt turn also includes praise, this increases the adult’s control, in that such a turn serves to select the adult as next speaker. This finding is similar to that noted for W and K in Chapter 5. That the deaf boys’ talk in interaction in this respect should be similar is in keeping with the findings of other researchers, notably Wood and his colleagues. It was noted by these researchers, as it was here, that the talk involving deaf children is rather more like talk

---

involving younger normally hearing children, and is less like talk involving normally hearing children the same age as the deaf children.

The typical test question sequence was less evident in the data for the two normally hearing children discussed in this chapter. Here both extended turns and extended topical sequences of turns were noted. More talk was also found in those sequences in which the adult did not make a third turn receipt of the child’s response to a question turn. As was the case for J, the talk between E and his sister and Jo and his sister was collaborative: both participants initiated sequences and designed their first turns in a variety of ways.

The following points of interest will be more fully discussed in Chapter 8. Jo and E are talking to their sisters. Whilst Jo’s sister is older (22 years) than E's sister who is 15, it could be that the collaborative nature of their talk has to do with being a sibling and not a parent. It is obvious that more needs to be found out about how Sylheti-speaking families living in London regard the role of all family members in their children's language development. Gregory (1996b) has addressed this issue with regard to the role played by older siblings in the literacy development of children of Bangladeshi origin. She shows how older siblings support their younger sisters/brothers in reading practice at home, and when they do this, they provide feedback which is finely tuned to the younger child’s reading ability. One can speculate that since E’s sister is only 15, her talk with him may be different to the way in which either of their parents would talk to E. However, as their mother indicated in the interview following the data collection session, the sister is considered to be one of E’s chief carers. It is also in the realm of speculation how much the talk in interaction is affected by the relative proficiency in English of the participants. In this regard, the data from Kh indicates that in spite of the fact that neither Kh nor his father speak standard English, their talk is actually very similar to the talk in the English-speaking dyads of K and W. That proficiency may not be a determining factor is also evidenced by the similarities in the structure of talk between E and his sister and Jo and his sister. Jo and his sister both speak a relatively standard form of English, and do not mix Sylheti and English when they talk to each other. E and his sister speak a fluent mixture of the two languages.
In spite of the languages spoken in each interaction, there are demonstrable similarities in the talk involving these two normally hearing boys, which was also similar to the talk of the English-speaking dyad involving the normally hearing boy J.

The fact that the participants in all the dyads presented thus far are talking the same language appears to go some way to account for the similarities between them. In the next chapter the analysis of the two dyads in which the participants speak a different language will be presented. Here the adults speak Sylheti and the children speak English, and in both interactions the adult is the mother, and the child is her deaf son. As will be shown in the following chapter, some notable differences are demonstrated in their talk.
CHAPTER 7

ANALYSIS OF TALK IN THE SYLHETI-SPEAKING DYADS WHERE DIFFERENT LANGUAGES ARE SPOKEN BY THE PARTICIPANTS.

7.1 INTRODUCTION

The talk between the participants in these two dyads, namely the deaf boys Kh and A and their respective Sylheti-speaking mothers, warrants separate discussion because, unlike the talk analysed in Chapters 5 and 6, the participants here do not speak the same language in the interaction. In both dyads, the mothers speak Sylheti, and the boys speak English, as is their habitual pattern of language use.

The analysis below sets out to examine the ways in which the talk in these two dyads may be similar to each other, and also, to examine the ways in which this talk may resemble or differ from that observed in the other dyads analysed thus far, particularly that involving Kh and his father\(^1\), and the deaf boy W and his father. Would the talk be structurally similar to talk in the other dyads in terms of, for example, where and how the acknowledgement to an answer was made, and how that acknowledgement was designed?

As will be seen, the talk in the two dyads analysed below is, in the first place, similar to that of other dyads in the study insofar as it is characterised by question-answer sequences, as was the talk in the dyads discussed previously. One's initial impression of the data is that Kh and his mother, and A and his mother are not 'engaged' in their talk. They are involved with the activity, but their talk seems 'parallel' rather than interactive. The analyses which follow seek to investigate the likelihood that although the normative structure\(^2\) of question-answer adjacency pairs is oriented to by the participants in the local management of turn-taking, there is evidence that the talk may not be interactionally managed. The theoretical approach underlying this notion was outlined earlier (see Chapter 4, section 4.3.4). In summary, this relates to the idea that

\(^{1}\) Interactions between Kh and his mother will henceforth be designated as Kh[M] to differentiate them from interactions between Kh and his father, which will be designated as Kh[F] in this Chapter.

\(^{2}\) This topic was discussed previously in Chapter 4 section 4.3.4. See also Heritage 1984; Sacks Shegloff and Jefferson 1974; Schegloff 1992.
interactional talk is organised by actions (turns at talk) on a turn-by-turn basis in which displays of intersubjective understanding are continuously updated as was seen in Chapter 6, in fragments Kh4 and E3. The analyses set out below explore the possibility that there are turns in this data in which displays of understanding are warranted but are not in evidence.

In addition to what appear to be problems with intersubjectivity, it will be seen that there are turns which appear not to display the principle of recipient design (see Chapter 4 section 4.3.4).

The presentation of the analyses of talk in this Chapter will follow the pattern of presentations used in Chapters 5 and 6, starting with the occurrence of typical 'test' question sequences as were found in previous data. This will be followed by an investigation of sequences which start with a question but which display a particular sequential structure, rendering the application of the term 'test' question inappropriate. Sequences in which an answer is pursued and those in which extended turns are found will be detailed. The issue of how the participants attempt to ensure mutual understanding will be addressed.

7.1.1 Participants

Details of the dyads in this analysis are summarised in Table XII:

Table XII: Details of dyads speaking different languages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child's name</th>
<th>Child's age</th>
<th>First language</th>
<th>Hearing status</th>
<th>Adult</th>
<th>First language</th>
<th>Language usually spoken by child and adult</th>
<th>Language spoken in current sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kh</td>
<td>6.10 yrs</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Deaf</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Sylheti</td>
<td>M-&gt; Sylheti Kh-&gt;English</td>
<td>M-&gt; Sylheti Kh-&gt;English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>6.9 yrs</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Deaf</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Sylheti</td>
<td>M-&gt; Sylheti A-&gt;English</td>
<td>M-&gt; Sylheti A-&gt;English</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.1.2 Transcription notation

In the fragments quoted below, the talk in Sylheti is translated into English, and is written in *italics* as it was in Chapter 6. Family names in Sylheti are written in **bold** and have not been translated (see Chapter 4 section 4.2.4). The meaning of these words are given in footnotes. Further details of transcription notation are given in Appendix 4. Each fragment quoted or referred to in the text can also be found separately in Appendix 5.

7.1.3 Data collection and selection

As was the case for the recording sessions for Kh and E reported in Chapter 6, the interpreter Mrs H was present in the sessions for Kh and A which are presented below. Kh’s mother chose to look at one of the picture books¹, the book of rhymes, with Kh during the activity. A’s mother used photos. It is the talk during these activities which is analysed.

7.2 Analysis

7.2.1 Examples of typical (test) question-answer-receipt sequences in which the right answer is given

The typical three part (test) question sequence structure (as was shown in fragments K1, W1 and Kh1) was not found in the talk between A and his mother, and only a few examples were observed in the data for Kh and his mother, one of which is given in fragment KhM1.

Fragment KhM1.

1  M: * Alright who's that then ((points to a picture))
2  Kh: The baby
3  M: Mm (1.8) * and who’s that ((points to a different picture))
4  Kh: ( a bird) (1.3)
5  M: Alright
6  M: ((much interruption from Father and cousin))

---

M asks the first question in line 1, Kh answers in line 2 and M receipts his answer in line 3. There is no pause between the answer and the receipt, and examination of the prosody of the answer and the receipt, as shown in fragment KhM1a, shows that M has matched her receipt to Kh's answer, indicating that she acknowledges it as having been an adequate, 'right' answer.

Fragment KhM1a

2 Kh: The baby

3 M: m m (1.8) * and who's that

That M's affirmative receipt in line 3 has served to self select her as next speaker is evidenced in that she asks her next question in line 3. By waiting for 1.8 seconds (line 3), M could have been providing Kh with an opportunity to take a turn. However, he does not do so, and after 1.8 seconds, M takes her turn, prefacing her question with 'and', thus indicating that she is continuing with the activity of talking about the pictures, and demonstrating also that she is in control of the talk.

It is notable that what has come to be considered the 'typical' three part sequence such as that in KhM1 above (and in other fragments quoted in Chapters 5 and 6) is only observed occasionally in the talk between Kh and his mother. In the data from A and his mother it was not observed at all.

In the next section, fragments from both these sets of data will be quoted to show how question-answer sequences do proceed in the talk between the participants.

7.2.2 Sequences which display a three part sequential structure but which do not appear to be interactionally managed.

It was noted in the W and Kh[F] analyses, that the design of the third position receipting turn was such that the fathers always acknowledged and displayed their understanding of the boys' priors very clearly. They did this, for instance, by incorporating in that turn, a repetition or a partial repetition of the prior, or by indicating
affirmation or disagreement with the prior in the choice of a suitable word (such as ‘yes’ or ‘no’), and/or by matching the pitch contour of the acknowledgement with that of the prior. In this way, the fathers and Kh and W, were characteristically shown to overtly confirm and reconfirm their understanding. In other words, the issue of understanding per se, was “topicalised” in their talk (Heritage 1984 p. 259). Fragments Kh4 and W2 illustrate this point. In fragment Kh4, in each of F’s turns (lines 3, 5, 7, and 9) some aspect of Kh’s priors are referred to (these words are underlined in the transcription below).

**Fragment Kh4**

2 Kh: sister  
3 F: what’s: (. she got(1.6)  
4 Kh: a ball  
5 F: what she got a ball  
6 Kh: mum (.)  
7 F: your mum and me (1.6) I got a ball=  
8 Kh: and me (1.6) I got a ball=  
9 F: =you got a ball too(0.9) big ball  
10 Kh: yeah

In some instances, ensuring mutual understanding was extended by the fathers to incorporate a repetition (underlined) of some aspect of the prior in their next question, as was seen in lines 5, 7 and 9 of fragment Kh4 above and also in fragment W2, lines 10 and 14/15, quoted below.

**Fragment W2**

5 F: Yeah but what was the name of the country  
6 (2.9)  
7 W: ((shrugs))  
8 F: ((looks at him quizzically))  
9 W: Austria  
10 F: Austria (. and how did we go to Austria (1.1)  
11 How did we get there did we fly in an aeroplane  
12 W: No (.8) we went in a car and then in a boat and  
13 then in a car  
14 F: In the car to the boat (.5) then in the boat  
15 that's right we did (.8) What did we do on the boat

It was suggested that by designing the third turns in this way, the fathers were, by and large, ensuring the intersubjectivity of their talk and they were also orienting their talk to the particularity of their deaf sons’ perceived abilities in spoken language. In effect, the fathers were shown to demonstrate the principle of recipient design (Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson 1974). It was also noted that whilst the fathers achieved this
intersubjectivity, they did so at the expense, so to speak, of encouraging extended
turns at talk, and in order to make such achievements, they kept fairly firm control of
the local management of the turn-taking in the talk, notably by designing the third
position receipting turn in such a way as to select themselves as next speaker.

The fragments presented below illustrate the various ways in which the trajectory of
talk in question-answer sequences in Kh[M] and A proceed and how the participants
deal with the issue of ensuring understanding. The first fragment discussed is KhM1b
(note that the first two lines of this fragment were discussed above in section 7.2.1).

Fragment KhM1b

1 M: * Alright who's that then ((points to a picture))
2 Kh: The baby
3 M: Mm (1.8) * and who's that ((points to a different
4 picture))
5 Kh: ( a bird) (1.3)
6 M: Alright
7 ((much interruption from Father and cousin))

In line 5 Kh answers M's question (line 3), and M receipts his answer in line 6. Kh's
utterance in line 5 was not fully intelligible to the transcribers, but it did not appear to be
problematic for M since she does not display it as being so, for example, she does not
make a clarification request in her next turn. Unlike her turn in line 3 (see analysis in
section 7.2.1 above), whilst M's turn in line 6 is structurally fulfilling the third position
receipting turn locus, its specific design does not display whether or not M is affirming
Kh's answer as having been a 'right' answer or a 'wrong' answer. That this is so can be
seen from the timing between the answer and the receipt, and in the lack of matching
of pitch contours, in fragment KhM1c

Fragment KhM1c

   ___ ___________
5 Kh: ( a bird) (1.3)
   ___ ___________
6 M: *ai*right
Furthermore, in line 6, M has not indicated to Kh that she has or has not understood his prior. The talk is interrupted after M's turn in line 6 and it is not possible to know whether or not Kh oriented to M's "alright" in his next turn.

The overall effect is that the talk ends rather abruptly. By using the third position receipting turn as she does, it can arguably be said that M does not provide either Kh or herself with the opportunity of ensuring mutual understanding at this point in the talk.

The impression that the opportunity for displaying and checking understanding may be absent is also evident in the talk between A and his mother. In fragment A2, M is shown to take a turn in the third position receipting turn locus, and the analysis below attempts to tease out what function that turn serves in the interaction.

Fragment A2

1 M: * Who's that ((points to a new photo))
2 A: My dad
3 M: mm ((points to another person in the photo))
4 A: he brother
5 M: mm
6 A: look ((pointing to photo and holding the book up to the camera))
7 8 M: * who's that ((points to a different photo))
9 A: look= ((he is attending to a different photo))
10 M: =mm
11 A: who he got ....

Note that M's utterances in lines 3 and 5 are not words, so there is no overt lexical component to her turn which could provide a clue about understanding. The prosodic features of M's utterances in lines 3 and 5 and those of A's utterances in lines 2 and 4 are presented in fragments A2a and A2b. Neither shows evidence of the kind of prosodic matching which has previously been taken as indicative of affirmation of the adequacy or 'rightness' of an answer.

Fragment A2a

2 A: My dad

3 M: mm
Thus it would seem that neither the prosody nor the utterance itself appears to explicitly indicate understanding, in contrast to the talk involving W and Kh, where there was always some lexical or prosodic reference (or both) to the prior.

What then is happening in this sequence? One suggestion is that M is attuned to the normative requirement for her to take a turn after A has answered her question. She fills the third position receipting turn. In this way, she displays that she is orienting to the three-part structure of the question-answer sequence. The talk is locally managed. However, in the design of her turns, she does not overtly indicate to A whether or not his answer was adequate, or 'right' or 'wrong', or that she has even understood it. The talk is not extended, neither is a topic opened. However, she does achieve the structural completion of a normative trajectory of turns. In so doing, incidentally, she also keeps control of the talk, and maintains the activity.

These "mm's" are unlike the "mm hm" in story progression (Sacks 1995c [1968] and the "uhu"'s and other 'continuers' which are described by Schegloff (1982) as tokens presented to the speaker by the listener to acknowledge that an extended turn is underway, that a point has been reached where he (the listener) may take a turn, but that he is withholding that turn. Such "mm's" usually occur in the middle of an extended turn. In those instances, the listener is, effectively, saying 'go on' to the speaker (Sacks 1995d [1971]). There is an example of "mm" used as a continuer in the talk between Kh and his mother as will be discussed in section 7.2.5 below. However, the "mm's" used by A's mother occur in the third turn place, not in the middle of an extended turn.

A further issue has to be raised in accounting for the sequence of turns in fragment A2. This relates to the notion (discussed earlier in Chapter 4) that the structural framework of talk can allow for the continuous updating of intersubjective understandings either
with or without “topicalising” the issue of understanding per se (Heritage 1984)*. In other words, participants do not have to overtly confirm and reconfirm their understanding to each other, their understanding can be conveyed by other means, as will be shown in fragment Jo2 below. Is this what may be happening in the talk between A and his mother in fragment A2?

The contention is that it is not the case, and in order to show evidence for this contention, it is germane at this point to refer back to the talk involving the normally hearing boys J, Jo and E. In the fragments of their talk analysed in Chapters 5 and 6, there were several sequences in which the absence of an acknowledgement and/or overt understanding check in the third turn was observed. But here this usually led to an extended turn sequence, as was seen particularly in fragments Jo2 and El. A brief re-examination of Jo2 will serve to illustrate how, whilst not overtly topicalising their understanding, the participants nevertheless implicitly display intersubjectivity to each other, and an extended sequence of turns is observed.

Fragment Jo 2

1  L: * What’s this
2  Jo: This is (.) kind of starry air um (.) air line
3    look
4    (1.5)
5  L: Where is it
6  Jo: Goes to into the a
7  L: (whats this) what is it
8  Jo: (rainbow)
9  L: Where are they
10 Jo: In the airport
11 L: and that is
12 Jo: That’s in (. ) near where it comes from (. ) near
13 (.) the: helicopter
14 L: Uh ( (turns the page))

Having asked the first question in line 1, L then asks a series of questions in lines 5, 7, 9 and 11, each of which Jo answers. None of the questions contains an overt display of understanding (or misunderstanding) of the prior given answer. L’s questions are topically related to one another (unlike A’s) and thus implicitly demonstrate comprehension of Jo’s answers. That this is the case is evidenced in the design of Jo’s turn following the question. In each case, this is an answer which in turn reflects his

---

* Instances of topicalising the issue of understanding per se were shown in Chapter 6, section 6.2.4, in fragments Kh4 and W4c.
own understanding of the question. The next turn by L is another question which implies that the prior answer was understood, and so forth. The result is an extended sequence of turns at talk about a topic, started by L’s original question, and some of those turns are extended, as seen in Jo’s answer in lines 12/13.

This example demonstrates how, when there is not an overt display of understanding in the third turn place, an implicit display of understanding (in this instance by the asking of a next question) by the questioner implements a ‘normative’ forward trajectory (Heritage 1984) for that sequence. This is because in the next turn the answerer displays their own understanding. In so doing, the mutual understandings in the sequence are continuously displayed. The sequence in Jo2 was shown also to be extended, the original question opened a topic, and some of the turns in the sequence were elaborated.

Let us now return to the examination of fragment A2:

Fragment A2

1 M: * Who’s that ((points to a new photo))
2 A: My dad
3 M: mm ((points to another person in the photo))
4 A: he brother
5 M: mm
6 A: look ((pointing to photo and holding the book up to the camera))
7
8 M: * who’s that ((points to a different photo))
9 A: look= ((he is attending to a different photo))
10 M: =mm
11 A: who he got ....

In attempting to account for M’s design of the third position receipting turn, as in line 3, if she is not using that turn to overtly address the issue of intersubjectivity, perhaps she too is implicitly indicating that indeed she has understood and is implementing a normative trajectory in a similar way to that illustrated in Jo2. That this is not the case is evidenced firstly by the lack of prosodic matching between her turn and A’s, as was shown in fragment A2a (above) Secondly, further evidence is to be found in the turns following M’s third position receipts, in lines 6, 9 and 11. In line 6, A shows that he is no longer focused on his talk with M. He addresses the camera and tries to engage the attention of others in the room by holding up the picture. M then asks a question about another photo (line 8). A’s answer in line 9 shows that he has not attended to that
question - he is looking at another photo altogether. In her next turn, M says “mm” again (line 10), and again, this utterance bears no prosodic similarity to A’s prior:

**Fragment A2c**

9 A: look = (he is attending to a different photo)

10 M: =mm

In line 11, A then starts another sequence by asking a question about a new picture.

In concluding this section, a few general comments can be made. In fragment A2, there is no evidence of M’s questions serving as topic openers. There is no extended sequence of turns, and there are no extended turns. There is, however, a three-part structure (question, answer, third turn), leading to the impression that the talk is locally managed in terms of turn-taking, but it is not clear that intersubjectivity is achieved or that the talk is interactionally managed.

A characteristic feature of sequences illustrated by Kh[M]1 and A2 is that having asked the question, the questioner (the mother) is shown not to use the third position receipting turn to acknowledge the answer that was given in the second turn. The absence of this receipt that makes the use of the term ‘test’ question inappropriate in the discussions that follow in this section, since ‘test’ question has been used hitherto with reference to a particular three part question-answer-receipt sequence, in which the design of the receipt defines the question as having been a test question.

A’s mother’s use of the third position turn does not provide either herself or A with the opportunity for checking understanding. The third position receipting turn is also not used as a locus for making an overt check of understanding. In this way, the talk is very different from that involving the other deaf boys Kh and W, whose fathers did not allow any possible utterance to pass without overtly checking for mutual understanding.
As can be seen in the fragments quoted above, the talk between Kh and A and their mothers is not any less 'controlled' than was the talk involving W and Kh[F]. It will be shown that it is also the way in which the questioners (Kh, A or their respective mothers) use the third position receipt turn that allows them to keep control.

With respect to the ensuring of mutual understanding, it appears that the talk between the deaf boys Kh and A and their mothers differs substantially from the talk between Kh and W and their fathers.

7.2.3 Reformulated questions and the pursuit of an answer

Another way in which the fathers of Kh and W and the mother of K were shown to display understanding was in the way questions which did not get the right answer were reformulated until that answer was given. This displayed the principle of recipient design. In contrast, there were no examples in the talk involving the mothers of Kh and A of a 'wrong' answer being given, and a 'right' answer then being pursued. In the talk between W and his father, K and his mother and Kh and his father, there was a characteristic pursuit of the 'right' answer to a question by successive reformulations of the question. This too was not observed in the data for either A or Kh. In the A data, for example, as shown in fragment A8a, when A does not receive an answer to his question (line 4) in Sylheti, he asks the question again, later, in English (line 8). When M does not receive an answer to her question in line 5 she does ask another question (line 7) but this is not a reformulation, and she also does not receive a reply.

Fragment A8a

4 A: ((turns over page; points to a photo)) * Who’s that
5 M: mm Is that mummy ((pointing to the same photo))
6 (3.4)
7 M: Is that baby (1.7) (unintelligible)=
8 A: =What that ((points to the same photo again))
9 M: hm
10 (3.2)
11 ((M points to a different photo on same page))

Dealing firstly with A's question in this fragment: A asks his question in line 4, in Sylheti and not in English. This is one of the two times in the talk that A uses Sylheti. In line 5, M responds by saying "mm" but she does not give an answer. In line 8, A asks his question again, this time in English. M again does not give an answer, but responds
with “mm”. By not responding to this after the 3.2. second pause (line 10), A appears to ‘give up’ his line of questioning.

With regard to M’s questions, instead of answering A’s question in line 5, she asks her own question, (which is designed to prefer a yes/no answer). She does not get an answer after 3.4 seconds, and so goes on to ask another yes/no question (line 7) about someone else in the photo. A in turn does not answer after 1.7 seconds, and M then says something which was not intelligible to the transcribers or translators. A follows this turn immediately with what has been suggested to be a reformulation (line 8) of his original question in line 4 “what that” (in English) pointing to the same photo as in line 4. M still does not answer the question. In her turn she says “mm” again (line 9) but she does not ask another question in that turn. This could be the subtle way in which she responds differently to A’s question in Sylheti as opposed to his English question. However, A does not respond after 3.2 seconds, and M then attends to a different photo. She too, appears to ‘give up’.

In this fragment, both A and M seem to be pursuing a response to their questions, but neither insist on getting that response in the way that the adults did when talking to W, Kh[with father] and K. The talk ends with this matter unresolved.

7.2.4 Keeping control of the talk

As has been implied in the discussion thus far, the three part structure of the talk in these dyads displays the local managment of the talk. It is in this local management of the talk that the participants’ control is shown. Control of the talk is taken by both the children and the adults, and is displayed in the fact that both parties ask questions, and also by the observation that both parties take charge of the activity (as was previously discussed in section 6.2.5) by turning the page or by pointing to another picture. A further examination of Fragment A8 (quoted in full here) illustrates this feature of the talk, and moreover provides an additional insight into the reformulated questions discussed above.
Examining lines 1 to 4 in the first instance shows that although M has given A 1.5 seconds to respond to her question in line 1, he has not taken a turn, and she gives the answer herself in line 2. After the 2 second pause (line 3) during which M does not self-select as next speaker, A takes control of the talk in line 4 by turning the page and asking his own question, in Sylheti.

In line 5, M’s “mm" provides a structural receipt for A’s turn, but its precise function is difficult to determine. It is prosodically different from A’s prior, and it does not appear to be an answer to his question, especially as M immediately continues this turn in line 5 by asking a yes/no question thus making a single answer from A relevant. She has now taken back control of the talk.

Dadi means paternal grandmother.

Affa means sister or girl cousin.
She does not self select in the 3.4 second pause (line 6), indicating that she expects A to answer, but when he does not, she asks another yes/no question (line 7). Again, A does not answer her question, but asks another question (line 8), in English. Since he is pointing to the same photo as in lines 4 and 5, his question in line 8 could be a reformulation of his original (line 4), the reformulation being a switch from Sylheti to English. However, M does not answer the question. She receipts his turn in line 9, saying "mm". As was the case in line 5, this "mm" could be serving as an acknowledgement that he has asked a question, but the prosody of the adjacent utterances is not matched in any sense. A does not take a turn after 3.2 seconds.

M then points to a different picture, and, taking control, asks a question which she designs to prefer a yes or no response, “is that affa” (line 9/10). After 2.8 seconds, during which time M does not self select, A then asks his own question (line 12) about the same person. It is interesting to note that he asks this question in Sylheti. This could be a request for clarification of M’s prior question in line 9/10. However, M’s response (line 13), which is to give the answer, indicates that she is treating A’s question in line 12 as though it was his own question and not a repeat of hers. When A does not acknowledge her response after 3.4 seconds, M seems to do so herself, saying “mm”. In his next turn, A then acknowledges her answer, by repeating the word affa. That this is an acknowledgement is evidenced in the prosody of these adjacent lines, as shown in fragment A8a:

Fragment A8a

13 M: affa ((keeps pointing to the photo)) (3.4) mm
14 ((sound of baby breathing))

15 A: affa ((turns attention to another photo on same page)) LOOK MY DAD

There are a number of noteworthy issues illustrated by fragment A8. The control of the conversation shifts from one participant to the other. This was shown in lines 9 to 15. A did not answer M’s question in line 9, but then asked effectively that same question himself in line 12, starting a three part sequence which ends with his
acknowledgement of M's answer as being 'right', and allowing him to self select as next speaker, and thus to control the talk.

In this fragment, A switches between English and Sylheti - most of his talk in the recording session as a whole is in English. In fragment A8, A is observed to use a Sylheti phrase on two consecutive occasions (lines 4 and 12). In both instances, it appears that he switches when he is taking control of the talk, after he has not answered a question from M. This point will be discussed again later.

It is also notable that although M has designed her questions in lines 5, 7, and 9/10 as yes/no questions, these do not elicit an answer from A. In designing the question thus, she could be showing a sensitivity to A's perceived ability to understand and answer the question. She has made it conditionally relevant for A to answer, and also made it possible for him to design his response as a simple single answer. His response is another question - he does not provide the expected second pair part to these questions.

Accounting for this is tricky. A's questions do not overtly indicate whether or not he had understood M's prior questions. M's next turn then equally does not overtly display her understanding of his prior. A possible account for these observations could be in the issue of control: A appears to be controlling the talk, and even when presented with yes/no question/answer adjacency pairs, he does not relinquish control by answering the question. M too appears to try to control the talk, by asking questions and by not answering A's questions. It is only at the end of the sequence (see fragment A8a) that M seems to concede, when A asks his question in line 12, to which M gives her answer (line 13) and A acknowledges it in line 14.

In the data fragments presented in this section, the impression is that taking control of the talk is locally managed by both participants. This is different from the observation of the deaf boys W and Kh[F] where the adult was shown to keep control of the whole interaction.
7.2.5 Possible misunderstandings

It would seem that one of the consequences of the structure of the talk involving A and Kh[M] described thus far is that because understandings are not displayed, what may be termed ‘possible misunderstandings’ or ‘troubles’, in the talk may not be attended to. In the talk between the deaf boys W and Kh and their fathers, all misunderstandings and troubles in the talk were acknowledged (e.g. by asking for clarification) and where possible, these were overtly resolved (as evidenced by the design of turns in fragments W2 and Kh4). This is not observed in the data involving A and Kh[M].

The reason for attending to this issue in some detail here is twofold. Firstly, as was referred to in Chapter 4 (section 4.3.5) CA research into talk where one participant is ‘less competent’ than the other shows that a prominent feature of such talk is the lengthy repair sequences which the participants embark upon to resolve misunderstandings. In order for such sequences to be undertaken, an acknowledgement of misunderstandings must be displayed and oriented to by the participants. The second reason for close attention to this issue is that the turn in which an orientation to a misunderstanding can be displayed is an important locus in the talk between a ‘natural’ and a ‘less competent’ speaker - it is here that the misunderstanding is shown to be recognised, and attempts to resolve it can be initiated. In talk between ‘more’ and ‘less’ competent speakers, the process of displaying and resolving misunderstandings provides an opportunity for language learning and teaching by the participants.

In the A data and the Kh[M] data, there are several instances in the talk where it would appear that a possible misunderstanding or trouble has arisen, but it is not overtly oriented to by either of the participants. It must be said, at this point, that these possible misunderstandings are identified as such by the analyst observing each participant’s utterances from the perspective of a fluent, competent speaker/listener. In a strictly CA sense, the application of the term possible misunderstanding to an utterance of a participant, runs the risk of imposing an interpretation on the data which may not be reflected by the participants themselves in the talk per se. Nevertheless, for the reasons outlined below, a detailed examination of instances which intuitively appeared to be ‘troublesome’ was considered appropriate.
Firstly, the dissimilarity between these deaf boys (A and Kh[M]), and the deaf boys W and Kh[F] with regard to the way in which troubles were oriented to, was striking. It seemed that investigation of this aspect may cast some light on the issue of the dyads speaking the same language or a different language in the interaction.

Secondly, the absence of acknowledgements or displays of understanding in the third position receipting turn could signal that the speaker of that turn is indicating a trouble with the prior turn. In the examples given thus far, furthermore, it is the turn which follows (that is, the fourth turn) that implies that the third turn may signify a trouble. The analysis of the Kh[M] and A data has shown that in the fourth turn, neither the child nor the adult display that that turn is topically related to the prior sequence. For example, in the fourth turn, the child may divert his attention to something else, or he may point to another picture, or the adult may ask a question about another picture, etc.

Thirdly, it is the regularity with which these instances of possible misunderstandings occur in the talk of A and Kh[M], and the curtailment of talk which accompanies them, that warrants more detailed examination.

In the first fragment (A7) discussed below, the possible misunderstanding seems to be located in A’s third position receipting turn. The structure of the talk in fragment A7 proceeds in a similar way to that described in fragment A2, insofar as the three turn sequence is in evidence. However, A’s utterance (line 3) which appears to be a possible source of misunderstanding, is not oriented to by the participants.

Fragment A7
1 A: Who that ((pointing to his sister in the photo))
2 M: Shani
3 A: h he (. ) your sister ((looks at M))
4 M: mm
5 ((A turns the page))

A asks a question (line 1), to which M gives an answer in line 2. A does not acknowledge this answer overtly, but asks another question in line 3. This could be a clarification request, evidenced by his non-fluent start, and by his looking up at M as he takes his turn, indicating that A has found some aspect of M’s answer in line 2 problematic. M gives a response in line 4, by saying “mm”. This response could indeed
be an affirmative answer to the clarification request, (such as ‘yes, that is a picture of sister Shani’), although the prosody of the consecutive turns is not similar:

Fragment A7a

3: h he (. ) your sister ( looks at M )

4 M: mm

As was the case with previous examples of talk between A and his mother, M’s response in line 4 does not indicate her understanding or lack of it. The reason M’s response here is particularly interesting is because of A’s prior. The design of A’s turn in line 3 warrants closer attention. It displays a non-standard use of the English pronominal system. A has used ‘he’ in place of ‘she’ to refer to a female, and he is using the pronoun ‘your’ instead of ‘my’ to refer to his own sister. Given the apparent violation of these linguistic conventions, this would seem to be a potential problem around which a more detailed clarification and repair sequence might ensue. However, the evidence is that this is not problematic for M whose response appears to be acceptable to A who then turns to the next picture (line 7).

From the viewpoint of a native English speaker, A’s turn in line 3 contains ‘errors’ in his use of personal pronouns in English. There are a number of ways of accounting for these errors. One account relates to A’s deafness. Deictic words such as ‘I’ and ‘you’, and ‘here’ and ‘there’, and in this instance, ‘your’ and ‘my’ and ‘he’ and ‘she’ which are given their specific meaning by their interactional context, are known to be difficult for deaf children (Brannon 1968; Wilbur, Montanelli and Quigley, 1976; McAnally, Rose and Quigley, 1987), and are particularly difficult in discourse (Wood, Wood, Griffiths and Howarth 1986 127-129). Furthermore, these words are not easily lip read, for example, ‘you’ ‘your’ ‘she’ ‘her’ all have lip rounding; ‘he’ and ‘his’ have no clear lip pattern. They are also not necessarily prosodically marked in a sentence, making them difficult to perceive auditorily.

An alternative and additional account concerns cross-linguistic issues. A’s use of ‘he’ in place of ‘she’ could be explained by the fact that the third person pronoun in Sylheti
has no gender distinction (Stokes and Duncan 1989), but instead has a three way
distinction between unmarked, near (proximate) and far (non-proximate) forms
(Jackson 1987; Ferguson 1971). Mistakes in the gender of third person pronouns are
commonly made by Asian speakers of English (Jackson 1981). This could therefore be
an instance of cross-linguistic influence (Sharwood-Smith and Kellerman 1986), where
Sylheti usage affects A's English. Such cross-linguistic influence could also affect M's
understanding of A's use of pronouns: both 'she' and 'he' would be acceptable to her.
However, it has to be remembered that A's first language is stated, by his mother and
by his teachers, to be English. He does not speak Sylheti, although he does use some
Sylheti words. Notwithstanding, his English seems to be influenced by Sylheti.

Accounting for A's use of the pronoun 'your' in line 5 is also complex. It could be a
simple mistake caused by his not recognising Shani in the photo. It could also be a
likely 'mistake' in his spoken language, in keeping with predictable errors in pronoun
usage made by deaf children: Wilbur et al (1976) showed that possessive pronouns
were the most difficult category for deaf children. It is less likely that there is a cross-
linguistic influence from Sylheti effecting A's use of second person pronouns, as these
are grammatically rather more similar to English, although there is a distinction
between ordinary and honorific second person pronouns, and the form of the second
person pronoun varies further according to the type of person being referred to, such
as younger siblings vs senior relatives (Ferguson 1971). It is not, however, a common
mistake of Asian speakers of English to use a second person pronoun in place of a
first person pronoun (personal communication, Jackson 1995).

It is not only deictic terms that appear to present difficulties. There are instances in the
A data where possible misunderstandings occurred in relation to specific semantic
categories. The vocabulary used to name family members seems to be particularly
problematic. The use of family names in Sylheti is complex. There are many terms
which define relationships and which are important in the culture. Stokes (1989) reports
that family names are widely used by Sylheti children, and in her study, many of these
words had been acquired by children as young as two years. Verma (1987) has drawn
attention to the increasing tendency of the children of South Asian families to use
English kinship terms, rather than attempt mastery of the complex lexical field of
kinship vocabulary in their family language. That a deaf child will have some trouble
using this family naming system is not surprising.
In the following fragment, A13, an illustration is given of how A's possible misunderstandings about Sylheti words used to name the relationship between people combine with his non standard use of English pronouns to create a unique sequence of talk.

Lines 1-15 of this fragment show how A and his mother describe a photo in a sequence that appears to the analyst to display instances of possible misunderstandings. Accounting for this sequence necessitates incorporating some of the fine-grained turn by turn analysis into the discussion which follows.

Fragment A13

1 A: * who that ((points to a woman in the photo))  
2 M: mm (.) affa

3 A: * him ? ((points to a second woman in the photo))  
4 M: kalama *=

5 A: =he brother your brother ?= ((points to a man in  
6 the photo))  
7 M: =Who's that who's that ((she points to a third woman))  
8 A: your mum  
9 M: (ne)= ((shakes her head))  
10 A: =that your brother ? ((looks at mother; points back to  
11 the man))  
12 M: mm ((nods her head)) sister  
13 A: ((looks at camera, shows photo)) it she sister ((points  
14 to mother))  
15 M: mm (.) sister ((nods her head))  
16 (2.2) ((M turns the page))  
17 M: Mama 9 ((M points to a man in a new photo. Other family  
18 members including his mother are also pictured.))  
19 A: (A looks down at the same picture) mama (.) my (.) mama  
20 ((A points to the same photo))  
21 M: mm  
22 A: that my (.) THAT my mum ((looks up at camera; holds  
23 the same photo up to the camera; points towards  
the photo))  
24 M: mm  
25 (2.3)

In line 1, A asks a question which M answers in line 2. A does not acknowledge her answer, but takes the next turn to ask another question (line 3) which M answers in line

---

7 Affa means sister or girl cousin.  
8 Kalama means maternal aunt.  
9 Mama means maternal uncle.
4. Although A has said "him" when pointing to the second woman in the photo, M has given an answer appropriate to the gesture, by giving the family name of the woman, and A’s use of 'him' (a masculine third person pronoun) instead of 'she' (a feminine pronoun) is shown not to be problematic. Again, A does not acknowledge M’s answer, but in his next turn asks another question (line 5). M does not give an answer to this question, instead she asks her own question (line 7) about a third woman in the photo. A answers this in line 8, “your mum” and in line 9 M says “(ne)” and shakes her head, indicating that A’s answer was ‘wrong’. Her utterance was not entirely clear to the translators, but taken together with the headshake which in Sylheti has a negative meaning, as it does in English, it was interpreted as ‘no’. However, M does not pursue a ‘right’ answer, and M’s negative is not shown by A to be a problem, as he uses his next turn (line 10), to ask another question.

Lines 7, 8 and 9 could be seen as an insertion sequence, since in line 10, A returns to his question about the brother. The return to topic after this insertion sequence gives a topical cohesion which was lacking in some fragments analysed earlier (see fragment A8). By asking a question in line 7 (instead of giving a response to A’s question about the brother) M could be trying to re-establish her control of the talk.

Continuing the analysis, in line 10, A reformulates the question he first asked in line 5, “that your brother”. M responds to this in line 12, saying “mm”, nodding her head, and then saying “sister”, in English. Closer examination of lines 10 and 12 in fragment A13a shows that the pitch contour of A’s “...brother” and M’s “mm” are not similar.

Fragment A13a

10 A: =that your brother ? ((looks at mother; points back to
11 the man))

12 M: mm ((nods her head)) sister

However, M’s nod which accompanies her utterance indicates that she is indeed affirming that A’s assessment of the picture as being a photo of her brother was right. Her saying “sister” in English, however, is puzzling. It could be that M has not
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understood A's realisation of the word 'brother' [bʊədə] in lines 5 and 10, and her acknowledgement in line 12 is simply affirmative in order to keep the talk going. Her addition of the word 'sister' in English, however, may indicate that she is actually correcting A's prior (there is a sister depicted in the photo, as was said in line 2). She could be using the English word here to emphasise that she is referring to the sister and not to the brother. It could also be that having affirmed that the men in the photo are brothers, by saying "mm" and nodding her head in line 12, M then says 'sister' in that same turn, to correct A's answer of the question (line 7) in the insertion sequence, which she had previously receipted as being wrong: the photo was not of her mum, but her sister. Alternatively, saying 'sister' could mean that M is acknowledging that she is the sister of the 'brother' referred to by A.

Concluding this sequence, in his next turn, A addresses the camera, saying "it she sister" (line 13/14) and showing the photo. In her acknowledgement in line 15, M says "mm" and repeats the word "sister", again in English. The prosody of M's "mm" and "sister" here, coupled with her nod, indicates that this turn is serving as an affirmative acknowledgment of A's prior, as shown in fragment A13b.

Fragment A13b

13 A: ((looks at camera, shows photo)) it she sister ((points to mother))

15 M: mm (.) sister ((nods her head))

Using the English word 'sister' in lines 12 and 15 is one of the few times M uses an English word in the talk. Her use of the English here could indicate that she acknowledges that there is a possible trouble which has to be addressed, perhaps relating to the two Sylheti words affa and kala ma which describe women, and which A did not overtly acknowledge. On the other hand, by turning to show the picture to the camera, and saying "it she sister" A could be indicating that he has understood M's prior turns. It would appear however, that although in this instance, A and M reach agreement about the photo, neither has displayed the kind of recipient design of their turns that was seen in the previous talk between the deaf boys and the fathers.
Continuing with fragment A13c, this point is illustrated again.

Fragment A13c

16   (2.2) ((M turns the page))
17 M: Mama⁴⁰  ((M points to a man in a new photo. Other family members
18   including his mother are also pictured.))
19 A: (A looks down at the same picture) mama (. . ) my (. . ) mama
20   ((A points to the same photo))
21 M: mm
22 A: that my (. . ) THAT my mum ((looks up at camera; holds
23   the same photo up to the camera; points towards the
24   photo))
25 M: mm

In line 17, M draws A's attention to a picture of the maternal uncle. In reply, A looks down at the photo and acknowledges M's comment by repeating the word "mama" (line 19), and pointing to the photo. In line 21 M says "mm" in response. However, in line 22, A then holds the photo up and tells the camera that it is of his mother, using the English word "mum". M's next turn, in line 24, is to say "mm" again. A closer look at the prosody of lines 19 and 21, and lines 22 and 24 do not show similarities in the pitch contours:

⁴⁰ Mama means maternal uncle.
Fragment A13d

19 A: (A looks down at the same picture) *mama* (.) *my* (.) *mama*

20 ((A points to the same photo))

21 M: *mm*

22 A: that *my* (.) *THAT* *my* *mum* ((looks up at camera; holds
23 the same photo up to the camera; points towards the
24 photo))

24 M: *mm*

It could be that in line 19 A is referring to another person in the photo, and that he is changing the topic from that of the prior turn in which M pointed out the uncle. It could also be, however, that in line 19 he was not attending to the man in the photo, and was using the word 'mama' in the English sense to refer to his mother. He may have misunderstood M's initial comment about the uncle, and understood it to be about herself. M's response (line 21), does not indicate how she may be understanding A's prior. When he involves the camera in the interaction in line 22, he uses the English word 'mum' to refer to the photo. In line 24, M then gives a response which also does not overtly display her understanding. The crucial point here is that M's acknowledgements of A's turns are all similar, no matter what A's prior was. She says "mm". In doing so, it can be said that she is completing the structural pattern of making a response to A's turn and in so doing, she does maintain the activity of talking about the pictures. However, these responses of M's are accompanied by a curtailment of the talk, and extended turns are not in evidence. The topic is not explored further.

Sequences similar to A7 and A13 are also found in the talk between Kh and his mother. It would seem that possible misunderstandings are not oriented to, and the principle of recipient design is not displayed. Kh's mother, like A's mother, designs many of her acknowledgement or receipt turns as a single utterance like "mm". This could simply be the mother's style, quite appropriate for the activity of talking about...
pictures, in that an utterance like “mm” serves to complete the sequence of turns following a question. However, in several instances, Kh's mother's receipts do not make it clear whether or not she understood the answer, which itself appears to contain possible 'errors' to which M does not orient her talk. Once again, as with A and his mother, there is not an indication in the talk itself, that these interchanges are problematic for the participants (there are no clarification requests or repair initiations).

In fragment KhM3a, Kh starts the sequence with a comment about a picture.

Fragment KhM3a

((Kh holds the book on his lap and looks at the pictures))
1 Kh: * Big great teddy bear
2 (M looks over at book, and glances up at Kh))
3 M: Mm
4 Kh: The ambulance (1.8) the fire engine
5 (2.2) ((M takes book and turns the page))
6 M: Speak loudly (0.8) the way you said it before
7 Kh: I said=
8 M: =And what are these who’s that *((points to a picture))
9 Kh: Boat
10 M: and ?
11 Kh: And childrens (2.0)
12 * ((M points to a different picture))
13 Kh and the ( . ) girl is ((he points to same picture as M))
14 (little sister starts to cry)

From M's response (line 3) to Kh's comment in line 1, and from the responses she makes to his further comments in lines 5, 6, 8, 10 and 12, it is shown that M takes her turns, indicating locally managed turn-taking, but there is no overt display of understanding. M is not tracking Kh's priors (compare fragment Kh4 where the father was shown to track every prior utterance of his son).

The design of her turn in line 8 is particularly notable because Kh's response to it appears to warrant an understanding check from M in the following turn. Firstly, by latching this turn to Kh's prior, M has not given him a chance to fulfil the request she made in her prior (line 6), to "speak loudly the way you said it before". She also uses 'and' to preface the question, indicating that she is taking charge of the activity of talking about the pictures. Furthermore, she immediately changes the question from 'what are these' to "who's that", not allowing any time after the first question for Kh to
give an answer\(^{11}\). In line 9, Kh overlaps the second question with a possible candidate answer which could be seen as an answer to either of M's two questions. However, in her first question, M has asked, 'what are these', and Kh has given an answer in the singular: 'boat', which is not in number agreement with the question. The second question started with 'who' and would require an animate subject to be named in the answer. 'Boat' is not appropriate as an answer to this question. It is in the turn following this answer that an understanding check of some sort could be warranted. However, in this turn, M does not orient to his specific answer, but she says "and" with a rising intonation. In response, Kh continues to list items in the picture, indicating that he has taken M's "and" as indication that he can continue the list.

Given the subsequent turns (lines 10 and 11) an alternative account for Kh's turn in line 9 "boat" could be that here he was answering neither of M's questions, but continuing to name the objects in the picture, as he had started to do in line 1. He also has not displayed understandings of M's turn.

This example demonstrates how neither Kh nor his mother orient their talk to ensuring mutual understanding. It is a possibility that this feature of their talk has to do with the fact of their not speaking the same language. Examination of the talk following that quoted in fragment KhM3a may shed some light on this issue, since here (in fragment KhM3b), the talk is overtly directed to the language issue.

Fragment KhM3b

15  (3.7) ((little sister continues to cry; father picks  
16 her up and stands next to Kh, looking at the book))  
17 M: Speak in Bangla what is it called what  
18 is it called in Bangla ((she points to a new picture))  
19 F:  
20 Kh: =Bird  
21 F: BIRD  
22 S: Bird bird  
23 ((little sister cries))  
24 M: ((to father)) You said it in English (1.7)  
25 ((to K))* and these what are they in Bangla= ((points  
26 to a new picture))  
27 S: ="Balloon"\(^{12}\)

\(^{11}\) In respect of the reformulation of her question, and the timing between reformulations, this talk between Kh and his mother is similar to that between W and his father.

\(^{12}\) There is no Sylheti word for 'balloon'. The English word has been incorporated into the language.
In line 17, M asks Kh to name a picture of a bird in Sylheti. The father interrupts her turn by providing the English word for bird (line 19), and it is the father who affirms (line 21) that Kh's repetition of "bird" (line 20) is right. The sister adds in her affirmation in line 22, in Sylheti. M does not acknowledge Kh's response. She takes her next turn (line 24) to chide father for giving the word in English, and goes on to ask Kh to give the Sylheti name for another object, the balloon. Although sister says "balloon" quietly in line 27, possibly to prompt Kh, it is likely that Kh has not heard her, (he is not looking at her) and that his answer in line 28 is not a repetition. However, he does say "balloon" in line 28. M responds to this with "mm", the prosody of which is not matched to the prior. But, father then affirms Kh's answer, as shown in fragment KhM3c

The talk appears to be fragmented, not only by the absence of understanding checks from M, but also by the demand for Kh to use Sylheti words. Fragment KhM3b is an instantiation of the different approaches to interaction demonstrated by fathers (as was seen in Chapter 6) as opposed to the mothers, in this chapter. This fragment shows up what could be different agendas in talk of Kh's mother and his father.

In fragment KhM3d (line 31), M designs her next turn as a question in which the language of the expected answer is not specified. Kh gives his answer in line 32, to
which M responds with non-verbal behaviour which appears to indicate that she does not understand. The design of M’s third turn (lines 33 and 34) alerts the analyst to the possibility that in this turn, a more overt display of understanding or lack of understanding may have been warranted.

Fragment KhM3d

31 M:  *what’s the name of this horse* (0.9)
32 Kh:  old (1.4) man
33 (3.2) ((M looks at I, then looks back down at book; then turns the page))
35 M:  *and what are they doing here*

In line 32, Kh answers M’s question (line 31) and after a long pause, M asks a further question, in line 35. During the pause, M’s non-verbal behaviour can be interpreted as being her third position receipting turn. She looks at the interpreter, looks back at the picture in the book and then turns the page, giving the impression that somehow Kh’s answer was problematic. But M does not address this possible problem in her talk. She does not use the third position receipting turn to acknowledge Kh’s answer in a manner that conveys her understanding or lack of understanding of it to Kh. Following Kh’s answer in line 32, she does not speak immediately. The pause could be indicating to Kh that she is allowing him to continue. However, her non-verbal behaviour during this pause seems to indicate that she has not understood Kh’s answer. Her verbal turn in line 35 then serves to restart the talk.

More will be said in Chapter 8 about the implications drawn from these observations of possible misunderstandings in the talk between Kh and A and their mothers. What is clear from the analyses made above, is that A and Kh[M] are similar to each other with respect to the frequent and routine occurrence of possible misunderstandings in their talk. In attempting to account for this, the analysis seems to indicate that the fact of their speaking different languages during the interaction may contribute to the findings. Indeed, the very fact that such misunderstandings are not a feature of the talk involving W and Kh[F] and that they speak the same language during the interaction could go some way to accounting for the observations made above.
7.2.6 Extended turns and extended sequences of turns

As was mentioned in the introduction to this Chapter, there were a few instances of talk in which extended turns were evident. In concluding this Chapter, some of the fragments in which these occur will be described. There are similarities between these fragments, and fragments previously discussed for other dyads, for example, Jo3 and E2a and E2b, when the first turn in a sequence is not designed as a question.

In fragment KhM4a, M is shown to allow Kh to describe the picture and she encourages him, using "mm" as a continuer (line 2), to list his descriptions. (In this fragment, for the sake of continuity, the pitch contours of some utterances are given in the transcript rather than as separate fragments).

Fragment KhM4a

1  Kh: * the old lady((points to picture)

2  M: ((looks back at book)) mm
3  Kh: The children giving the m money (1.1) um (1.2)
4  This holding it
5  M: * What are these ((smiles up at sister; points to another picture))

Kh starts to describe a new picture in line 1. M acknowledges his comment in line 2. Her "mm" here has a low starting point with no pitch change, and is accompanied by her looking back down at the page. Kh then continues to talk about the picture in lines 3 and 4. However, M interrupts (line 4) to ask him a question, having chosen a new picture to talk about.

A similar sequence is found later in this sequence, in fragment KhM4b (lines 10-20) where Kh lists the objects he can see, and M allows him to, by not taking a turn at the transition relevance places indicated by the long pauses. The pitch contours of 'ducks', 'grass' and 'leaves' attest to their being a list. During the pauses, Kh looks intently at the picture, and in allowing him to do so, M seems to be displaying a sensitivity to his
actions. Having said this, however, it is interesting to note what she actually does during the pauses is to gesture vaguely, and to start to turn the page.

Fragment KhM4b

10 \((4.1)\) ((M turns the page; glances over to I; Kh looks at the picture))

\[\]

12 Kh: \textit{ducks::}

13 \((4.2)\) ((M and Kh scan the picture, M points vaguely across the page))

\[\]

15 Kh: \textit{grass}

16 \((3.7)\) ((M starts to turn the page; both are looking down at the book))

\[\]

18 Kh: \textit{leaves}

\[\]

19 M: ((M turns the page)) \textit{mm}

20 \((3.2)\) ((Kh and M scan the page))

Her "mm" in line 19, does show pitch matching with Kh's prior and appears to indicate an acknowledgement of his list, whilst not overtly displaying that she understands what he has said.

However, continuing with this same sequence, later still, M is shown not to be consistent in this sensitivity, as can be seen from fragment KhM4c. M's turns are shown not to be designed to contain some topical reference to Kh's priors, although an extended sequence of turns is observed.
Fragment KhM4c

21 M: what's he doing

22 Kh: ((points to a picture)) Him?

23 M: mm
24 Kh: ((Kh looks down at the book) Cooking (0.8) up (.))
25 food and the ma:sh
26 (2.1) ((M looks towards I; F distracts her; Kh continues to look down at the book))
27 Kh: man eating (.) the the saus
28 M: Say it louder ((she is still looking towards F))
29 Kh: eating SAUSAGES

31 Kh: He eating UP(.)SAUSAGES

32 M: Huh? ((M looks back at book))

33 Kh: EATING SAUSAGES

34 M: mm (1.3)((glances at I then looks back at book))
35 * what are they doing?
36 Kh: Making sausages
37 M: * And ((M points to a picture))
38 Kh: and (1.3) see (. ) the old lady frightened (. ) and
39 that(1.6) that (. ) one (1.2)
40 M: ((addresses the interpreter in Sylheti))

Here M is shown to become distracted from the talk (lines 26/27), and to make responses (lines 29, 32, 34) to Kh's turns which indicate that she is not displaying understanding or keeping track of his turns. In spite of this, Kh continues to describe the picture, in so doing he indicates that he is doing the activity and has understood her questions: he is telling her what the people in the pictures are doing.
In contrast, when M does overtly indicate her understanding of Kh’s prior, a topic which he has initiated is extended, as will be shown in fragment KhM5. It is interesting to note that mutual laughter turns are seen in the sequence. A similar phenomenon is noticed in the A data, where laughter turns are part of an extended sequence, as will be shown later in fragment A10.

Fragment KhM5

1 Kh: ((points to a picture)) * Old (. ) lady sitting in ( . )
2 a chair
3 (3.3) ((Kh and M look at the picture; M turns page))
4 Kh: everyone ((He points to a picture, keeps his finger on this picture)) (1.1) everyone ( . ) look in a book for
5 one dog the old man (1.2) stuck with the ( . ) with
6 gold ( . ) one
7 ((smiles up at Kh)) He hasn’t got any teeth
8 M: (laughs)
9 Kh: (laughs)
10 M: (laughs)(unintelligible)
11 Kh: (laughs)(unintelligible)
12 M: Say what the man’s doing ((both Kh and M look down at 13 a different picture on the page))

Kh comments in lines 1 and 2 about the picture he has chosen. In the 3.3 second gap that follows, M does not respond to Kh’s comments, but she does look at the same picture. She then turns the page. Kh chooses the next picture, and comments about it (lines 4-7). M does not take a turn at the two transition relevance places (when there are pauses) in Kh’s utterance. However, in her turn in line 8 she responds by commenting on an aspect of the picture (the old man’s teeth) and so extending the topic. This is followed by mutual laughter turns until M draws Kh’s attention to another picture in line 12.

In fragment A10, a similar incidence of mutual laughter turns ends an extended turn sequence.
M offers the name of Shani (the sister) as a first turn to start the talk, in line 2. She
does not get a response from A after 1.6 seconds, and then points to the picture of A
and says his name. He does not respond after a further 1.6 seconds, and M keeps the
turn and makes a comment in English, (line 3) about the picture of A. A’s response is
to extend the topic in line 4, followed immediately by a potential test question which M
answers in line 6. A. comments on this answer in line 7, and his comment is
acknowledged by M in line 8: “ehh” (note that the pitch contours of A’s “big” and M’s
“ehh” are similar). After 1 second, when A does not take a turn, M then names Shani in
another picture. This leads to mutual laughing and A copies the pose in the photo,
showing the picture to Shani (lines 10, 11 and 12). He turns to her and addresses her
in line 13, M also collaborates to include Shani in the interaction, by laughing and
turning to her (line 14). Shani does not take a turn after 1.6 seconds, nor at the next
transition relevance place in line 15. A’s restatement that the photo is of his sister in
line 16 “…that you” is acknowledged by M (note the similar pitch contours). A and M
then turn back to the book and attend to a new photo (in lines 18 and 19).

Although extended turns are not observed here, an extended sequence of turns has
resulted from M’s turn (line 8) designed as a comment on the photo.

In a subsequent sequence, illustrated by fragment A11, which also starts with a turn
designed by A as a comment, an extended turn sequence is observed again. Here
however, the extended sequence of turns seems to be about clarifying A’s initial
comment.
Fragment A11

1 A: ((turns his attention to another photo on same page)) * my bicycle
2 M: ((points to this photo and nods)) uh Shani (2.3)

5 A: Shani bicycle ?

6 M: mm ( . ) bicycle

7 A: my bicycle ?

8 M: mm ((nods))
9 A: LOOK MY BICYCLE ((looks at camera))
10 M: ohya They have seen they have seen your bicycle
11 A: Look my bicycle (1.2) LOOK=
12 M: =They have seen =((gives Altab a gentle push
13 with her shoulder))

15 A: =look my bicycle

16 M: uh ( . ) Altab's bicycle (2.9)

In line 2, A comments on 'his' bicycle. In acknowledging this comment in line 3, M nods and says 'uh' and then says 'Shani', which is open to the interpretation that she is disputing A's claim that the bicycle is his. After looking at the photo for 2.3 seconds, A could be asking for clarification (line 5), "Shani bicycle ?" but the fall on the last syllable of 'bicycle' casts doubt on this interpretation. It must be considered here that his deafness could well be affecting his ability to use intonation patterns contrastively. In line 6, M says "mm" and says "bicycle" putting a rise fall on her "mm" which could indicate agreement that the bicycle is Shani's. At this point in the talk, M has not yet
explicitly conceded A's ownership of the bike. A still seems unsure, and in line 7 says "my bicycle ?" and M responds with a "mm" in line 8. A's intonation pattern in line 7 is complex, and M's "mm" shows a narrow rise fall, possibly indicating implicit affirmation of his ownership when taken in conjunction with her nod. A shows the photo to the camera and says "LOOK MY BICYCLE" in line 9, and finally, in line 10, M explicitly concedes his ownership: "...they have seen your bicycle". In lines 11 to 15 M tries to regain his attention. In line 16, M reaffirms that his comment in line 2 was right, by saying "uh (. ) Altab's bicycle".

Fragment A11 shows how longer sequences of turns at talk are noted when the initial turn in the sequence is not designed as a question, even though there are no extended turns from either participant.

7.2.7 A's reaction to the camera

As has probably become apparent from the fragments quoted above, A's reaction to the camera is a feature of this data. Reaction to the presence of the camera, the researcher (R) (and for the Sylheti families, the interpreter (I)) in their homes was only occasionally seen in the data from the other dyads. For example, in fragment K8, K and his mother address the camera to confirm the name of the sister. Both R and I are known to all the children in the study. In A's case, both visit his school fairly regularly and on those occasions, both speak to him in English. At the time of making the recording, it was not possible to set up the room in A's home so that the camera would not be intrusive, or so that R could withdraw from the room. A and his mother live in a small council flat, and only one room was available for use.

In fragments A9 and A13, both sequences of talk in which there has been an unresolved misunderstanding of the type discussed above, A addresses his final turn in the sequence to the researcher (who is behind the camera). In so doing, A seems to be presenting the final words to these English speakers he is familiar with the role of arbiters of his English output. There is a comparable instance in the data for W, where after a lengthy sequence in which a misunderstanding between W and his father, is almost resolved, W then appeals to his mother, for final confirmation of his answer (see fragment W4).
There are other instances in the A data when M has to work hard to gain A's attention, since he addresses his turns in English either to the researcher or to the interpreter. This feature of the talk is discussed in more detail with reference to fragment A14\textsuperscript{13}.

Fragment A14

1 M:* ((points to a photo))
2 A: LOOK
3 (1.0)((points to the same photo as M))
4 A: MY PLANE
5 (1.3)((holds up a photo for the camera))
6 M: °plane° ((looks at Altab))
7 R: Plane lovely
8 A: MY BANGAL
9 M: (1.5)((smiles and crinkles eyes)) Bang
10 A: LOOK MY BANGLA (1.7)
11 ((shows photo to I on left)) my ((points to himself))
12 M: o: Bangl Is he from Bangladesh
13 I: His plane from Bangladesh ((I talks to sister in Sylheti))
14 M: ((looks left; is momentarily distracted))
15 A: Yes (1.5) ((addresses to I; nods and points to himself))
16 I got Bengali
17 (1.6)
18 M: mmm (0.8) In Bangladesh (unintelligible)
19 A: loo:: me plane
20 M: oh:=
21 A: =and (0.9) hey (1.2) hey (1.8) ((looks up at camera and gestures to R to get her attention)) I got I got big (.)
22 plai: (.:) my (1)
23 (A looks at a new photo on the same page))
24 °aeroplane° * Who's that ((pointing to granny in the photo A is attending to))
25 M: °aeroplane° * Who's that ((pointing to granny in the photo A is attending to))

Even though A points to the same photo as M, in line 4 he addresses his talk about that photo to R. M acknowledges his comment quietly (line 6), but R also acknowledges it, in line 7. He repeats his comment loudly in line 8, and when M starts to respond (line 9) after 1.5 seconds, A interrupts her to address I in line 10 and 11. M acknowledges A's comment to I in line 12, but I also acknowledges his comment, in line 13. A addresses I again in line 15/16. After 1.6 seconds, M takes the turn (and I does not) and acknowledges A's comment. In line 19, A repeats his comment, this time accompanying his speech with signs. M starts to respond, but A overlaps her and tries to attract the attention of R. She does not respond, and A then looks down at the photo. In line 25, M acknowledges the comment A had addressed to R, and then draws his attention to a new photo.

\textsuperscript{13} In this fragment, the underlined words in lines 19 and 23 were accompanied by BSL signs.
A wants to involve the others in the room in his talk, and to explain to them the content of the photos about which he is excited and interested. This could in part be due to the fact that he knows R and I will speak English to him, and will know the few signs which he uses. In addition, R had never been to his home before (I has made a number of home visits), and his eagerness to involve them both in the talk seems natural. What is unusual about it, is the frequency with which it occurred, and the way it distracted the participants from their talk.

7.3 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

In earlier Chapters, it was shown that when the adult asks a question with a single 'right' answer in mind, and when the child gives that answer, whether or not the answer is receipted, the talk ends, or is effectively 'adjourned' (Schegloff and Sacks 1974) until the next segment restarts (often when another test question is asked). The initial question has not served as a topic opener. This pattern of talk was frequently observed in the talk between the younger normally hearing child K and his mother, and between the deaf children and their carers. It was suggested that, in part, the pattern could be accounted for in terms of the adult taking control of the talk, and taking charge of doing the activity of talking about pictures. For K, W and Kh[F] it was also suggested that the adults could be adapting their talk in accordance with their perception of their child’s linguistic skills. In the talk between the older normally hearing children and their carers, the pattern was not as frequently observed, and analysis of the talk showed it to be more collaborative. Both child and adult appeared to establish and maintain the activity.

In some respects the talk between A and Kh and their mothers discussed in this chapter has features in common with the talk between the younger normally hearing child K and his mother, and the deaf children in the other dyads: when M asks a 'test' question, a short sequence of answer - receipt ensues. When either A or M do not design their first turns as questions, more turns at talk ensue, as was shown in fragments A10 and A11, and KhM5. However, whether or not longer turn sequences ensue, it is the case that neither mothers consistently display their understanding of their sons’ prior turns.

As was shown in fragment A8 (lines 7 and 8), A also does not, in the main, overtly indicate his understanding of his mother’s priors. On the other hand, Kh understands
what his mother says - he responds to her questions more or less appropriately, as was shown in most of the fragments quoted. An exception was seen in the case of fragment KhM3 (lines 31 and 32), where she asks him about the horse, and his response concerns an old man. As was discussed above, the adults in the other dyads (in which the participants speak the same language to each other) keep track of the child’s talk by designing receipts or acknowledgement turns to contain an overt or an implicit reference to the topic.

It is interesting to contrast the way Kh’s father, speaking English with Kh, designs his turns with the way Kh’s mother, speaking Sylheti, designs hers. The father almost always receipts the answer to his question with a repeat of that answer. Furthermore, in some instances, Kh’s father is seen to try to correct Kh’s English when he (F) notices an error, notwithstanding the fact that Kh’s father also makes (predictable) mistakes in English. In the fragments where Kh’s mother is shown to orient to a possible misunderstanding, her clarification requests (for example, in fragment KhM4 line 8 and line 32) appear to be in connection with not hearing him or not understanding his speech.

The implications of the analyses presented here will be discussed in more detail in Chapter 8.
CHAPTER 8

FINDINGS AND IMPLICATIONS

The aim of this chapter is to draw together the various strands emerging from the data, by means of further deliberating on data-related issues, as well as giving consideration to some of the wider issues on which this study will have an impact. The chapter starts with a summing up of the study and its main findings, followed by further discussion of the data and concludes with an assessment of the method of study.

8.1 SUMMARY OF THE STUDY AND OF THE MAIN FINDINGS

The study that has been reported in the preceding chapters was an investigation of the conversational interactions between deaf children (aged about seven years) and their carers where Sylheti is the language spoken at home, and English is the second language (E2L). The study was designed to examine the contribution of a number of factors to conversations between each selected child and adult. These were: the age and language ability of the children; whether they were deaf or normally hearing; and whether English was their first (E1L) or their second language. In the course of the study another factor was observed which had significant bearing on the talk. This was whether or not the participants in the talk spoke the same language in the particular segment of conversation analysed.

Examination of the contribution of each factor was made possible by contrasting data from eight pairs each of a child and an adult. The child in each of four of these pairs was deaf. Three of these were from families where Sylheti is the first language; the fourth was from a family where English is the first language. The child in each of the other four pairs was normally hearing. Two of these children, one from an E1L and the other from an E2L family, were of the same age as all the deaf children. The last two children, also one E1L and the other E2L, were younger, but had similar language ability to the deaf children.

In all the segments analysed the talk, which occurred in the activity of looking at photos or pictures, was characterised by question-answer sequences. The most frequently observed sequence, called the 'typical question sequence' here, had a three-part
structure, with the first turn being designed as a question, the second as the answer, and the third as the receipt. The question turn was often shown to have been a ‘test’ question (the asker knew the answer), and the answer to be adequate (either ‘right’ or ‘wrong’). The third position receipting turn was then used by the questioner to acknowledge the answer. This was usually done in such a way as to enable the questioner to self select as next speaker, allowing him/her to ask a next question and so to start another ‘typical’ sequence. If a given answer was deemed ‘wrong’ or troublesome, a ‘right’ response was pursued, or repair of the trouble was initiated.

The overall effect of these features was that the questioner was ‘in control’ of the talk. This ‘typical’ sequence exhibited local management of turn-taking, and interactional management in which intersubjectivity was either overtly or implicitly displayed between the participants in the talk (Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson 1974). Recipient design of turns was clearly in evidence (Heritage 1984).

The three turn structure characterised the talk involving one of the younger normally hearing children and the talk involving all the deaf children. In this regard, the deaf children’s talk was substantively different from that of the normally hearing children of the same age, whose interactions characteristically did not exhibit the three-turn structure. These findings are similar to those of Wood, MacMahon and Cranston (1980) and Wood, Wood, Griffiths, Howarth and Howarth (1982) who also showed similarities between conversations involving deaf children and those involving younger normally hearing children (see also Chapter 1 section 1.2.1). Comparable findings are reported by researchers working with children who have communication difficulties other than those resulting from deafness. For instance, Gardner (1989) found that the interactional styles of mothers when talking to their phonologically disordered children were more ‘controlling’ than were mothers talking to their normally developing children, and were also more similar to the ‘controlling’ style used by mothers to their younger children.

In the talk involving the deaf children and the younger normally hearing children, the ‘typical’ question sequence appeared to curtail the talk: there was little evidence of either extended turns or extended sequences of turns about the same topic. When a sequence starting with a test question was longer than three turns, it was often because a ‘right’ answer to the test question, or a verbal answer (as opposed to a non-
verbal answer), was being pursued by the questioner (Sacks 1995b [1972]). Reformulations of the question turn by the adult were often a characteristic of such sequences.

Control of the talk by the adult was not observed to the same extent in the talk between the 'same age' normally hearing children and their carers. This talk showed evidence of being collaborative: both participants initiated sequences and designed their first turns in a variety of ways. They jointly established and maintained the activity of doing talk about the pictures and longer topical sequences of turns containing extended turns were observed.

In all the segments analysed, when the first turn of a sequence was not designed as a question, or was not designed as a 'test' question, the resulting sequence of turns was longer than three turns. The sequence also showed a flow of topics which led naturally from one to the next (Jefferson 1984) and which sometimes contained extended turns. The first turn had served as a topic opener (Sacks 1995a [1972]). This feature was most frequently found in the talk between the older normally hearing children and their carers. Wood, Wood, Griffiths, Howarth and Howarth (1986) came up with a similar finding: when the adults' 'moves' in conversation were less 'controlling', the mean length of the child's utterance in response was longer.

With respect to first language, in the conversations analysed, what transpired to matter most in terms of the 'success' of the interaction, was that both participants in the interaction spoke the same language, whether it was their first language or their second language.

In those conversations where the participants used different languages, as was the case for Kh[M] and A, the distinguishing features of the talk can be characterised as follows:

In the dyads concerned, whilst the local management of the turn-taking was apparent in the talk, there was no indication that the talk was interactionally managed. In these dyads, the adults seldom incorporated any repetition of the child's prior turn into the design of their receipt turn. Neither was further topical reference to the prior turn made. In many instances, the adults' receipt turns consisted of utterances like "mm".
Designing the third turn in this way appeared to affect the perception and the resolution of possible misunderstandings. Given the nature of the activity, using this receipt could be viewed as an appropriate way of designing receipts to complete the structural sequence of turns following a question, indicating local management of turn-taking. However, receipts designed like this were shown not to display understanding either overtly or implicitly, and possible misunderstandings (especially concerning deictic terms and vocabulary items, such as the family naming system in Sylheti) were not oriented to, thus foregoing opportunities to resolve those troubles. As Gallaway and Lewis (1995 p. 13) put it

"...it is generally the duty of a listener to bear joint responsibility for successful interaction, and quite simply, if a listener always says yes, then failures of the speaker to convey an intended meaning will be overlooked and non-communication will result"

By way of contrast, in those dyads where both participants spoke the same language, the majority of third position receipting turns were designed to incorporate an overt or an implicit display of understanding (for example, a repeat or partial repeat of the prior turn, including some prosodic matching of the prior). This was seen as a way of achieving intersubjectivity and as evidence of recipient design; in other words, mutual understanding of the talk was displayed, topical coherence was maintained and opportunities in which misunderstandings could be resolved were created (Schegloff 1991b; 1992a). In the talk between the deaf children and adults who spoke the same language, there were no instances when attempts to resolve possible misunderstandings were not made. Designing the third position receipting turn in a way which overtly displayed understanding also allowed for the question sequences to function as devices for the teaching/learning of words (Tarplee 1993).

Detailed analysis of the talk in these two dyads led to the suggested conclusion that the particular character of this talk could be accounted for mainly by the fact that different languages were being spoken. In the following section, further contrasts between the various participants' talk will provide additional support for this conclusion.
8.2 FURTHER DISCUSSION OF THE DATA

The analysis and discussion of the data thus far has centred around the 'typical' question sequence: its occurrence, its absence, ways in which its structure was modified. The data sets were grouped according to the first language of the participants, and according to whether or not the same language was spoken in the interaction. In order to gain a broader perspective on the whole corpus of data from all the dyads, in the following sections, discussion of the data is continued across different groupings of the participants (for example, all the deaf children; all the older normally hearing children, etc). In each section, the discussion will include reference to the following aspects:

- the occurrence of the 'typical' question sequence;
- the child's conversational partner (mother, father, sibling);
- the age of the child;
- the hearing status of the child (deaf or normally hearing);
- the language spoken at home;
- the language spoken during the interaction;
- the activity of mutual looking at pictures;
- the 'control' of the talk.

8.2.1 Accounting for the similarity in the talk involving two of the deaf boys, W and Kh[F] and one of the younger normally hearing boys, K.¹

The analysis of the segments of talk for these three children showed that their talk had one prominent common characteristic, and this was the regularity with which the typical three part question sequence occurred. This commonality apparently occurred in spite of the fact that W and Kh were talking to their fathers, and K was talking to his mother; that K is younger than both Kh and W by almost two years; and that K has normal hearing whereas W and Kh are deaf. As has been mentioned previously, research has also shown that talk between deaf children and adults is similar to talk between younger normally hearing children and adults. The reasons for this, as were expounded briefly in Chapter 1, are to do with the delayed development of spoken language skills by deaf children, and the adaptation to their perceived level of competence by adults. In the current data, the concurrence of this finding with other

¹ W is the seven year old English-speaking deaf boy; Kh is the deaf boy aged six years and ten months from a Sylheti-speaking home; K is the normally hearing, English-speaking boy aged four years and eight months.
research findings lends further support to those findings and also indicates that the
design of this study was appropriate since known finding like these have been
reproduced.

The commonality of occurrence of the 'typical' sequence in these three dyads seemed
also to happen irrespective of the first language of the participants, and irrespective of
the proficiency with which they spoke that language during the interaction. W, K, W's
father and K's mother are all native English speakers, and they spoke English during
the interaction. Kh's father is a native speaker of Sylheti, and in the interaction he was
speaking his second language, English, often using non-standard forms. Kh also
spoke English in the interaction, and also used non-standard forms. These did not
appear to affect either Kh or his fathers' ability to display their understandings to each
other, as was evidenced by the recipient design of their turns (see fragment Kh4 in
which F tracks Kh's utterances). There were occasions when Kh and his father
engaged in sequences directly addressing their relative proficiency in English (see
fragment Kh3 line 31 and 32). However, cross linguistic features which have been
shown by other researchers to influence talk in English when participants are non­
native speaker of English, (such as the different use of contrastive stress patterns
mentioned by Scollon and Scollon (1983)), were not apparent in this instance.

With regard to the activity in which the participants were engaged, it was mentioned
previously (see Chapter 4 section 4.3.3) that looking at picture books may not be a
common activity in the homes of Sylheti-speaking families living in Britain, where
written materials may have a significance quite different to that in British homes
(Gregory 1994, 1996a). It is possible that this may have applied to Kh's family ².
However, the characteristics of the talk between Kh and his father during this activity
as displayed by the data itself, were sufficiently similar to the characteristics observed
for the other two dyads to indicate that unfamiliarity with the activity was not an issue.
Kh's father had arrived in the U.K in 1975, when he was 13, and he attended
secondary school in this country - this information may contribute to this observation.

In all three of these dyads, the questioner was usually the adult who thus controlled the
talk, giving the talk an 'instructional' quality. By adding praise to their third position

² This issue will be addressed again in more detail in section 8.2.3, where the contrast between
the Kh[F] and the Kh[M] data with regard to the activity is discussed.
receipting turns (see, for example, fragment Kh5 line 6), the father of Kh appeared almost didactic. Tarplee (1993) suggested that in labelling activities, this instructional quality is demonstrated when the adult adds 'praise', or what she refers to as a "confirmation marker" (ibid p.10) to the third position receipt. By doing this, the adult affirms the child's production of the label as having been an appropriate action. As was pointed out in the earlier discussion of relevant fragments (see chapter 6 section 6.2.5), this praise further strengthened the father's control. He had not only self selected as next speaker, but had made it very difficult for the boy to take the next turn., as was evidenced in the observation that Kh never took a turn after his father had praised him in this way.

8.2.2 Accounting for the characteristics of the talk involving the normally hearing boys Jo, J and E

The prominent feature of the talk involving these three children is that the typical three turn sequence is hardly ever in evidence. The talk in each of these dyads is similarly collaborative, in which both speakers take control of the talk and of the activity itself. Extended turns and extended sequences of turns are frequent.

Several factors may contribute to the similarity of the talk across these dyads, and to the fact that they are different from the talk in the previous grouping of W, Kh[F] and K above. None of these children is deaf. They are normally hearing and to all intents and purposes (although no specific assessments were done) they are also normal speakers. In spite of the fact that E is about one year and eight months younger than Jo and J, his talk in this interaction is very like theirs. The adults in these dyads are all women, raising the question that there may be an effect here of the gender of the interlocuter4 (Tannen 1990). Furthermore, in each dyad, the participants are speaking the same language as each other, and this language is each participant's first language. It is unlikely that the activity of looking at pictures is unfamiliar to the participants: all the adults were educated in the U.K., and the children are all at English schools.

---

3 Jo is the seven year old normally hearing boy from a Sylheti-speaking home; J is the seven year old normally hearing English-speaking boy; E is the normally hearing boy aged five years and eight months from a Sylheti-speaking home.

4 This aspect of the talk was not pursued further in this study, but is a candidate for the focus of further analysis of the data.
It might have been expected that the talk involving E was similar to the younger normally hearing English speaking child, K, (E is eight months older than K). It was striking that it was so different. The talk between E and his sister does not show regular occurrences of the ‘typical’ question sequence, and hence it does not have the didactic quality of the talk between K and his mother. Both K and E are competent speakers of their first language, and they are speaking the same language as their interlocutor, that language being the first language of both participants. Thus it seems unlikely that the fact of K being English-speaking and E being Sylheti-speaking can account for the differences. It could be that the eight months difference in their ages was significant. This is borne out by the observation that with respect to the extended sequences of talk, and the ensuring of mutual understanding, the talk between E and his sister is more like that between the older boy, Jo and his sister.

The question of sibling talk as opposed to parental talk has to be considered here. Both E and Jo are talking to their sisters, and not to their mothers or fathers. In the research literature, there are many studies concerning talk between peers, as opposed to talk between adults and children (McTear 1985). Other studies provide evidence of differences in the way fathers talk to their children, as opposed to the style of talk of mothers and older siblings (Rustin, 1995). There is no published research into how families of Bangladeshi-origin interact with their normal children, or with children who have communication difficulties. Although the research findings of Gregory® and her colleagues mainly concern the interactional style of families of Bangladeshi origin when reading with their children, Gregory (1996) has pointed to the role of older siblings as “language brokers” (p. 176). From interviews with the mothers of E and Jo after the recording session, it transpired that the sisters spent more time with the boys than the mothers did. The sisters are regarded by the family as one of the main adult carers, and it is in this way that their contribution to the study is regarded. Although E’s mother was in the room at the time of the filming, she refused to be filmed herself. Jo’s mother was not available when the recording of talk between Jo and his sister was made. In the absence of more information about the patterns of communication between different family members in the Sylheti culture in London, further comments on this point must remain speculative.®

---

5 Gregory’s work is discussed again later in this chapter. See section 8.2.3.
6 Although this aspect of the talk was not pursued further in the current study, it is a candidate for the focus of further analysis of the data.
What can be said, is that from the data, it would appear that variables external to the interaction, such as gender, family relationship and even linguistic and cultural background, are much less relevant to the actual interaction, than are the variables internal to that interaction, in this case, the hearing status of the child, the age and/or developmental level of the child, and whether one or two languages are being spoken. In other words, what affects the interaction are those variables which are observable in the interaction, and which are demonstrably oriented to by the participants. In this way, the case for using a CA approach in this study as opposed to an experimental approach which requires the control of external variables is given support.

8.2.3 Accounting further for the characteristics of the talk involving the deaf boys A and Kh[M]

As will be discussed later in this section, there are many factors which influence the structure of the talk in these dyads. In the main, however, it has been suggested that not speaking the same language contributes considerably to the characteristic nature of their talk. This conclusion was supported by evidence (presented in chapter 7) that displays of understanding of the children’s utterances are generally not made by the mothers, indicating that while local management of turn-taking within the three-part structure is proceeding ‘normatively’, there is no evidence of interactional management on a local level.

It is worth recalling at this point that in the other two dyads involving a deaf child, W and Kh[F], where the participants spoke the same language, overt displays of understanding are made by the adults in the third position receipting turns.

The mothers’ understanding

In accounting for the talk involving A and Kh[M] there are several other factors to take into account. One of these is that the mothers may be unable to understand the English words or sentences that their sons are saying, or they could perhaps find the phonetic realisation of those words by their deaf sons to be troublesome. This complex situation has potentially far-reaching implications, as can be illustrated in the case of A, who is said to have English as his first language.

In A’s talk, there are examples of a well documented characteristic of deaf children in spoken English, such as his non-standard use of deictic personal pronouns. His
mother does not speak English (except for a few words). This has important implications for the development of A's English pronominal system, since deaf children's development of understanding of the meanings of deictic terms, such as personal pronouns, and the appropriate usage of those terms in discourse, is said to result from participation in discourse (Wood, Wood, Griffiths and Howarth 1986). In the talk between A and his mother there is little evidence of the overt checks on understanding and opportunities for resolving misunderstandings so commonly found in the talk between deaf children and hearing adults who speak the same language. Such 'checks' could provide A with the input from which he could develop his skill in using the pronominal system of English. However, it is unrealistic to expect A's mother to have a command of English that would enable such sequences to occur. Looked at from a western language learning perspective, this could imply a language environment for A which may not represent what are thought to be the optimal language learning opportunities needed by a deaf child (McAnally, Rose and Quigley 1987).

**Cultural 'style'**

Another factor to be considered is that this data represents a cultural 'style' of interaction. The Sylheti families in this study are Muslims; the mothers are interacting with their sons, who are also their deaf sons. Without more information about normal and atypical family interactions in Sylheti-speaking homes, further comment, once again, can only be speculative. Clues about these aspects are not accessible from the data. What the data does show is that the way in which these mothers who are speaking a different language to their children are seen to design their turns, and especially their third position receipting turns, is very different from the way in which turns are designed by English and Sylheti-speaking adults who are talking the same language as their child. It is from this observation that the conclusion is reached that the characteristic nature of the talk in these two dyads has to do with the fact that the children and the adults are speaking different languages.

**Pattern of language use in family**

It is apparent that whilst in the main, the characteristic of the talk can be attributed to the 'different languages spoken' factor, there is yet a further contributing factor. This has to do with the patterns of language use in the homes, and the reflection of these
patterns in the data. An exploration of the patterns of language use in the families of A and Kh will illustrate the point.

In both the families of Kh and A, the language of the home is Sylheti. Unlike Jo and E, however, neither A nor Kh has older siblings who have some proficiency in English and who might talk to their deaf brothers in English. In Kh's case, his father speaks English to him at home. His sister is one year older than him, but she speaks to him in a mixture of Sylheti and English.

A is the oldest child in his family. His mother usually speaks to him in Sylheti, using lots of gesture and sometimes a few signs and fingerspelling. His father, who is reported to speak English, does not always live with the family, and he was away at the time of the recording. A's sister (younger by only one year) sometimes speaks to him in English, and sometimes in Sylheti, mostly she uses single words when addressing him. Both the mother and the sister use a lot of pointing and touching to get A's attention and to direct him to the object of their talk.

Much of the talk in the families which involves A and Kh concerns behaviour management, instructions, tellings off etc. Hence it is likely that the boys are familiar with the meanings of words and sentences in Sylheti said in these circumstances. Nevertheless, it was remarkable that in general the boys, Kh in particular, were shown to follow their mothers' Sylheti talk, their deafness notwithstanding.

**The activity of looking at pictures**

Finally, another examination of the activity of looking at pictures provides an additional contribution to this discussion.

Other than anecdotal reference, there is little published information about child-rearing practices in the Sylheti community in the U.K. at this time in their cultural history. Attitudes and practices concerning the development of speech and language per se by normal children from Sylheti-speaking homes are not well documented (Stokes 1989; 1990; Mahon 1995). In western culture, one such practice, as was mentioned in

---

7 Incidentally, both the researcher and the interpreter found the sister's speech quite difficult to understand.
Chapter 1 (section 1.3) is talking to children, often on a one-to-one basis, and frequently while looking at books. This practice is based on the belief that adults play a role in children's language development, and that children are regarded as conversational partners. As was pointed out in the Introduction, and in Chapters 1 and 2, in the absence of documentary evidence, it is not known whether such beliefs and practices are shared by the Sylheti-speaking community. Gregory, Mace, Rashid and Williams (1996) have studied the similarities and differences in literacy practices at home and at school for families of Bangladeshi origin. They collected data from Bangladeshi families who spoke Sylheti at home, and English families who spoke English at home. One of the findings was that the parents of both these groups were similar in that they did not know how the children were being taught to read in school.

In the current study, it is also difficult to know whether Bangladeshi mothers interacting with their children, and with their sons in particular, on a one to one basis is a common activity in the households.

Hence there is the possibility that for the mothers of A and Kh, the activity of looking at pictures with their sons was not something which they regularly did together. There is no published research into this specific aspect of parent and child interaction in Sylheti-speaking families, but the use of two dimensional pictures in a 'talking' activity must be considered further. In western culture activities such as the bedtime story are ordinary and unremarkable, but that this is a common activity in Sylheti families cannot be taken for granted. The work of Gregory and her colleagues on reading practices in children from families of Bangladeshi origin living in London's East End is relevant here again. Gregory (1994) has pointed out that with respect to reading practice, Sylheti children have a very different experience at home to that which they have at their English school. The purpose of reading at home is mainly utilitarian whereas at school it is generally promoted as being a pleasurable activity. The materials at home are not usually the bright children's books to be found in classroom reading corners - they are more likely to be religious tracts, official letters or documents or calendars. Furthermore, the way in which children and adults participate in reading activities at home could be influenced more by the didactic style of teaching reading that the children are exposed to in their 'religious' or 'community' school on Saturdays than with the 'reading for pleasure' approach in English schools.
This may not be the case for adult:child picture book interactions when the adult has had an essentially western experience of the activity. Indeed, this was shown in the interactions between Jo and E and their sisters, where the activity of looking at pictures revealed interactions similar to the English-speaking dyads. The two sisters were both born in England and had all their schooling in London, in English. However, because the mothers of A and Kh were both born and educated in Bangladesh, and had very little command of English, the likelihood existed that the activity of looking at pictures with their sons was sufficiently unusual and may have led to atypical interactions.

In order to address this point, it was considered necessary to briefly examine a little of the available recorded data for A and Kh, where they were not looking at pictures with their mothers, but were simply chatting.

A few background details for the families will help to set the scene. A's mother had been in the U.K. for 12 years, having arrived here aged 14, after completing her primary schooling in Bangladesh. She did not attend school in the U.K., but she has learned a little English. She has lived in the Sylheti community in East London since her arrival here. Kh's mother had been in the U.K. for 8 years, having arrived at the age of 19 after attending secondary school in Bangladesh. She too lived in the Sylheti community in the East End but recently the family has been rehoused in North London where there is not a close-knit Sylheti community. The boys are of similar age, and have attended school in London, in English, since they entered nursery class.

During the recording sessions, only a few minutes were spent in chatting between the participants. When analysing these sequences, it quickly became clear that the structure of the talk was not very different from that observed for the 'picture' data. Some differences were noted - in both dyads, there was more use of gesture, and in A's case, fingerspelling and even a few signs were used. It was also the case that both mothers had to 'manage' the boys behaviour more in these interactions, for example, encouraging them to sit down, speak up, and so on. To illustrate this talk, fragments from both Kh and A are given below, accompanied by a brief analysis of the salient features of the talk. Full transcripts of this talk can be found in Appendix 4.
Fragment KhM6

1 M: What does your miss do (.) what does your miss
2 teach you
3 (1.9)

4 Kh: and (.) she (.) we (.) play outside (2.5)

5 M: ((nods)) mm

6 Kh: with (.) the ball

7 M: mm
8 Kh: a:nd uh
9 (5.0)
10 M: who takes you in the morning
11 S: car=

12 Kh: =car

13 M: mm
14 (2.0)

The talk here is similar to the ‘picture’ activity talk, in that the turns do not display
recipient design, and the same absence of display of understanding is observed. The
impression is that the talk is not interactionally managed.

A similar observation was made for the only (and very short) segment of talk between
A and his mother that is not directed to the photos. Most of this is quoted in fragment
A1. The topic is the researcher’s name, and it is interesting to note that after a few
turns in which the name is provided by A, and confirmed by the interpreter, M then requests A to fingerspell the name (lines 8 and 9). Both the researcher and the interpreter become involved in the talk.

Fragment A1

1 M: o.k. come listen here who’s this ((pointing to R))
2 what’s their name name
3 A: is Merle=
4 M: hm ( ) hm ?

5 A: Merle

6 M: o:h

7 I: Merle Merle their name Merle
8 M: how is it then is it like this or like that
9 ((indicates that she wants A to fingerspell the name))
10 A: Merle ((fingerspells “m” correctly))
11 M: Merle ((fingerspells “m” incorrectly))
12 A: ((looks at R, fingerspells “m” again)) that Merle
13 M: ((fingerspells “m” correctly))
14 R: that’s right yes

In line 6, M’s receipt does not display the prosodic matching indicating her understanding of A’s realisation of the name. It is I who provides the receipt in line 7. In line 8, M then indicates to A to show her (using fingerspelling) what the name is, possibly demonstrating that she did not understand the answers given in lines 3, 5 and 7 where both A and the interpreter have repeated the name. The addition of fingerspelling appears to be helpful. In line 13, M fingerspells the correct letter, which is receipted by R in line 14.

This sequence is similar to the ‘picture’ data in terms of the design of M’s third position receipting turn. It is different insofar as fingerspelling is used and R and I participate in the talk. M does eventually display her understanding, but it would seem that she has had to work hard to understand A. She has had to contend with a number of difficult issues in this interaction: A is speaking English; his realisations of the English words are not standard; he is using finger-spelling. The possibility exists that M may have difficulties understanding A on all these levels. An important contribution to the
distinctive nature of the talk here is that different languages are being used in the interaction.

The interpretation which may be made from these observations is that the fact of A and Kh and their mothers speaking different languages is the feature which appears most likely to account for the characteristics of their talk, be that talk about pictures, or simply chatting. Further discussion of this conclusion necessitates reference to certain cross-linguistic issues which become relevant at this point.

8.3 CROSS-LINGUISTIC IMPLICATIONS ARISING FROM THE DATA

8.3.1 Similar structures in the talk, in spite of different languages spoken

In the talk between the older normally hearing children J, Jo and E, the structure of the talk is similarly collaborative, in spite of the fact that E and his sister are speaking a mixture of English and Sylheti, and Kh and his father are speaking a non-standard form of English, while J and his mother are speaking standard English. This seems to indicate that in the activity of talking about pictures, the actual language spoken by the participants is immaterial: the local and interactional management of the talk proceeds along a normative trajectory.

Furthermore, none of the participants in the talk involving E and Kh[F] are fluent speakers of English, and predictable 'errors' of both pronunciation and grammar are evident in their talk. However, the productive skills of E, E's sister, Kh and Kh's father, in English, can, in the context of these conversations, be viewed as

"strategic accomplishments in performance rather than as deficits in competence" (Martin-Jones and Romaine 1986 pp. 35)

Nevertheless, both the adults in these dyads are more proficient in English than are the children, and there are instances in the interactions which indicate that the adults are addressing this issue. For example, 'errors' in English made by Kh are picked up by his father. In fragment Kh3 lines 5-7, and again in lines 31 and 32 Kh's father tries to correct Kh's English. It is interesting to note that Kh does not acknowledge these corrections and that in some instances, his father does not give him the time to do so.

---

8 See Jackson 1980, 1981.
8.3.2 Code-switching and language mixing

As Romaine (1989) has pointed out, code-switching and language mixing is a natural and frequent part of communication between speakers of more than one language. Gumperz (1982) defined code-switching as:

"the juxtaposition within the same speech exchange of passages of speech belonging to two different grammatical systems or subsystems" (ibid, p. 59).

There were numerous examples in the data for the Sylheti-speaking participants of both switching and mixing. E and his sister were shown, in all their talk, to mix English and Sylheti, and to switch from one to the other in their talk. Both A and Kh, and their mothers, and Kh's father showed evidence of switching between English and Sylheti on occasions. A even brought a few signs into his talk. In her study of Arabic speakers, Collins (1991) found that code mixing and code switching were used for a variety of interactional functions, such as her participants exclusively used their first language to refer to home cultural events in their talk. When undertaking conversational repairs, the second language (also English) was never used. Her participants used English to repeat certain Arabic words for emphasis.

Whilst it is not the aim of this project to specifically investigate this aspect of the talk, it is relevant to briefly mention the interactional function that code-switching played in the talk, with respect to the conversations involving A and Kh[M]. In both the 'picture' talk and the 'chatting' talk between Kh and his mother, it is Kh who exhibits switching from English to Sylheti. Kh's mother only uses English words on those occasions when there is not an equivalent Sylheti word, e.g. 'homework', 'miss' (as in 'teacher').

Kh switches when specifically asked to name something in Sylheti, or, as illustrated below, when the subject of 'which language is to be spoken in the interaction', is directly talked about. In the two fragments quoted below Kh switches to Sylheti to make his preference for speaking English known. His mother displays her obvious concern about his intelligibility in English. Just prior to the talk in fragment KhM9 below, M turns to the interpreter and says "he can speak in English but not everyone can pick up what he says". In both fragments quoted below, the interpreter is shown to reassure the mother about Kh's speaking English.
In fragment KhM9, in the middle of a sequence in which he is describing a picture, his mother addresses the interpreter and the other adults in the room (lines 3-4), about the language Kh is speaking. It would appear that by making this statement “I want speak English” in Sylheti (line 6), Kh is trying to ensure that his mother understands his preference for English.

Fragment KhM9

1  Kh:  and (1.3) see (..) the old lady frightened (..) and
2       that(1.6) that (..) one (1.2)
3  M:  ((addressing the other adults in room)) they want to
4       see if he can speak Bangla but he won’t speak it
5  I:  mm he’s speaking Bangla and English
6  Kh:  I want speak English
7  I:  that’s o.k. it’s not a problem
8  M:  then I said
9  Kh:  ((points to a picture)) old (..) lady sitting in (..) a
10     chair
11     (3.3) ((M turns the page))

Fragment KhM10 illustrates this same point again, with Kh firmly expressing his desire not to speak in Sylheti (lines 6/7 and line 10)

Fragment KhM10

1  F:    °tell him to speak in Bangla°=
2  M:    =say in Bangla what do you do=
3  Kh:    =I eat (..) I eat some (1.4) dinner
4  M:    speak in Bangla
5  I:    no it’s o.k. for him to speak in English
6  Kh:    (na (.)) why
7       I speak in Bangla
8  M:    Then you have to speak Bangla or you can’t be
9       filmed
10  Kh:   I can’t speak in Bangla ((shakes head))
11  I:    it’s alright in English
12  M:    alright
13  I:    let him speak in English it’s o.k.
14  M:    do you want to speak ? ...

In the talk between A and his mother, there are only two instances when A switches to Sylheti, and on both occasions he does so when he asks the first question in a sequence about a new photo. The analysis did not show any particular sequential difference between the times he said “who that” in Sylheti and the times he said it in English. His mother’s switches to English on the other hand, seemed to have more
interactional impact. She was shown to use an English word in a receipting turn, in two instances, both of which were in turns which acknowledged A's prior.

Fragment A6
A: ((A points to a different photo on same page)) * look the my baby
M: ALTAB (looks at Altab)
A: (laughs)=
M: 'you baby'
A: (1.8) (smiles up at camera; looks at mother; turns over page; turns back page) look

and Fragment A1a (The underlined words (lines 20 and 22) are accompanied by BSL signs)
16 A: ((looks at R)) Margaret Merle ( ) ((looks at M)) mum 17 (fingerspelling “m” with each word)
18 M: ((laughs))
19 R: That’s right
20 A: ((looks at R)) same
21 R: very goo:d ( ) Altab=
22 A: =same
23 M: same=

In these instances, A’s mother appears to use English when she is affirming something that A has said.

Before concluding this further discussion of the data, two additional areas need to be explored briefly. These are concerned with the relative competence in speaking/listening between the deaf children and the hearing adults in the talk

8.4 SOME FURTHER COMMENTS ABOUT DEAFNESS

8.4.1 The effect of deafness on the interaction is the same, in spite of the different languages spoken

It can also be said that deafness has the same effect on conversational structure no matter what language is being spoken. It is the very fact of the child’s sensory deficit that to some extent determines the structure of the talk. This has been shown in the similar ‘control’ of the talk (evidenced by the design and local management of turns) by the adults in all the dyads involving deaf children. Other studies of interaction between deaf children and adults also conclude that the fact of the child’s communication disorder is a major influence on the adult interactant’s behaviour. The way this influence is seen, is mainly in the relative efficiency in establishing mutual

The current study has indicated that even when the deaf child and the adult speak a different language in the interaction, certain structural features of the talk, such as orderly management of turn-taking, are no different. However, there does seem to be some cross-linguistic effect operating in the data. This has to do with the Sylheti mothers who speak Sylheti to their deaf sons who speak English. Here, although the structural features of the talk was very similar to the other deaf dyads, the lack of display of interactional management appeared to be directly to do with the language spoken in the talk, as has been argued above.

8.4.2 More about ‘control’ in talk between competent and less competent speakers

The typical three part question sequence has been thoroughly analysed in the data of the participants in this study. It was shown that when this sequence was prevalent, it appeared to curtail the talk, and to concentrate control of the talk with one speaker. Demonstrable, structured control of talk has been shown to be a feature of talk between participants when one is more competent in the use of the language than the other, as in the talk between the adults and the deaf children, and adults and younger normally hearing children.

These conversationally ‘controlling’ sequences can be considered in a positive light. That is that they serve a useful function in keeping talk going between the two speakers. When the structure is used by the participants to overtly confirm and reconfirm their understanding of each other’s turns, then the possibility of misunderstandings is reduced. This enables the more competent speaker (the adult, in this data) to keep track of what the child has said, and to monitor whether or not the child is also keeping track. In this way, intersubjectivity can be ensured. For the child, the conversational structure is predictable, and in itself, is not problematic. S/he knows what is expected. Furthermore, the adult has the opportunity to ‘teach’ the child new words, or the ‘right’ word or a more acceptable realisation of a word. This type of interaction is not exclusive to institutional talk, such as may be observed in the classroom, but is also found in the home environment.
8.5 Evaluation of the Method of Study

8.5.1 Reasons for choosing CA

The reasons for choosing to use CA were fully discussed in chapter 4. As was pointed out in Chapter 3, the choice of a qualitative methodology was prompted by the desire to incorporate into the investigation as many as possible of the complexities inherent in the data, and thus to give as full a description as possible of the conversational interaction of the participants. It was shown, in that chapter, that in order to achieve a generalisable result, acceptable experimental controls over what could be regarded as experimental variables would have to be provided. In order to do this, the variables have first to be defined, and then controlled for, a task which would have been very difficult for variables such as 'pattern of language use at home' where one would have to consider who speaks what language to whom with what frequency, in what situations and with what proficiency. This difficulty of defining the variables, coupled with the difficulty of obtaining sufficient numbers of subjects in each subgroup, for statistical purposes, and in addition, the current paucity of suitable test materials, meant that an experimental method was unworkable as a way of pursuing the aims of this research.

There are other, more descriptive, but nevertheless quantitative methods available to researchers. These are methods of discourse analysis which focus on the linguistic structure of talk rather than on its interactional structure. These methods generally employ the procedures in which a set of categories or units of discourse is defined, and rules for connecting the said categories or units into coherent sequences are formulated. The methods generally rely on the intuition of the analyst in the assignment of turns or chunks of talk to categories (Levinson 1983). Such methods are based on the work of sociolinguists such as Labov, Austin and Searle in the 1970's, and more recently, expressed in the work of Stubbs (1983), to name but a few.

The main reason for not choosing such methods for the current study was to enable the interactional details of the talk to be analysed, taking linguistic structures into account where necessary. Given the nature of the data to be collected, using the CA method meant that categorising utterances into a coding system could be avoided. Categories which may be relevant to normally hearing western English speakers would
not necessarily have relevance for deaf speakers from another language culture. Thus, the use of an inductive method of analysis allowed for the exploration of the mix of (at least) four aspects in the proposed interactions: deafness and normal hearing (implying relative linguistic competence); situation and activity (being recorded at home whilst looking at pictures), culture (western English-speaking and Sylheti-speaking of Bangladeshi origin living in London) and of course, the conversational structure itself.

In contrast to the CA approach used in this study is the method of analysis used by Wood, Wood, Griffiths Howarth and Howarth (1982) and Wood, Wood, Griffiths and Howarth (1986) in their studies of classroom talk between deaf children and their teachers. Wood and his colleagues aimed to investigate the nature of the deaf child’s responses (mean length of utterances) to different linguistic demands (made by the teachers).

To do this, they formulated two coding systems for the analysis of conversations. One was for ‘levels of control’ in which the teachers ‘moves’ were ranked along a continuum of ‘control’: there were 5 levels of control, the most controlling move a teacher could make was an ‘enforced repetition’ (for example, “say ‘I have one at home’”) and the least controlling move was called ‘phatics’ (for example, “Oh lovely!” “hmm”) (Wood et al 1986 p. 185). The second system was to code the function of the teachers’ turns in the conversation (examples are ‘substantive’ moves which carry conversation forward, [such as a question], ‘repair’ moves, ‘continuity’ moves, etc). Using these codes the researchers could calculate a statistic called the ‘teacher power ratio’ which indicated the proportion of questions and enforced repetitions in the teachers’ talk. The child’s responses to the teacher’s moves are recorded in terms of mean length of utterance, and the child’s initiatives (those utterances which are not responses to the teachers’ moves) are also recorded.

Using this system of analysis, Wood and his colleagues showed, for example, that where there is a high teacher power ratio, there is low child initiative, and little tendency for the child to elaborate their responses. These findings (among others) have made an important contribution, particularly in terms of demonstrating the effect of the teacher’s talk on the child’s response. Their analysis concentrated mainly on two-part structures, that is, two consecutive turns, the teacher’s ‘move’ and the child’s response.
The system they used, however, was not able to investigate the interaction between the child and the adult across a sequence of turns. CA was chosen for the current study for the very reason that it would enable an investigation of talk as a sequential phenomenon. In choosing not to use a system of analysis like that of Wood et al (1986), it was possible, in this study, to avoid having to categorise utterances, allowing the analysis to focus on the participants’ interpretation of their talk, as displayed in each turn. In the current data, for example, the utterance “mm” was shown to function in different ways depending on its sequential placement. Had a coding system such as that of Wood et al (1986) been used, this utterance might have been coded as a ‘phatic move’, and its interactional significance and precise formulation might have been overlooked. The difficulties of fitting talk into coding systems is illustrated by Wood et al’s (1986) own data: examination of one of the data segments quoted in Wood et al (1986 p. 71) shows that “mm” occurs in the account of the category “two-choice questions” and is not coded as a ‘phatic move’.

The importance of two-part structures, basic to Wood et al’s approach is also recognised in CA, in the concept of adjacency. However, in CA this concept is then extended to the relation of such adjacent actions to the next action. And then further extended to the relation of paired actions to the systematics of conversational organisation (Heritage 1984). In Wood et al’s analysis of question-answer pairs, there is no direct reference to the turn which follows the answer to a question. In the current data, it has been shown that the sequence of turns following a question gives insights into the conversational intersubjectivity of the talk, making it possible to examine question-answer sequences in more detail. As has been discussed above, one of the findings has been to show how a turn functions as ‘doing questioning’, by demonstrating that turn’s structural design, by indicating its sequential positioning and by analysing the subsequent turns.

Lastly, using CA also meant that the focus of analysis could be on conversational coherence, in which the speakers displayed their intentions to each other in the talk. This had made possible the illustration of the conversational competence of the deaf participants, and has allowed a departure from focusing on their deficiencies.
8.5.2 Possible limitations of the CA method of study

Quantification and generalisability

A perceived limitation of CA concerns the issues of quantification and generalisability within the analyses. Schegloff (1993) has usefully made a distinction between formal and informal quantification, as being different sorts of accounts of undertakings. For example, in the current study, informal quantification of the sort employing terms such as 'usually', 'often', 'seldom' etc. is applied to events or actions that were observed in the data. These terms are not used instead of actual numbers, to refer to actions that were counted, but they are used, in Schegloff's words (ibid pp. 119), "to report an experience or grasp of frequency" (his italics). In order to provide formal quantification of the actions or events observed in talk, the constraints on such quantification would have to be met. As has been mentioned, to do this implies using a methodology in which variables can be controlled, and from which statistical inferences can validly and reliably be made.

As the findings presented here are based on the analysis of relatively little data from relatively few participants, it is possible that the descriptions of the data in this study, and the way in which they have been accounted for, will only ever be applicable to these participants, in the situation they were recorded in for this study. The sample is unrepresentative in the conventional sense (Silverman 1993). However, Schegloff (1993) has pointed out, that it may be the case that the orderliness of conversations may only be detectable at the level of the singular occurrence. Furthermore, he expresses the idea that if a study of aggregates were made, employing formal quantification of some sort and thus warranting the generalisability of findings, there is the chance that such orderliness may not be demonstrated. In considering the necessary limitations on a data corpus for CA, Lerner (1995) suggests that these limitations do not necessarily imply that the features of that data may not be "...instantiations of a more general domain..." (ibid p. 114)

The body of knowledge which has accumulated in the CA field has pointed towards certain orderly events in conversational interactions which appear to be observable in the talk of participants other than those whose talk was originally investigated. One such phenomenon is the notion of the adjacency pair, and the local management of turn taking which adjacency sets up. Turn taking has been shown to have a systematic
organisation which is demonstrable in the talk of participants in many different contexts. This particular feature of conversation was also shown in the current data: in the talk of the deaf children and their carers: the three turn question, answer, receipt sequence followed an orderly pattern and was indeed comparable to the pattern described for other data by other researchers (Tarplee 1996; Gardner 1997).

While it is not possible to make predictions about the talk of all deaf children from Sylheti-speaking families on the basis of the descriptions made here, certain patterns and sequential events reported can defensibly be attributed to the analysis of the data. As has been pointed out in previous chapters, there are indications from the work of other CA researchers, investigating talk between less competent speakers and more competent speakers, that similar actions are taken by participants, and similar events occur in the talk as have been shown here (Tarplee 1996; Gardner 1997; Collins 1996). As has been noted throughout the discussion, the findings reported here are compatible with findings reported elsewhere using other methods.

**Analyst bias**

In this study of deaf children from Sylheti-speaking families, the analyst was western, English-speaking, normally hearing, and inevitably brought to bear upon the analysis her personal experience, expectations, knowledge, and so on. Knowing so many background details of the participants and the context in which the talk took place could be perceived as problematic, insofar as such knowledge could have influenced the analysis of the data, such as in the formulation of conclusions arising from the analysis. However, this is shown not to be the case. For example, the knowledge about the children’s deafness, and the difficulties they have demonstrated (in other contexts, such as at school) in their own speech, and in hearing, not to say understanding, the speech of others, may have influenced conclusions reached about displays of understanding between the participants in the current talk. However, by attending to the fine details of the talk in the interactions, it is possible to gain a fresh insight into the skills of the participants, and to be freed from the conventional bias of the ‘deficit’ model in which deaf children’s spoken language output is usually considered. A case in point from the current data was the observation of how the deaf boys A and Kh displayed their understanding of their mothers’ Sylheti talk in the design of their turns following such talk. It is in this way that CA is a powerful tool for the analysis of any talk.
in which one of the participants is ‘less competent’ in speech and language, than the other, and not only talk between deaf and hearing participants.

Whilst not minimising the possibility that analyst bias could influence the analysis, it is the case that the procedures of CA allow for the context within which the talk occurs to be considered as something which is “endogenously generated within the talk of the participants” (Heritage 1984 p. 283). Once this is appreciated, and the analyst no longer considers the context as an external interpretive source, CA procedures enable the analyst to overcome preconceived expectations.

*Cultural differences between the analyst and the participants*
In this study, not only was the culture of the analyst different from that of families with a deaf child, but also from that of the Sylheti-speaking families. Obviously these differences have the potential to have affected the study, by influencing the interactions between the participants during the data collection at which the analyst was present, and thereafter, by influencing the analysis itself, through all the stages of data scanning, selection, detailed analysis and drawing of conclusions. However, once again, the inductive, data-driven procedures of CA provide a measure of safety from these dangers. It was the experience of the analyst that in several instances, a preconceived culturally-derived assumption about a particular sequence of talk, was undermined as a result of turn by turn analysis of that sequence. For example, contrary to expectations, the non-standard use of English by Kh and his father did not present either of them with demonstrable problems. On the other hand, the detailed analysis also made it possible to find evidence, within the data, for intuitive assumptions about how the participants might be interpreting the data. For example, in the case of what have been called ‘possible misunderstandings’ (see Chapter 7 section 7.2.5) careful analysis revealed that what the analyst expected to be oriented to as a trouble source, in fact was being displayed as such by the participants by the design of their turns (see analysis of fragments KhM3 and A7, and A13).

In fact, the procedures of CA proved very useful in illustrating similarities and differences across the cultures of the participants. For example, the structure of the talk was shown to be essentially the same in the case of W (English-speaking deaf), Kh[F] (deaf, from a Sylheti-speaking family) and K (normally hearing English-speaking).
‘Ordinary’ conversations
CA research usually focuses on ordinary conversational data, gathered in naturally occurring situations. The data collection in this study was not entirely natural, since the conversations were set up, the recording equipment was visible and observers were present. It was also not entirely contrived since the recordings were made in the homes of the participants, all of whom were family members. As was mentioned previously (see chapter 4 section 4.2.2), some degree of contrivance in the collection of conversational data is unavoidable. The ways in which the data collection in this study attempted to capture typical conversations has been detailed in chapter 4.

Reporting the analysis
The laborious detail of the analyses in CA could possibly be considered as a limitation. In the form presented in this dissertation, it certainly would be impractical as a method for use by busy teachers, for example, or speech and language therapists, working in schools and clinics. However, the insights gained into both the child and the adult’s talk provided by such analysis could only assist any educative or therapeutic process. CA’s usefulness as a research tool must be undisputed. As Collins (1991) pointed out, the process of description, following conversation analytical procedures, may appear rather laboured and difficult to read and “the coherence and fluidity of talk may evade the process of description” (ibid p 105). On the other hand, many details which may not otherwise have been uncovered, are exposed, and the resulting descriptions will be closer to the events which are being described.

This chapter has attempted to provide a discussion of several aspects emerging from the data, and to regard these aspects in relation to broader issues in the field of deafness, of bilingualism and of the method of study of conversations. In the following chapter, the discussion will proceed, to address possible practical implications of this work, and to suggest some directions for future research.
PRACTICAL IMPLICATIONS AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

The research reported here has addressed the need for detailed descriptions of children's conversations with their carers expressed in the literature (Richards and Gallaway 1994; Snow 1994). The systematic and explicit characterisation of the phenomena described above contribute to our understanding of conversations involving deaf children. This study has resulted in a corpus of data which is available to interested parties who may wish to access it as being samples of talk between the different groups of participants. The analyses have provided some measure of interpretation of that data, and are also available.

Detailed descriptions of what actually happens in adult:child interactions such as have been reported here have not been prominent in the literature to date. In the vast majority of reported group studies there is a necessary loss of detail about individual differences. Whilst the observations made here may strike a chord with all professionals who work in the field of children's language, and with those who work with deaf children in particular, they do not necessarily lead to a defined set of practical applications and suggestions for either the parents or those professionals. It is hoped, however, that the insights which the study provides will promote an understanding of talk-in-interaction in dyads such as these. In this regard, a few issues arising from the investigation which concern the professional service provision for deaf children in the U.K. will be considered.

The point has been made throughout this work, that in the U.K. there are many deaf children from ethnic minority families, particularly those of South Asian origin. Services for these children are not uniform across the country, as Turner (1996a) recently indicated. In general, there is also a lower uptake of such services by people from ethnic minorities, as reported by Sharma and Love (1991); Barker and Adelman (1994) and Turner (1996a; 1996b).

Professional intervention directed to addressing the particular situations of deaf children and their families for whom English is not the first language aims to be relevant and effective, and also to provide a service 'equal' to that provided for native
English-speaking deaf children. To achieve these aims, the intervention needs to operate from an informed standpoint. As has been mentioned in previous chapters, there is a dearth of information about cultural groups, and about Sylheti-speaking families in particular, although some information is now becoming available. For example, the Health Education Authority (1995) has published a report on their survey of black and ethnic minority groups’ health and lifestyle, including a database of available resources. Given the current incomplete state of knowledge and understanding of the different cultural and linguistic groupings in the U.K., the information base may not be adequate. In this way, commonly held stereotypes and hearsay knowledge may hold sway.

In the area of language development, the underlying beliefs and attitudes, and the roles in that development played by family members may not be the same for the Sylheti culture as for the host culture. The literature on western, child directed speech indicates strongly that parents see themselves as active promoters of language development in their children (see Chapter 1) and that in their talk, they provide opportunities for the teaching/learning of language. We do not know how Sylheti parents regard this issue. There may also not be consensus of approach between the families and western experts or professionals with regard to the role played by family, and parents in particular, in the education of the child. Gregory (1994) pointed out that difficulties arise when, for example, “discourse and participation styles” (ibid p 119) are not shared between a (normally hearing child) and her/his teacher. Undoubtedly, similar difficulties will arise between teacher and deaf child, and deaf child and speech and language therapist. Furthermore, as Langdon (1994) points out, attitudes and practice concerning language development and education may also differ between different members of the family.

Examples of hearsay abound. In 1985 Speedy noted that there was, at that time, an “orthodoxy” amongst white professionals that Asian families did not talk to or play with their children, leading to the conjecture that language development was not encouraged, and, furthermore, that this may bias the child’s progress in education. Sharma and Love (1991) reported that a recurring feature in their interviews with Black and Asian deaf people was the possibility of “commonly-held stereotypes distorting professional decision-making” (ibid p. 17), and that these then affected the delivery of service. Turner (1996a) noted the comments from her respondents that Asian parents may be undemanding of the service provision, and hence a more “superficial” service.
is offered (ibid pp 15). Sharma and Love (1991 p.17) quote the father of a deaf child whose doctor had told him that it was the "bilingual household" in which the child was being reared that was holding back the child's language development. Notions such as 'ethnic minority groups all have supportive extended families' may not always be true. As Justice (1990) pointed out, in many cases, women whose marriages were arranged from afar may find themselves very isolated in London.

Some insight into the problems of acting on hearsay knowledge is provided by Mahtani and Huq (1993) in their report of using a western model in the running of a counselling group on anxiety management for Bangladeshi women. Mahtani and Huq report that they had intuitively thought that the women would not have the cognitive strategies to understand the complex condition of 'anxiety', but in fact, the women came to grips with explanations of the concept of anxiety very quickly.

With respect to deaf children, some of the beliefs held by the 'caring' professions are based on the conviction that the child can be habilitated or rehabilitated into mainstream society, and that facilitating this is the obligation of the professionals involved. Parents who share this conviction will presumably be motivated to take up the service and to participate in it. It is not known how this works for families of Bangladeshi origin. The attitudes of the Sylheti-speaking community towards deafness, towards disability and towards rehabilitation have not been investigated and urgent research is required in this particular area.

Furthermore, there is also the principle that service provision for deaf children should be equal for all members of the society. How this can be achieved is open to question. It cannot be equal to provide services for children from linguistic minorities only in the medium of English, within an English cultural context. By the same token, it would not be 'equal' to provide a service only in spoken language for deaf children whose families are users of BSL. When linguistic minority issues and deafness issues are combined in one family, the integrity of the professionals is tested to the limit. A simple way forward from this difficult position is, at the very least, to bear in mind that the assumption of commonality of attitudes may not lead to the desired end result.
Ideally, effective support for professionals working with deaf children from all linguistic minorities is required, and this would necessitate a number of actions which include the following:

- Resources are needed to provide services in the language of the family, implying the need for training of personnel from minority groups (Duncan 1989). A recent report from the Centre for International Child Health specifically addresses the issue of the training of bilingual support workers, and the training of health professionals to work with the support workers (Leather and Wirz 1996). Staff training with a view to raising consciousness in the health professions in these matters is of prime importance. It is difficult to conduct such training without detailed information about different cultures and their lifestyles, most importantly the attitudes towards health, disability and rehabilitation.
- the development of appropriate assessment materials (Duquette 1992);
- the addition of sensible and sensitive programmes of instruction about minority cultures into the training courses for all professionals (Duquette 1992; Centre for Audiology, Education of the Deaf and Speech Pathology 1996);
- the allocation of resources for the further study of different cultures in the U.K.

Gregory (1994) sums up these ideals with respect to primary education, but her sentiments apply to all service provision.

"If we take seriously the evidence that a child interprets the world in a way consistent with the home culture, we must look to find ways by which we both acknowledge that culture and introduce children explicitly to the new world they are entering in school" (Gregory 1994 p. 121)

The role of speech and language therapists (SLT) is particularly relevant to this discussion. In the past two decades SLT's have developed a close involvement in the deaf community. It is their role in the process of language development of deaf children that is of interest here. Generally speaking, they work closely with teachers of the deaf. Guidelines for speech and language therapists working with deaf people, and with clients from linguistic minority communities have been compiled by what is now the Royal College of Speech and Language Therapists (RCSLT) (CST 1990; Camden and Islington 1995). Although SLT's working with clients from these groups have access to the resources of the national and regional special interest groups (SIGs) in deafness and in bilingualism (under the auspices of the RCSLT) which meet regularly to discuss
issues of service provision to the client groups, there is an urgent need for more
information and research..

For young deaf children, the SLT approach centres around early intervention, in which
the parents are considered to be partners with the therapist and the teacher in the
programme of language development for the child (such as the Hanen programme
(Girolametto, Greenberg and Manolson 1986)). The beginning of this therapeutic
endeavour must lie in the establishment of trust between the professionals and the
parents, based on a mutual belief that a deaf child can indeed become a
communicator. As Turner (1996b) has pointed out, this is a difficult enough process
between therapist and family from the same language and cultural background. It is
that much more complex when the family is from a different language and culture. The
professional may not have much understanding of the deaf child’s family culture, and
the family, for its part, could equally not have insight into the culture of ‘caring’ from
which the therapist is operating. Then the therapist and family may not be speaking the
same language. Furthermore, the interaction itself, the topic of which is the young deaf
child, may be a stressful situation provoking further anxiety and worry for the parents.
Further complications can arise, as Jupp, Roberts and Cook-Gumperz (1985) have
pointed out, situations in which professionals and their clients interact also involve talk
between participants perceived as having significantly different social status.
Communicating under such complex conditions can be problematic for both
participants.

A further challenge to the professional is in the matter of the practical assessments
and procedures used. Preconceived notions about what procedures may or may not be
productive and relevant for the communicative interactions in the clinic or other
institutional settings may adversely affect that interaction. For example, even though
they themselves are Asian, Mahtani and Huq (1993) reported that they mistakenly
thought that the Bangladeshi women in their group would find the use of checklists and
the keeping of written records ‘foreign’. This turned out not to be true, but as a result of
the mistake, much valuable time was lost, information was not collected, and clients did
not return for future appointments. Ostensibly simple matters in rehabilitation
strategies, such as attendance at clinics or at support groups must be handled with
understanding and delicacy. Turner (1996a) noted that where concepts of punctuality
may be different, attendance will be affected.
In respect of SLT intervention with deaf children, the dearth of appropriate tests and assessments for speech and language for linguistic minority groups has been discussed earlier (Chapters 3 and 4). In their recommendations for intervention, Green and Rees (1992) sensibly suggest a pragmatic approach, but they do not include suggestions for overcoming potential cultural barriers. For example, they propose the use of video feedback to parents as a way of targeting their interactional skills, but this may not be appropriate for Asian women. They also remind SLT's of the need for careful assessment of the "...interactional styles used by parents...", but the tools for making such assessments appropriate for use with linguistic minority families are yet to be devised. It is hoped that the insights provided by this study will inform future research in this area in particular.

Speech and language therapists and teachers of the deaf who become involved in a deaf child's habilitation as soon as the diagnosis of deafness is confirmed will always welcome practical suggestions, but insights and information are also valuable. Practical suggestions need to be grounded in research findings, such as provided by the current study. For example, the findings reported here will be relevant to the crucial focus of early intervention with families of deaf children in counselling the family about language development. An understanding of what can promote extended turns at talk and what curtails such talk can inform both the early counselling sessions with parents, and later interaction between the professionals and the deaf children. Lynas (1994) has commented that improved understanding of the process of language acquisition can put teachers of the deaf in a better position to offer constructive advice to the parents of young deaf children. Whilst she does not detail what sort of advice would, in fact, be useful, she suggests that "knowing what was going wrong enables us to put it right" (ibid p.19). Evidence from Wood and Wood (1984) shows how difficult it was for practising teachers to implement practical suggestions such as changing their conversational 'style' with their deaf pupils, even though they had evidence from both research and personal experience that a less 'controlling' style promoted more talk from the child. It may be the case that the development of interactional skills in a multicultural setting could be addressed at the prequalification stage of training of professionals. This is an area for future research.
An important aspect of early intervention with deaf children (both from English-speaking families, and from families where English is not spoken) concerns the tricky problem of which language the child should learn first. In some quarters, the acquisition of British Sign Language as the deaf child’s first language is promoted as being the best alternative. There is a growing movement in the U.K. towards the empowerment of Deaf people as an identifiable language group, rather than as a group who are disabled by their sensory impairment (Gregory, Bishop and Sheldon 1995; Beazley and Moore 1995; Daigle 1995). However, in the matter of professional counselling about language development, unless there is adequate provision for the family to be trained in BSL themselves, quickly, and without undue expense, and, there is then adequate provision and resources for the child to progress to a bilingual school, this could be a course of action which may fail all the key players: the families, the deaf child and the well-intentioned professionals. Evidence of problems with this approach were reported by Sharma and Love (1991). They quote the example of fathers and/or husbands of deaf people of Muslim faith who were reported not be comfortable in signing classes in which there are many women, and vice versa for wives and mothers. Essential aspects of signing, such as eye contact, may be anathema in cultures where eye contact is seen as being rude, or is not acceptable between men and women. There is the risk that if well-intentioned but wrong decisions are made about the language spoken to the deaf child, not only may the parents be unable to communicate with their deaf child, but that deaf child, being from a minority group, may not later be accepted into the Deaf culture (Gregory, Bishop and Sheldon 1995).

Alternatively, linguistic minority language families may be recommended to speak English to their deaf child. This too may be risky. Similar problems to the BSL alternative arise, in that affordable, convenient, socially comfortable classes for the learning of the additional language may be hard to find. How will the family learn English quickly enough in an acceptable manner to provide the input considered necessary for the child’s language development? The best alternative for families like these may be to encourage them to speak to their deaf children in their own language, providing that resources for the supporting of this alternative are made available.

Clearly it would be sensible for the parents of deaf children and those whose children are learning English as their second language to have a choice in this matter, since language and culture are so closely associated. But the matter of parental choice
depends upon the approach of the professionals, from which stem the policies and budget allocations which may enable real choice. The resources and the policies of local authorities will determine these issues. As Turner (1996b) has noted, in order that the needs of pre-school deaf children from ethnic minority families may be met, extra resources are needed to afford the children "equal opportunities for optimal development" (ibid p. 91). Working on the premise that policy decisions at that level are informed by professional advice about the children, or the 'disability' concerned, it is hoped that studies like this, which draw attention to cross cultural and cross linguistic issues, will be useful.

Before finally concluding this report, some further indications for research arising from this study are made.

The development of Sylheti and of English in children of Bangladeshi origin
One of the main suggestions for further research is the need for a thorough investigation of the development of language in Sylheti-speaking children living in the U.K. Such a study, using survey techniques and ethnographic methodologies, would further the understanding of many issues which are currently not accessible to western professionals. It would also provide background data to develop informal and formal assessment procedures for deaf children and other children with speech and language disorders.

Further analysis of the current data
The corpus of data which has been collected for the current study can be used for further analysis. Given that the method of study using CA provided insights into the aspects of conversations analysed so far, other aspects could profitably be investigated. In particular, it would be of great value to examine the repair strategies in the talk in more detail, particularly with regard to the talk between the Sylheti-speakers who speak English in their interactions, and the manner in which they deal with non-standard English forms. Close examination of repair strategies used in this corpus would further elucidate the procedures by which the participants in the interactions ensure intersubjectivity in their talk.
Analysis of talk in activities other than looking at pictures

It would also be of great interest and value to examine conversations that were recorded which did not arise from the activity of looking at pictures (e.g. the ‘chatting’ talk and the talk concerning the toys). Not all the dyads had these conversations (as was pointed out in Chapter 4, the activity of looking at pictures was the only consistent activity across the dyads). Thus cross-dyad comparisons would not be possible. However, such analyses would broaden the picture for individual children. This would also demonstrate how picture book sequences may or may not be representative of, or mirror, other sorts of talk. This has implications for assessment procedures. For example, as was shown in chapter 8, the ‘chat’ (as opposed to the picture talk) between A and Kh and their mothers was similar to the picture book talk with respect to recipient design. This may or may not be the case for the other children in the sample.

In several of the data collection sessions, the children were also recorded talking to various other adults and in some cases to other siblings, who were present at the time. It would further enhance the picture to investigate these conversations further. Insights into the similarities and differences between parent:child and sibling:child talk could be gained.

Analysis of new data

A further collection of additional data involving talk in Sylheti between normally hearing and speaking Sylheti speakers, across different generations, would ideally make it possible to formulate a basis from which conversations between Sylheti-speakers speaking English, and speaking to a deaf child, could be evaluated. It will be of particular interest to investigate the use of “mm” markers by Sylheti-speaking women (see chapter 7).

In conclusion, it is hoped that the detailed descriptions provided in this research may contribute to the body of knowledge to which professionals refer when considering the complex situation of deaf children from families where English is not the main language spoken at home. It is not unusual that more than one language is spoken in these homes. Recommendations as to which language to use with the child at home are difficult to make: mother tongue? English? sign language? As has been discussed in previous chapters, there is much debate and concern but little agreement amongst professionals as to the relative merits of the different approaches in the home and in schools, but the evidence from this study supports the notion that the family should be
encouraged, with the employment of appropriate resources, to use their own language with their deaf child.

Lastly, this study has demonstrated that CA is a powerful tool for the study of talk involving a participant who has a communication disability. Applying CA to such conversations is a relatively new area of investigation, and this study has contributed to the growing body of knowledge in the field, both empirically and in respect of methodology.
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APPENDIX 1

AUDIOLOGICAL PROFILES OF THE DEAF CHILDREN IN THE PRELIMINARY STUDY
Audiological Information

Name/Number: F.B. 81

Date of birth: 20.12.87

Date of test: 11.11.87

School: C. H.U.

Description of hearing impairment: Appears to be severe bilateral sensori-neural loss

Otology: Not known

Hearing aids: Home: Bosch x 2

School: Siemens

Audiogram

Results not available.
AUDILOGICAL INFORMATION

Name/Number.......................... EK S2 (E2L)
Date of birth...................... 4-5-87 Date of test........... 5-92
School............... Hill
Description of hearing impairment.............................. Profound bilateral sensori-neural loss + conductive component.
Otology.................................................. Bilateral granuloma
Hearing aids: Home: Phenak Andinet x 2
School: Phenix ear 421

AUDIOPHONIC INFORMATION

Right ear

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency (Hz)</th>
<th>Hearing Level (dB)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4000</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8000</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Left ear

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency (Hz)</th>
<th>Hearing Level (dB)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4000</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8000</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AUDILOGICAL INFORMATION

Name/Number: E. A
Date of birth: 27.9.87
Date of test: 26.3.92
School: H.H.
Description of hearing impairment: Moderate bilateral sensori-neural loss with conductive component
Otology: Bilateral grammes

Hearing aids: Home: B.E. 35's x 2
School: Sennheiser

AUDIGRAM

Not testable

Right ear

Frequency (Hz)

Left ear

Frequency (Hz)

Reflexes:

Left

Right

500 Hz 85
1000 Hz 95
2000 Hz 105
4000 Hz 85
85
AUDIOLOGICAL INFORMATION

Name/Number: Y.B. 84 (E21)
Date of birth: 23.11.84 Date of test: 5.92
School: L. H.U.

Description of hearing impairment: Moderate bilateral sensori-neural loss worse in high frequencies
Otology: Bilateral grommets

Hearing aids: Home: Oticon E43 x2 School: Phonicon ear 421

AUDIOGRAM
AUDIOLOGICAL INFORMATION

Name/Number: KU 85 (E2L)

Date of birth: 19.9.87
Date of test: 7.92

School: K. HU

Description of hearing impairment: Severe sensori-neural loss on left. Mild-moderate conductive on right

Otology: Bilateral OME. Bilateral gammets

Hearing aids: Home: AM 120 PEC (left)
School: Planar ear 421

AUDIOGRAM
AUDIOLOGICAL INFORMATION

Name/Number.............. D.K. SS (EIL)
Date of birth............. 29.7.87
Date of test............. 5.92
School..................... HL
Description of hearing impairment... Severe Bilateral
                             Sensori-neural loss
Otology..................... Bilateral. O.M.E. and wax

Hearing aids: Home: Phoner Picafone C K2
               School: Phonic ear 421

AUDIOGRAM

Right ear

Left ear

Frequency (Hz)

Hearing Level (dB)
AUDILOGICAL INFORMATION

Name/Number ........................................ C.D. S.T. (E/I.E.)
Date of birth ........................................ 6-6-87
Date of test ......................................... 7-92
School ................................................... L. #IU

Description of hearing impairment: Profound bilateral (progressive) sensori-neural loss

Otolaryngology: Granuloma in Right Ear

Hearing aids: Home: Oticon E30 V
School: Phonics Ear 421

AUDIOGRAM

Results very unreliable.
AUDIOLOGICAL INFORMATION

Name/Number.............................................. K.E. 88 (E1L)
Date of birth........................................... 13.4.87
Date of test............................................. 9.92
School..................................................... A.U.H.U.

Description of hearing impairment: Left: severe to profound sensorineural, worse in high frequencies. Right: NR.

Otology........................................................

Hearing aids: Home: Unitron US 80PP
School: Phonix Ear 421

AUDIOGRAM

Right ear: N.R.

Frequency (Hz)

Left ear

Frequency (Hz)
AUDILOGICAL INFORMATION

Name/Number: H. T. 89 (E14)

Date of birth: 9.9.87

Date of test: 

School: H.T.U.

Description of hearing impairment: Profound bilateral sensori-neural loss

Otology: O.K.

Hearing aids: Home: Post Audials X 2 (E30U)

School: Phonics Ear 421

AUDIOGRAM

NOT AVAILABLE
Audiological Information

Name/Number: E. Mcc 810 (E14)

Date of birth: 1.3.88 Date of test: 2.92

School: H. H. L.

Description of hearing impairment: Moderate to severe sensori-neural loss, worse in left ear

Otology: Bilateral grommets

Hearing aids: Home: Phonak Picofone P.14

School: Phonak Ear 421

Audiogram
AUDIOLOGICAL INFORMATION

Name/Number          AS 511 (E1L)

Date of birth       26.12.87       Date of test     12.3.92

School               C.H.I.U.

Description of hearing impairment: Moderate to severe bilateral sensor-neural loss

Otology: Has had bilateral OME. Left ear - commnets in file.

Hearing aids: Home: RE 18's

School: Sennheiser

AUDIOGRAM

Right ear

Left ear

Frequency (Hz)

Hearing Level (dB)
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(see also Table VIII Chapter 4 section 4.2.1)..........................................................310

Key to abbreviations:

L1 = First language
E2L = E2L Toy Test (Vocabulary) (Bellman, Mahon and Triggs 1996)
RST = Rapid Screening Test of Derbyshire Language Scheme
WPPSI-R_UK = Wechsler Preschool and Primary Scale of Intelligence - Revised for U.K.
OA = Object Assembly subtest of WPPSI-R_UK
BD = Block Design subtest of WPPSI-R_UK
Results of tests for all the deaf children.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name, L1 &amp; d.o.b.</th>
<th>Age at time of testing</th>
<th>RST</th>
<th>E2L</th>
<th>WPPSI- UK</th>
<th>WPPSI- UK</th>
<th>WPPSI- UK</th>
<th>WPPSI- UK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OA Raw score</td>
<td>OA: Scaled score</td>
<td>BD Raw score</td>
<td>BD: Scaled score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S (Sylheti) 12/10/87</td>
<td>6.8.15</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>1/3</td>
<td>0/4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A (Sylheti) 29/9/87</td>
<td>6.8.29</td>
<td>5/6</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>0/3</td>
<td>0/3</td>
<td>0/4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W (English) 22/7/87</td>
<td>6.11.12</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>1/3</td>
<td>1/4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F (English) 1/3/88</td>
<td>6.3.9</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>3/3</td>
<td>3/3</td>
<td>2/4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kh (Sylheti) 19/7/87</td>
<td>6.8.14</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>3/3</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>2/4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results of tests for Sylheti-speaking normally hearing children aged 6-7 years
(for possible pairing with deaf children A, Kh and S (shaded))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name &amp; d.o.b</th>
<th>Age at time of testing</th>
<th>RST</th>
<th>E2L</th>
<th>WPPSI-Ruk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A 29/9/87</td>
<td>6.8.29</td>
<td>5/6</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>19/32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 12/10/87</td>
<td>6.8.15</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>27/32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kh 19/9/87</td>
<td>6.8.14</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>23/32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Si 24/9/87</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>30/32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sh 21/1/88</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>25/32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ra 28/3/88</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>27/32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kha 14/7/88</td>
<td>6.11</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>31/32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jo 10/11/87</td>
<td>6.11</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>26/32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Results of tests for English-speaking normally hearing children aged 6-7 years
(for possible pairing with deaf children W and F (shaded))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name &amp; dob</th>
<th>Age at time of testing</th>
<th>RST</th>
<th>E2L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W 22/7/87</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>2/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Se 3/7/87</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>3/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P 12/5/87</td>
<td>7.01</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Da 19/6/87</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J 20.10.87</td>
<td>7.00.05</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F (English)</td>
<td>6.3.9</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 25/3/88</td>
<td>6.3.3</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 10/1/88</td>
<td>6.5.18</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Li 26/1/88</td>
<td>6.5.2</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results of tests for Sylheti-speaking normally hearing children aged 4-5 years
(for possible pairing with deaf children A, Kh and S (shaded))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name &amp; dob</th>
<th>Age at time of testing</th>
<th>RST</th>
<th>E2L</th>
<th>OA Raw score</th>
<th>OA: Scaled score</th>
<th>BD Raw score</th>
<th>BD: Scaled score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A 29/9/87</td>
<td>6.8.29</td>
<td>5/6</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>0/3</td>
<td>0/3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 12/10/87</td>
<td>6.8.15</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>1/3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kh 19/9/87</td>
<td>6.8.18</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>3/3</td>
<td>2/4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23/32 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ek 15/11/88</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>3/3</td>
<td>1/3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Em 26/1/89</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>1/3</td>
<td>2/4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Af 12/1/89</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>1/4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sha 23/1/89</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>3/3</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>1/4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WPPSI-RUK
Results of tests for English-speaking normally hearing children aged 4-5 years (for possible pairing with deaf children W and F (shaded))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name &amp; dob</th>
<th>Age at time of testing</th>
<th>RST</th>
<th>E2L</th>
<th>OA Raw score</th>
<th>OA: Scaled score</th>
<th>BD Raw score</th>
<th>BD: Scaled score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W 22/7/87</td>
<td>6.11.12</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>1/3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25/32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>31/42</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jos 25/5/89</td>
<td>5.2.25</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>3/3</td>
<td>3/3</td>
<td>4/4</td>
<td>25/32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>29/42</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cha 4/4/89</td>
<td>5.3.7</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>3/3</td>
<td>3/3</td>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>17/32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12/42</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ma 23/1/88</td>
<td>6.6.5</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>3/3</td>
<td>3/3</td>
<td>4/4</td>
<td>28/32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22/42</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 1/3/88</td>
<td>6.3.9</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>3/3</td>
<td>3/3</td>
<td>2/4</td>
<td>25/32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20/42</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ha 20/10/89</td>
<td>4.8.3</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>1/3</td>
<td>3/3</td>
<td>1/4</td>
<td>15/32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10/42</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El 29/9/89</td>
<td>4.9.18</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>3/3</td>
<td>1/3</td>
<td>1/4</td>
<td>22/32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17/42</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 21/10/89</td>
<td>4.8.4</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>3/3</td>
<td>3/3</td>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>26/32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10/42</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary of participants finally included in the study (see also Table VIII Chapter 4 section 4.2.1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name &amp; d.o.b.</th>
<th>Hearing status</th>
<th>Home language</th>
<th>Age at time of testing</th>
<th>Rapid Screening Test (Derbyshire Language Scheme)</th>
<th>E2L</th>
<th>WPPSI-RUK</th>
<th>WPPSI-RUK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W 22/7/87</td>
<td>Deaf</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>6.11.12</td>
<td>6/6 6/6 2/3 1/3 1/4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 21/10/89</td>
<td>Normal hearing</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>4.8.4</td>
<td>6/6 6/6 3/3 3/3 3/4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J 20.10.87</td>
<td>normal hearing</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>7.00.05</td>
<td>6/6 6/6 3/3 3/3 4/4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 29/9/87</td>
<td>Deaf</td>
<td>Sylheti</td>
<td>6.8.29</td>
<td>5/6 6/6 0/3 0/3 0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kh 19/9/87</td>
<td>Deaf</td>
<td>Sylheti</td>
<td>6.8.14</td>
<td>6/6 6/6 3/3 2/3 2/4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E 26/1/89</td>
<td>Normal hearing</td>
<td>Sylheti</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>6/6 6/6 2/3 1/3 2/4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This Appendix contains the following:

1) Audiological case history information for the deaf children
These are the child's most recent hearing test results and current hearing aid usage compiled from the school records and information given by parents and teachers.

2) Family information for all the families
These are outlines of the family structure and the the patterns of language use in the family, compiled from the information obtained during the structured interviews. A copy of the interview questions are given on page

The sequence is as follows (arranged alphabetically by first name of child, with all the deaf children first, followed by all the normally hearing children):

A...............................................................................................312
Kh............................................................................................314
W..............................................................................................316
E................................................................................................318
J................................................................................................319
Jo..............................................................................................320
K................................................................................................321

Suggested interview questions used to obtain information.....322
A has a bilateral moderate to severe sensori-neural hearing loss, worse in the high frequencies. His right ear has a retracted drum which is also perforated. The left drum is ventilated. His hearing loss was diagnosed when he was 12 months old, and he was issued with hearing aids at this time. He has bilateral BE34 hearing aids for use at home, but he seldom wears the aids. He uses a Sennheiser radio system at school.

Pure Tone Audiogram

Date of test: March 1994
An interview with A's mother made it possible to formulate a picture of the pattern of language use in the home. A's parents and other relatives speak Sylheti to each other and to the children. A's sister is learning English at school, and she speaks a mixture of English and Sylheti to A, but only speaks Sylheti to the adults. Mother speaks very little English although she does understand some. Father learned English at secondary school, but does not use it at home. He is frequently absent from the home for long periods of time. English is mainly used at the children's school, at the hospital or clinic and at the shops when necessary. According to his mother, A is best at speaking English which he learned at school, although he can understand a few words of Sylheti. She considers English to be his first language. The family watch television in English, and also watch videos in Bengali and Hindi.
Kh has a mixed moderate to severe hearing loss in his left ear, and a mild to moderate mixed loss in his right ear. He has chronic bilateral otitis media. His hearing loss was first diagnosed when he was about 2 years old. Hearing aids were issued at this time. He has bilateral post aural BE 31 aids at home, but does not use them consistently. He uses a Phonic Ear 421 radio system at school.

**Pure Tone Audiogram**

**Date of test: July 1993**
Family information for Kh (as of July 1994) [Interviewer: AH]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Date arrived in U.K. or date of birth</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>First language</th>
<th>Other languages spoken</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Occupation / working</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Sylheti</td>
<td>Occasional English</td>
<td>Attended secondary school in Bangladesh</td>
<td>Housewife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Sylheti</td>
<td>Occasional English</td>
<td>Attended secondary school in U.K.</td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kh</td>
<td>9/87</td>
<td>6.10</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>A little Sylheti</td>
<td>Attends H.I.U. at primary school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sister</td>
<td>8/88</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Sylheti</td>
<td>Learning English</td>
<td>Attends primary school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sister</td>
<td>4/92</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Learning Sylheti</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When interviewed, Kh's parents indicated that they speak Sylheti at home to each other all the time. When speaking to their children, they use Sylheti and father sometimes uses English. The children use both languages when speaking to each other. Kh communicates mainly in English which is the language his parents consider he is best at. Father has a fair command of English, but mother's English is rudimentary. It is the mother who spends most time with Kh. Outside their home, they use English at the schools, at the hospital or clinic and at the shops. Kh has to learn Arabic for religious purposes. The family watch videos in Bengali, in Hindi and occasionally in English. The parents are very keen for Kh to improve his English as they feel that he is getting a lot from his school and he has made good progress. They hope that with the support of the school he will overcome his problems.
CASE HISTORY INFORMATION FOR W

W has a bilateral profound sensori-neural hearing loss at 500 Hz and above. Below 500 Hz he has a bilateral mild to moderate sensori-neural hearing loss. His loss was diagnosed at 13 months following meningitis. He was issued with hearing aids at that time.

He uses a Transposer FT40 hearing aid at home, and at school, this is linked to the Phonic Ear 475. He uses his aids consistently and well at school and at home.

Pure Tone Audiogram

Date of test: June 94
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of birth</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>First language</th>
<th>Other languages spoken</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Occupation / working</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td>A-levels in U.K.</td>
<td>Housewife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td>Left school at 16</td>
<td>Insurance broker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sister</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td>Attends primary school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sister</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td>Attends primary school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>7/87</td>
<td>6.9 English</td>
<td></td>
<td>Attends primary school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brother</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td>Attends primary school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The family only speak English. When W was first diagnosed, they used lots of gestures to communicate with him, and they also used some British Sign Language signs.
**Family Information for E**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Date arrived in U.K. or date of birth</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>First language</th>
<th>Other languages spoken</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Occupation / working</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Sylheti</td>
<td>Occasional English</td>
<td>Finished primary education in Bangladesh</td>
<td>Housewife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Sylheti</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Finished primary school in Bangladesh</td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brothers</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Sylheti</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>O'levels in U.K.</td>
<td>Restaurant worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Sylheti</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>At secondary school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>dob 7/86</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Sylheti</td>
<td>English sometimes</td>
<td>At primary school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>dob 1/89</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>Sylheti</td>
<td>Starting to learn English</td>
<td>At primary school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>dob 4/94</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>Sylheti</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sisters</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Sylheti</td>
<td>English sometimes</td>
<td>Up to ‘O’level in Bangladesh</td>
<td>Housewife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Sylheti</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>At secondary school in U.K.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When interviewed, E’s mother gave the following insight into the family’s pattern of language use. She and her husband speak Sylheti to each other, to their children and to their relatives at home. The children speak a mixture of Sylheti and English to each other, but they mainly speak Sylheti to E. The parents use English when they visit the hospital, clinic or school. E watches television and English videos. He goes to religious school, and has to learn Arabic. His mother thinks that E speaks Sylheti best, but that his English is improving at school.
Family information for J (as of September 1994) [Interviewer: MM]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Date arrived in U.K. or date of birth</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>First language</th>
<th>Other languages spoken</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Occupation / working</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td>Left school at 15</td>
<td>Housewife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td>Completed secondary modern</td>
<td>Musician</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>10/87</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td>Attends primary school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sister</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td>Attends nursery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The family only speak English.
### FAMILY INFORMATION FOR JO

Family information for Jo (as of September 1994) [Interviewer: MM]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date arrived in U.K. or date of birth</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>First language</th>
<th>Other languages spoken</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Occupation / working</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Sylheti</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Matriculated in Bangladesh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Sylheti</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Matriculated in Bangladesh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jo</td>
<td>11/87</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Sylheti</td>
<td>Fluent English</td>
<td>Attends primary school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sister</td>
<td>/72</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Sylheti</td>
<td>Fluent English</td>
<td>BSc degree in U.K.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sister</td>
<td>/74</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Sylheti</td>
<td>Fluent English</td>
<td>A-levels in U.K.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Everyone in the family can speak English, the sisters consider themselves and Jo to be fluently bilingual. The children all speak Sylheti to their parents, although Jo is a bit better in English. The children usually speak English to each other. The parents speak Sylheti to each other and to the children. Sylheti was Jo's first language, but he could speak English before he started nursery school. He has to learn Arabic at religious school. The family watch television, and occasionally English language films on video.
CASE HISTORY INFORMATION FOR K

Family information for K (as of July 1994) [Interviewer: MM]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Date arrived in U.K. or date of birth</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>First language</th>
<th>Other languages spoken</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Occupation / working</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td>Librarianship diploma</td>
<td>Temping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Hindi</td>
<td></td>
<td>Accountant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sister</td>
<td>10/86</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td>Attends primary school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>10/89</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td>Attends primary school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother's Sister</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td>A-levels in Ireland</td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The family speak only English at home. Father also speaks Hindi. K learned some Hindi words when the family visited relatives in India, but has now forgotten them.
May 1994
Suggested questions for interviews with parents/carers and teachers

Information gathered by

1. SUBJECT INFORMATION
   Name
   Date of Birth
   Home address
   Telephone
   School
   Class and teacher
   Date of first entry into school
   Nursery ? Specialist ? Ordinary ?
   Test/Date of test
   Date of recording

2. AUDIOLOGICAL DETAILS
   Audiology clinic
   Consultant
   TOD/Social worker/Link worker
   Most recently tested at
       date
       tester
   Audiogram/other results available?
   First diagnosed by
       approx. date
   Type of loss
   Etiology
   Family history of hearing impairment
   Otological complications
   History of medical intervention
   Hearing aids: when first issued?
       type at home
       settings
   Last moulds made: date and type
       type at school
   pattern of use at home
   pattern of use at school

3. USE OF INFORMAL SIGN SYSTEM/S
   at home
   by whom
   comments
   at school
   comments
4. INFORMATION ABOUT PATTERN OF LANGUAGE USE IN HOUSEHOLD
Who in family speaks English?
Where did they learn English?
Which language is mainly spoken at home?
When/where is English used outside home?
Is learning English considered important?
If yes, why?
What language/s do you and adult relatives speak to the children?
When and proficiency?
What language/s do you and adult relatives speak to each other?
When and proficiency?
What language/s do the children speak to each other?
When and proficiency?
Who spends most time with the child in the project?
What language/s do they speak to the child?
If T.V/videos are watched by the child, what language/s are they in?
If the child attends religious ceremonies, what language are they in?
Does child have to learn a religious language?
At what age did the child start to speak their mother tongue?
At what age did the child start to speak English?
Which language is the child best at?
Attitude to deafness?

5. INFORMATION ABOUT FAMILY MEMBERS IN HOUSEHOLD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>date arrived U.K.</th>
<th>age</th>
<th>L1</th>
<th>other L's</th>
<th>education</th>
<th>occupation/working</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brother/s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sister/s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. TEACHERS
Language/s used in class.................................
Language used in playground...........................
Child’s overall school performance: ..................
Performance in oral English: ...........................
Non-verbal abilities: ..................................
Reading ability: .....................................
Group discussion: ....................................
One:one conversation: ...............................
APPENDIX 4
TRANSCRIPTIONS OF DATA SEGMENTS

Transcription Notation

The notational system in these transcriptions is based on that detailed by Levinson (1983:369-70) and by Atkinson and Heritage 1984:i-xvi).

References:

Simultaneous utterances [[ ]] Overlapping utterances [ ]
Contiguous utterances =
Intervals between utterances (10ths of sec) () less than 0.5 sec

lengthening :::::
loudness CAPS
quiet * *
aspersions/inhalations (hh)
vocalisations ((cough))
details of conversational scene ((phone rings))
transcriptionist doubt ( ) or ( unintelligible)

omitted sections: horizontal ellipsis 1. Ma: he said . . . y'know
vertical ellipsis 5. Ma: she said hello *


The transcriptions are presented in the following order (as for Appendix 3):

4.1.1 A with Mother [pictures] (colloquial translation) .....................................325
4.1.2 A with Mother [pictures] (word-for-word translation) .................................330
4.1.3 A with Mother [chat] (colloquial translation) .............................................337
4.1.4 A with Mother [chat] (word-for-word translation) .....................................339
4.2 Kh with Father .....................................................................................342
4.3.1 Kh with Mother [pictures] (colloquial translation).......................................347
4.3.2 Kh with Mother [pictures] (word-for-word translation).................................350
4.3.3 Kh with Mother [chat] (colloquial translation) ............................................356
4.3.4 Kh with Mother [chat] (word-for-word translation)......................................359
4.4 W with Father .....................................................................................366
4.5.1. E with Sister (colloquial translation).......................................................370
4.5.2 E with Sister (word-for-word translation).................................................374
4.6 J with Mother......................................................................................381
4.7 Jo with Sister ......................................................................................384
4.8 K with Mother......................................................................................388
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APPENDIX 4.1.1 A WITH MOTHER [PICTURES] (COLLOQUIAL TRANSLATION)

A is a deaf boy, aged 6 years 9 months. In this segment he is looking at a family photograph album with his mother (M)

Talk in Sylheti has been translated into colloquial English. To indicate the translated talk, different typefaces are used as follows:
All utterances which are said in English are printed like this.
All utterances which have been translated from Sylheti to English are printed like this.

Family names in Sylheti are printed in bold and the meaning given in a footnote.

Signs are occasionally used. These are transcribed as follows:
spoken word plus sign
[sign only]

* indicates a new photo

There are occassional contributions from the researcher (R) and the interpreter (I)

M: * { (points to a photo))
A: LOOK
    (1.0) { (points to the same photo as M))
A: MY PLANE
    (1.3) { (holds up a photo for the camera))
M: "plane" { (looks at Altab))
R: plane lovely
A: MY BANGAL
M: (1.5) { (smiles and crinkles eyes) Bang
A: "LOOK MY BANGLA (1.7)
M: o; Bangl Is he from Bangladesh
I: his plane from Bangladesh ((I talks to sister in Sylheti))
M: ((looks left; is momentarily distracted))
A: yes (1.5) { (addresses to I; nods and points to himself)) I got Bengali
    (1.6)
M: mmm (0.8) i Bangladesh (unintelligible)
A: loo:: me plane
M: oh:=
A: =and (0.9) hey (1.2) hey (1.8) { (looks up at camera and
gestures to R to get her attention)) I got I got big (.)
plai: (. my (1)
{(A looks at a new photo on the same page))
M: "aeroplane" * Who's that ((pointing to granny in the photo
is attending to))
A: bibi
M: * who's that ((pointing to little brother in the same photo))
A: Alamin
M: * Shani Shani { (points to sister in the photo))
Alamin { (points to a new photo on the same page) * Mummy is
not there ((A refuses to look at the photo she is pointing to))

Bibi means an old woman or grandmother not necessarily related to the speaker.
A: not that (. ) * that ((looks at a different photo; pushes mother's hand off the album))
M: OK OK I have seen Bangladesh
A: no (. ) ((A turns the page)) * got one more= ((he shows a new photo to the camera))
M: =um (1.4 ) ((A turns the page))
A: *one more*
(2.7)
M: *((points to a photo)) * That's Altab
(2.7)
A: small BABY=
M: =um (1.4 ) ((A turns the page) )
A: °one more°
(2.7)
M: °who's that ° Who's that ((pointing to a different person in the photo each time))
A: mum
(0.5)
M: * who's that ((points to a new photo on the same page))
A: *((looks where she's pointing))
M: Shani
(2.3)
A: °Shani° ((turns the page))
M: *((nods)) uh (0.9) ° Shanaz ((pointing to a photo))
(4.3)
((knock on door))
M: *((points to another photo on same page)) * who's that (1.5)
dadi²
(2.0)
A: *((turns over page; points to a photo)) * Who's that
M: hm is that mummy ((pointing to the same photo)) (3.4) is that baby (1.7) (unintelligible)=
A: =what that ((points to the same photo again))
M: hm (3.2) *((points to a different photo on same page)) * Is that affa³
(2.8)
A: who that ((points to the photo M is still pointing at))
M: affa ((keeps pointing to the photo)) (3.4) mm
((sound of baby breathing))
A: sister ((turns attention to another photo on same page))
* LOOK MY DAD ((looks up at camera and then looks to the right))
(2.9)
M: hmm ?
(3.3) ((A looks up at camera, trying to get R's attention))
R: tell your mom
A: wha ? ((addressed to R))
R: tell your mom ((points to M))
M: uh That's your dad (1.5) ((points to a different photo))°
Shani
(2.7) ((continues pointing to this photo)) * who's that (. )
Jalal (3.0) brother (1.6)
((A turns the page))
M: *((M points to a photo on this page)) ° Shani=
A: *((A points to a different photo on same page)) ° =look the my baby
M: ALTAB ((looks at Altab))
A: °laughs°=

² Dadi means paternal grandmother.
³ Affa means sister or girl cousin.
M: ="you baby"
A: (1.8) ((smiles up at camera; looks at mother; turns over page; turns back page)) look
M: I have seen I have seen=
A: =Look look ((holds book up to camera))
M: I have seen I have seen I have seen ((tries to turn to next page))
A: look=
M: =uh=
A: =me ((shows picture to camera))
M: mm
A: me (laughs)
M: mm Altab
((sound of Baby in background))
A: ( (turns to attention to another photo on same page) ) * my bicycle
M: ((points to this photo and nods)) uhu Shani (2.3)
A: Shani bicycle ?
M: mm ( . ) bicycle
A: my bicycle ?
M: um ((nods))
A: LOOK MY BICYCLE ((looks at camera))
M: ohya They have seen they have seen your bicycle
A: (1.25) LOOK=
M: =they have seen =((gives Altab a gentle push with her shoulder))
A: =look my bicycle
M: uh (.) Altab's bicycle (2.9)
M: * who's that ((points to a new photo))
A: my dad
M: (points to another person in the photo) * and that ?
A: he brother
M: hmm ?
A: look ((pointing to photo and holding the book up to the camera))
M: * who's that ((points to a new photo))
A: * look= ((he is attending to a different photo))
M: =hm
A: who he got kalama4 [kalama means maternal aunt] (1.5)
he got kalama((looks to the right in direction of I and sister)
M: they have seen they have seen (. ) kalama
A: look (1.1) kalama ((he looks up at camera))
M: umm (1.5) kala. ((looks up at camera))
A: * I want. ((looks up at R; addresses request to R))
R: when you've finished
A: ((looks back at picture)) kalama
M: uhu (.) kalama((looks to the right, then down at album, points to the aunt in the photo))
A: * who that ((points to another woman in the photo))
M: uh ( . ) affa [affa means sister or girl cousin]
A: * him ? ((points to another woman in the photo))
M: kalama=
A: =he brother your brother ?= ((points to two men in the photo))
M: =who's that who's that ((she points to a different woman))

4Kalama means maternal aunt.
A: your mum
M: hnn= ((shakes her head))
A: =that your brother ? ((looks at mother; points back to the two men))
M: mm ((nods her head)) sister
A: ((looks at camera, shows photo)) it she sister ((points to mother))
M: mm (. ) sister ((nods her head))
   (2.2) ((M turns the page))
M: mama^5 ((M points to a man in a new photo)
A: mama (. ) my (. ) mama
M: mm
A: that my (. ) THAT my mum ((to camera; pointing to the same photo)
M: hmm
   (2.3) ((M tries to turn page; A prevents her and points to a new photo))
A: * what that
   (2.0)
M: Shani
   (2.1) ((A turns the page; M points to a new photo))
M: * Shani (1.6) * Altab ((pointing to another photo on this page)) (1.6) little baby(1.5)
A: me big he small * who that ((points to another photo; looks up at mother))
M: (laughs gently) Altab
A: me I'm big
M: eh (1.0) ((points to another photo on this page)) * Shana:z (2.5) ((A laughs, puts both hands to head copying pose of Shanaz in photo; M laughs; A looks to the right, towards sister))
A: look you
M: (laughs) (1.6) ((looks towards sister, points to picture))
A: (laughs) you (1.5) ((still looking at sister, addressing her) that you
M: hmm
A: y you're a baby ((turns the page))
M: eh * that's Altab ((pointing to a new photo))
   (3.6) ((vocal isations in the background; M turns the page; A points to another picture))
A: (unintelligible) (1.4) * He bad (1.0) he h horrible
M: horrible ?
A: ((turns page))
M: * Shani ((pointing to a new photo))
A: who that
M: Shani ((keeps pointing to the same photo))
A: Shani
M: hmm
A: oh * Who that ((points to a new photo))
M: bibi
A: who that
M: Shani
A: h he (. ) your sister ?
M: mm
   ((A turns the page))
A: WOW
M: who's that

^5 Mama means maternal uncle.
A: my dad
M: is that funfair ((points to the photo)) What are these
what are these
A: funfair I want in there ((points to R's bag, moves out of picture))
APPENDIX 4.1.2   A WITH MOTHER [PICTURES] (WORD-FOR-WORD TRANSLATION)

A is a deaf boy, aged 6 years 9 months. In this segment he is looking at a family photograph album with his mother (M)

This Appendix is the word for word translation of the same segment presented in Appendix 4.1.1. Overlaps and some of the details of conversational scene are not included in this transcript.

In this transcription, different typefaces are used as follows:
All utterances which are said in Sylheti are printed like this.

All utterances which are said in English are printed like this.
All utterances which have been translated from Sylheti to English are printed like this.

Family names in Sylheti are printed in bold and the meaning given in a footnote.

Signs are occasionally used. These are transcribed as follows:
spoken word plus sign
[sign only]

* indicates a new photo

M:* ((points to a photo))
A: LOOK
   (1.0) ((points to photo))
A: MY PLANE
   (1.3) ((holds up a photo for the camera))
M: °plane° ((looks at Altab))
R: plane lovely
A: MY BANGAL
M: (1.5) ((smiles and crinkles eyes))
M: Bang
A: LOOK MY BANGLA
   (1.7) ((shows photo to left - to Interpreter))
M: oh (1.1)
A: my ((points to himself))
M: Bang Bangladesh taki ni
   Bang Bangladesh from
I: plane from Bangladesh ((admonishes S))
M: ((looks left; is momentarily distracted))
A: yes ((to I)) ((nods and points to himself))
M: mm
A: I got Bengali
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M: mm ? Bangladesh taki ni
    mm ? Bangladesh from

A: [plane] me plane
M: oh:::=
A: =and (1.1) hey (1.1) hey (1.3) ((looks up at camera and
gestures to R to get her attention)) I did I got big plane
    (0.7) my (1.5)
M: °aeroplane° ye khe ((pointing to photo))
°aeroplane° that who ((pointing to photo))

A: Bibi'
M: ye khe
    that who

A: Alamin
M: Shani Shani (0.8) Alamin (0.9) ammama bar khorī Shanaz
    Shanaz (0.8) Alamin (0.9) not there mummy is.
A: NOT THAT ( . ) THAT

M: aicha ami deksi Bangladesh
    alright I have seen Bangladesh

A: No ( . ) he got one more ((he shows the photo))
M: hmm
    (1.5)
A: °one more°
    (2.8) ((they look at the same photo then turn to the next one))
M: ((points to picture)) ye Altab
((points to picture)) that Altab
    (2.7)
A: small BABY=
M: =bebi ye khe ye khe
    =baby who that who that

A: mum
    (.5)
M: ye ((points))
    that ((points))

---

*Bibi means an old woman or grandmother not necessarily related to the speaker.*
A: ((looks where she's pointing))
M: Shani
A: °Shani°
M: u:h((nods)) Shani
((knock on door))
M: ((points to another photo)) ye khe (1.4) dadi
((points to another photo)) that who (1.4) dadi
(2.6)
A: ((turns over page)) ye khe
((turns over page)) that who
M: huh? deki amma deki ((pointing to a different photo))
huh? mummy let's see ((pointing to a different photo))
(2.8)
*M: bhaiya (1.2) brother
brother (1.2) brother
A: what that ((points))
M: hm? (3.7) ita affa° ni ((points to a different photo))
hm? (3.7) that cousin ((points to a different photo))
(3.1)
A: who that
M: affa ((points))
(4.8)
M: mm
A: ((turns to another photo)) affa (1.3) LOOK MY DAD
(2.9)
M: hm?
R: °tell your mom°
A: what= (addressed to R)
R: =te tell your mom
M: uh (0.7) is tor abba ni (1.1) Shani (3.0) ye khe (.)
Jalal (1.5) bhaiya (1.8) Shani=
uh (0.7) your dad that (1.1)Shani (3.0)that who (.)
Jalal (1.5) brother (1.8) Shani=
A: =look the my baby

7 Dadi means paternal grandmother.
8 Affa means sister or girl cousin.
M: ALTAB= ((looks at Altab))
A: =laughs
(4.0)((A smiles up at camera, looks at mother, turns over page, then turns page back))
A: look
M: deksi deksi=
have seen have seen =
A: Look look= ((holds up book to camera))
M: =Deksi deksi deksi (tries to go on to next page)
=have seen have seen have seen
A: look=
M: =uh=
A: =me= ((shows picture to camera))
M: =mm
A: me ((laughs))
M: uh Altab
A: ((attends to next picture)) my bicycle
M: ((points and nods)) uhu Shani
(2.2)
A: Shani bicycle
M: hm (.) bisilcolo
hm (.) bicycle
A: my bicycle
M: um ((nods))
A: LOOK MY BICYCLE ((looks at camera))
M: oy oy deksoyn deksoyn timar bisicolo
yes yes have seen have seen your bicycle
A: look my bicycle (0.8) LOOK
M: ((gives Altab a gentle push with her shoulder)) deksoyn
((gives Altab a gentle push with her shoulder)) have seen
A: look my bicycle=
M: =uh Altab er bicycle
(2.9)
M: ye khe ((points))
that who((points))
A: my dad
M: ((points to another part of the picture)) hm ?
A: he brother
M: hmm
A: look (1.4) ((pointing to photo and holding up book))
M: ye khe
that who

A: look=
M: =mm
A: who he got kalama⁹ (1.2) he got kalama=
M: =deksoyn deksoyn kalama
=have seen have seen kalama

A: Loo:k (1.0) kalama
M: umm (1.5) kalama
A: I want ((addresses R, points to parcel))
R: when you've finished
A: ((looks back at picture)) kalama:
M: hm (1.2) kalama:=
A: =Who that
M: um affa
(2.4)
A: (him ?)
M: kalama=
A: =he brother your brother=
M: =ye khe ye khe
=that who that who

A: your mum ? ((looks up at M))
M: (hm) ((shakes her head))
A: that your brother ((looks at mother))
M: um ((nods her head)) sister
A: ((looks at camera)) he she sister ((points to mother))
M: mm sister ((nods her head))
(2.6)
M: mama¹⁰
A : mama (.) my (.) mama
M: uh

⁹ Kalama means maternal aunt.
¹⁰ Mama means maternal uncle.
A: that my (to camera) that my mum
M: uh
(2.6)
A: what that (1.7)
M: Shani (2.3) Shani (0.9) Altab (1.9) (pointing) little baby
A: me big he small who that (looks at mother)
M: (laughs and smiles at A) Altab (1.2)
A: Me I'm big=
M: =Eh (1.1) Shani:
A: ((laughs, puts both hands to head))
M: ((laughs))
A: ((looks towards Shani)) look you
M: ((looks to Shani, laughs, points to picture still looking at Shanaz))
A: ((laughs)) you ((to Shanaz)) (1.2) that you
M: uh
A: you a baby
M: eh Altab
(3.4) (M turns page; A points to another picture)
A: (bi) (1.3) he bad ho horrible=
M: =horrible ?
A: ((turns page))
M: Shani (1.6)
A: who that
M: Shani
A: Shani
M: him
A: who dat
M: bibi
A: who that
M: Shani
A: h he: (.) your sister
M: hm=
A: =WOW
M: ye khe
that who
(0.9)
A: My dad
M: funfair ni (.)(points)) igu khita (.) igu khita
funfair that(.) (points)) these are what (.these are what

A: funfair I want in there ((points to R's bag, moves out of picture))
A is a deaf boy, aged 6 years 9 months. In this segment chatting with his mother (M) talk in Sylheti has been translated into colloquial English. To indicate the translated talk, different typefaces are used as follows:

All utterances which are said in English are printed like this.

All utterances which have been translated from Sylheti to English are printed like this.

Signs are occasionally used. These are transcribed as follows:

spoken word plus sign

(sign only)

* indicates a new photo

There are occasional contributions from the researcher (R) and the interpreter (I)

M: o.k. come listen here who’s this ((pointing to R))
    what’s their name name
A: is Merle=
M: hm ( ) hm ?
A: Merle
M: o:h
I: Merle Merle their name Merle
M: how is it then is it like this or like that
    ((indicates that she wants A to fingerspell the name))
A: Merle ((fingerspells “m” correctly))
M: Merle ((fingerspells “m” incorrectly))
A: ((looks at R, fingerspells “m” again)) that Merle
M: ((fingerspells “m” correctly))
R: that’s right yes
M: ([laughs])
A: ([looks at R]) Margaret Merle (.) ([looks at M]) mum
    ((fingerspelling “m” with each word))
M: ([laughs])
R: That’s right
A: ([looks at R]) same
R: very good (. ) Altab= 
A: =same
M: same=
R: =same
M: that the same and Ingrid (.) is it Ingrid=
A: =Ingrid not same ((shakes head))
I: (unintelligible)
M: not same ((shakes head)) then how is Ingrid (.) like this
A: no
M: let me see (.) show me then
I: sit down here sit down here
A: Ingrid
M: hm ?
A: I want car
I: (unintelligible) talk about your son
A: I want
M: come and listen then(.) come this way(.) come Altab come Altab Altab Altab
A: o:w
M: ((to I)) he doesn’t want to sit with me
M: oh Altab

M: how is daddy ((holds up her hands ready to fingerspell)) how is daddy
A: (unintelligible)
M: o.k. then mum will say it(.) is it like this daddy () is daddy like this daddy
A: no (,)daddy that is ((fingerspells "d"))
M: Daddy () and Altab
A: Kumar () Johnpaul ()
M: Johnpaul=
A: =Daddy
M: daddy=
A: =J
M: J (,) and how is Ingrid Ingrid
A: I’m not like Ingrid
M: Ingrid
APPENDIX 4.1.4  A WITH MOTHER [CHAT] (WORD-FOR-WORD TRANSLATION)

A is a deaf boy, aged 6 years 9 months. In this segment he is chatting with his mother (M)

This Appendix is the word for word translation of the same segment presented in Appendix 4.1.3. Overlaps and some of the details of conversational scene are not included in this transcript.

In this transcription, different typefaces are used as follows:
All utterances which are said in Sylheti are printed like this.
All utterances which are said in English are printed like this.
All utterances which have been translated from Sylheti to English are printed like this.

Signs are occasionally used. These are transcribed as follows:
spoken word plus sign
[sign only]

There are occasional contributions from the researcher (R) and the interpreter (I)

M:  aicha ow huni za obai ow yen khe  ((points to R))  
    o.k. come listen go this way who’s this  ((points to R))  
    er nam khita nam khita name 
    what’s their name name

A:  is Merle=
M:  =hm (,) ha
A:  Merle
M:  o:h
I:  Merle Merle tar nam Merle 
Merle Merle their name Merle

M:  kilan te olan ni na olan 
how then like this or like this 
((indicates that she wants A to fingerspell the name))

A:  Merle ((fingerspells “m” correctly))
M:  Merle ((fingerspells “m” incorrectly))
A:  ((looks at R, fingerspells “m” again)) that Merle
M:  ((fingerspells “m” correctly))
R:  that’s right yes
M:  ((laughs))
A:  ((looks at R)) Margaret Merle (,) ((looks at M)) mum 
    ((fingerspelling “m” with each word))
M:  ((laughs))
R: That’s right
A: (looks at R) same
R: very good ( ) Altab=
A: =same
M: same=
R: =same
M: that the same ar Ingrid (.) Ingrid ni=
that the same and Ingrid ( ) is it Ingrid=
A: =Ingrid not same ((shakes head))
I: (unintelligible)
M: not same ((shakes head)) kilan te olan ni Ingrid
not same ((shakes head)) how then is Ingrid

oh ni te
that is it then
A: no
M: dekhi (.) amare dekha te
I see (.) me you show then
I: ono bow ino bow
there you sit here you sit
A: Ingrid
M: hm ?
A: I want car
I: ta tumar Ingridre tumar seler khota khow
your Ingrid your son talk speak
A: I want
M: huni za te obai dla ow ay Altab ay Altab Altab
listen go then this way through come come Altab come
Altab Altab
A: o:W
M: ((to I)) amar loge boyto na oh Altab
((to I)) my with me sit no oh Altab
.
.
.
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M: **huni zow te (. ) eh te Daddy kilan daddy daddy kilan**
   listen go then (. ) eh then daddy how daddy daddy how
   ((holds up her hands ready to fingerspell))

A: (unintelligible)

M: **aicha te amma khoi (. )**
   o.k. then mum I say (. )

   **olan ni daddy daddy olan ni daddy**
   like this is it daddy daddy like this is it daddy

A: no ( ) daddy that is ((fingerspells "d"))

M: daddy ( ) **ar Altab**
   Daddy ( ) and Altab

A: Kumar ( ) Johnpaul ( )

M: Johnpaul=
A: =Daddy
M: daddy=
A: =J

M: J ( . ) **ar Ingrid kilan Ingrid**
   J ( ) and Ingrid how Ingrid

A: I'm not like Ingrid
M: Ingrid
APPENDIX 4.2  

KH WITH FATHER

Kh is a deaf boy, aged 6 years 10 months. In this segment he is looking at family photos with his father (F).

* indicates a new photo

Sylheti family names are printed in bold and the meanings are given in footnotes.

F: watch me I’m gonna show you:: Khaim (0.8) I gonna show you some picture (.) you can chell tell me: (1.0)
Kh: I um
F: =where your mom and dad friend (0.8) and your sister (2.3) nice (1.6) * who are them (1.7)
K: dad and mum
F: your mum and dad (.) where your mum (3.2) (mother says something in background)
Kh: there ((points to picture))
F: yeah (0.7) what colour sari she is wearing (1.1) (the one)
Kh: purple (2.2)
F: is not purple=
S: =pink
F: ((to sister)) sssh
S: pink
Kh: pink
F: pink
Kh: is that pink (0.7) our new jacket’s got yellow and (0.7)
F: yellow:
Kh: green
F: blue (0.9) who got the jacket (1.3)
Kh: daddy
F: daddy (0.8) ((F nods)) good boy (1.0) what else there (1.0) what this
Kh:* this
F: mm
Kh: flowers
F: flower (.) what colour is (.) look
Kh: red green (1.3)
F: red and green
Kh: u::m (2.8) ((K and F look closely at the photo))
F: what colour (2.2) look this (6.0) the (unintelligible) not is=
Kh: =(hh) hehe ((K covers his mouth with his hand))
Kh: it’s come (.) look=
F: ((looks closely at K}) =yellow yellow
Kh: yellow ((looks up at F))
F: yellow ((nods to K))
(5.5) * ((F points at another photo))
Kh: me (1.5)
F: who (1.2)
Kh: me ((points to himself))
F: there ((points to another person in the photo))
F: sister (...) good boy

F: what this (1.0)
F: white one (points to photo) or (.) red
F: good ((F and K smile at each other))
F: 's me ?
F: is not me (0.9) somebody else
F: yea=
F: is not me
F: yes ((nods head))
F: how do you know ((smiles back))
F: I know ((points to his own head; ? using sign for 'know'))
F: you know (.) you clever (1.7)
F: good (. ) boy (0.7) * what this
F: bin
S: binnie binnie bin
F: what colour
F: green
F: green

1.6
Kh: my sister
F: sister (. ) good boy

2.8 ((little sister says something in background))
F: what this (1.0)
Kh: sister
F: what’s: (.) she got (1.6)
Kh: a ball
F: what she got a ball
Kh: mum (.)
F: your mum
Kh: and me (1.6) I got a ball=
F: =you got a ball too (0.9) big ball
Kh: yeah
F: the big which is big one (1.7)
(F points to the photo)
F: white one (points to photo) or (.) red
Kh: um (.) the black an a white one (points to the photo again)
F: good ((F and K smile at each other))
Kh: my uncle
Kh: me
F: who is she
Kh: sister
F: which one
Kh: ((turns around and points to Rosi who is sitting to his right))
F: what her name
Kh: Rosi
F: this is Rosi (1.9) * that ?
(2.5)
Kh: daddy (1.8) you (points to F))
(2.4)
F: 's me ?
Kh: hmm
F: is not me (0.9) somebody else
Kh: no ((shakes head))
F: yea=
Kh: =that
F: is not me
Kh: yes ((nods head))
F: no ((looks intently at K))
Kh: he is (. ) it exactly you=
F: =it is (0.8) it is me
(2.1)
Kh: (hhh) ((smiles))
F: how do you know ((smiles back))
Kh: I know ((points to his own head; ? using sign for 'know'))
F: you know (. ) you clever (1.7)
Kh: (nods)
F: good (. ) boy (0.7) * what this
Kh: dustbin
F: bin
S: binnie binnie bin
F: what colour
Kh: green
F: green
(8.3) ((little sister has moved in front of F, he talks softly to her and moves her aside))

F:* ((turns page, points to a photo and looks at K who looks at photo and then back at F))

Kh: affa

F: ((looks at K and nods; addresses little sister in Sylheti and moves her away again))

F:* who is she (1.4) you aunt=

Kh: =my aunt (1.6)

F:* uncle

Kh: uncle

F:* wha..

Kh: my uncle my daddy (2.5)

F:* whe where is this picture (0.7) can you tell me ((F picks up the album to show K))

Kh: hmm ?

F: where is that

Kh: by his (not) in a sand

S: (unintelligible)

F: in the sand (. ) where is it (1.5) ((looks at photo)) you remember that

Kh: ((nods))

F: (continues to look at photo)) (1.5) where you are (1.1) did you find where the Khaim here (2.0) no (.) can't see it

Kh: ((points to himself in the photo and looks up at F))

F: (. ) oh yes it is you it is ((telephone rings))

F: seaside (0.9) seaside (1.1) yeah? (1.3) seaside (nods)

Kh: same like say it same like that (0.8) one ((points behind him ))

F: where=

Kh: =Finton

F: in Finton (. ) yes (. ) nice=

Kh: =same

F: Finton

Kh: sister under in the water ((talking in the background))

F: you been there haven you (0.6) you been there (0.7) did you

Kh: two times (nods)

F: two times (. ) twice you been twice (1.9) good

Kh:* my uncle (0.8) me (. ) what wha I done myself (. ) wi? (. ) (the cow) (1.9) uncle

F: uncle uncle

S: uncle

Kh: my dad (1.1) my mum=

F:* =wha what this Khaim what this

Kh: a street (1.7)

F: walk (. ) is it walk What this

Kh: wha?

F: farm walk (1.1) you walk (3.7)

Kh: I been uh see that (2.1) (uncle)

F: turn over turn over what else is next

11 Affa means sister or girl cousin.
Kh: me play with the ball (.) my mum (1.3) staying (1.6)
gira::f
F: where's a giraffe where's a giraffe (1.2) where
(0.8) where=
Kh: =in there
F: in the where=
Kh: =there is
F: where
Kh: there
F: inside the house ?
Kh: yeah
S: giraffe
F: gira::ffe
(2.7)
Kh:* my mum (0.9) (holding me)
S: the
F: your mum
Kh: mum sister going like this ((smiles and covers mouth with
hand))
F: like this ((smiles back and covers mouth with hand))
Kh: (hhh)haha ((looks at F))
F: shes hold her mouth
S: hihi
Kh: (looks over to Rosi on his right))
F:* o.k. so turn the next page so oh what showing next
(7.6) ((K turns the page and they both look at the photos))
F: got some next (1.5) * well there some other people
going your school ((chooses and points to a photo))
(2.8) ((K has been attending to a different photo; he then
looks at the one F is pointing to))
Kh: me and my sister (2.0) my mum (2.9) and (6.2)
F: who else there
(2.0) ((sisters whisper))
Kh: my mum and my s sister and me (1.3) my dad
F:* this
Kh: a car
F: what colour is it
(3.0) ((K bends to look at the photo))
Kh: colour ((looks up at F))
F: what colour is that ((looks at K and nods))
Kh: red
F: red (1.7) good
Kh: and grey
F: is that daddy car
Kh: no (.) Yeah
F: no is not (1.2) is not my car
Kh: oh ((looks away))
(5.6)
F:* your mommy
(2.9)
Kh:* where that where uh see it water (0.8) a boat=
F: ^what is this
F: =what is is what is this Khaim
(4.2)
Kh: bridge
F: bridge a bridge good boy (1.0) well done is that
(2.8)
Kh: my mum (1.2) (kgi) (0.8) standing up wi water wi wi
sand
F: mummy
(7.2)
F: who is she (.) your teacher (.) say your teacher for me
Kh: ah mi:: the say
F: who who who is she who is she
Kh: Miss Door
F: Miss Tool
(15.6) ((K turns over a few pages; Rosi walks into picture))
F:* who is there (2.0) can you guessed anyone there
(1.1)
who is there
Kh: there ?
(2.1)
Kh: aunty (3.5) uncle (1.5) and now I do this
F: little baby
Kh: he ?
F: you cousin (0.9) o.k. (2.1) and here another aunty
(2.5) ((K nods))
M: Sheelamet (aside)
F: all finish ((looks up at K))
Kh: ((nods))
F: the end (2.2) right=
Kh: =((nods again))
APPENDIX 4.3.1  

Kh with Mother [Pictures] (Colloquial Translation)

Kh is a deaf boy, aged 6 years 10 months. In this segment he is looking at a picture book with his mother (M).

In this transcription, the talk has been translated from Sylheti into colloquial English. To indicate the translated talk, different typefaces are used as follows:

All utterances which are said in English are printed like this.
All utterances which have been translated from Sylheti to English are printed like this.

* indicates a new photo

In this interaction, there are several interruptions from father (F), sister (S) and older cousin (C). R (the researcher) and I (the interpreter) also occasionally contribute to the conversation.

M and Kh sit side by side on the sofa. I is sitting next to M. S sits on a stool in front of Kh. Baby is on floor in front of M. F sits behind baby, out of picture.

M: alright
Kh: mummy mummy (referring to an earlier context)
M: alright who’s that then
Kh: The baby
M: mm (1.8) and who’s that
Kh: (? a bird)
M: alright
  *(much interruption from Father and cousin)*
M: say it as you go along
  *(aside to father about little sister)* can’t you take her
  *(Kh holds the book on his lap and looks at the pictures)*
Kh: big great teddy bear
  *(M looks over at book, and glances up at Kh)*
M: mm
Kh: the ambulance (1.8) the fire engine
  *(M takes book and turns the page)*
M: speak loudly (0.8) the way you said it before
Kh: I said=
M: *and what are these who’s that* *(points to a picture)*
Kh: boat
M: and
Kh: and children’s (2.0)
  *(M points to a different picture)*
Kh: and the *(.) girl is *(he points to same picture as M)*
  *(little sister starts to cry)*
  *(3.7) *(sister continues to cry; father picks her up and stands next to Kh, looking at the book)*
M: speak in Bangla what is it called what
is it called in Bangla *(she points to a new picture)*
F: *bird bird=
Kh: =bird
F: BIRD
S: bird bird
  *(little sister cries)*
M: *(to father) You said it in English (1.7)
S: "balloon"
Kh: balloon
M: eh
F: balloon
M: what's the name of this horse?
Kh: old man
(M looks at I, then looks back down at book; then turns the page)
(M turns page and points to a picture) what are they doing
Kh: they are looking at, they are making hair nicely (he touches his own hair)
M: mm ((M keeps looking down at picture)) what else are they doing
(Kh attends to a different picture on the opposite page, he pulls the book nearer to him; I turns towards camera and whispers loudly; S makes a comment about the picture. M then turns to look at I, then looks back at Kh))
Kh: a kangaroo ((points to a picture))
M: a policeman
Kh: a policeman
M: pick up what he says
Kh: the old lady ((points to picture))
M: (looks back at book) mm
Kh: the children giving the m money (um) this holding it
M: what are these ((smiles up at sister; points to another picture))
Kh: it's the t
M: huh?
Kh: the policeman
(M turns the page; glances over to I; Kh looks over at a picture)
Kh: ducks:
(M and Kh scan the picture, M points vaguely across the page)
Kh: grass
(M starts to turn the page; both are looking down at the book)
Kh: leaves
M: (M turns the page) mm
(M and Kh scan the page)
M: what's he doing
Kh: ((points to a picture)) Him?
M: mm
Kh: ((Kh looks down at the book) cooking (0.8) up (.)
food and the man: (2.1) ((M looks towards I; F distracts her; Kh continues
to look down at the book))
Kh: man eating (. the) saus
M: say it louder ((she is still looking
towards F))
Kh: he eating UP(.)SAUSAGES
M: huh? (M looks back at book)
Kh: EATING SAUSAGES
M: mm (1.3) ((glances at I then looks back at book)) what are
they doing?
Kh: making sausages
M: and (M points to a picture)
Kh: and (1.3) see (. the) old lady frightened (. and
that(1.6) that (. one) (1.2)
M: ((addressing the other adults in room)) they want to see if
he can speak Bangla but he won't speak it
I: mm he's speaking Bangla and English
Kh: I want to speak English
I: that's o.k. it's not a problem
M: then I said
Kh: ((points to a picture)) old (. lady) sitting in (. a)
chair
(3.3) (M turns the page)
everyone (He points to a picture, keeps his finger on this
picture)) (1.1) everyone (. look in a book for one
dog the old man (1.2) stuck with the (. with) gold
(. one)
M: ((smiles up at Kh)) he hasn't got any teeth
Kh: (laughs)
M: (hmmm)(laughs)
Kh: (laughs)(unintelligible)
M: say what the man's doing ((both Kh and M look down at
the page))
Kh: oh playing with the (. boxing
M: mm
Kh: boxing
(2.9)
M: and what's he doing
(8.7) ((M points to a picture; points again; both look at the
page; M starts to turn over, then she turns and addresses I))
Kh is a deaf boy, aged 6 years 10 months. In this segment he is looking at a picture book with his mother (M)

This Appendix is the word for word translation of the same segment presented in Appendix 4.3.1. Details of conversational scene and overlaps are not included in this transcript.

In this transcription, different typefaces are used as follows:
All utterances which are said in Sylheti are printed like this.
All utterances which are said in English are printed like this.
All utterances which have been translated from Sylheti to colloquial English are printed like this.
Word for word translations from Sylheti to English are printed like this.

* indicates a new photo

M:  aicha
    alright
    alright

Kh:  amma amma
     mummy mummy
     mummy mummy ((referring to an earlier context))

M:*  aicha ar oho khe te
    alright and who that then
    alright and who’s that then

Kh:  the baby

M:*  mm (1.8) ar e khe
     mm (1.8) and that who
     mm (1.8) and who’s that

Kh:  (a bird)

M:  aicha
    alright
    alright
    ((much interruption from Father and cousin))

M:  khoya khoya zhow
    say say you go along
    say it as you go along
    ((aside to father about little sister)) ogu tan re newo
    her take away please take her away
    can’t you take her please
Kh: big great teddy bear
M: mm
Kh: the ambulance (1.8) the fire engine
(2.2)
M: zhure mato (0.8) heyba zhe koyso
speak loudly (0.8) the way before you said
speak loudly (0.8) the way you said it before
Kh: I said
M: ar ita khita ye khe
and these what who that
and what are these who’s that ((points to picture))
Kh: boat
M: ar
and
and
Kh: and children’s (2.0) and the (.) girl is
(3.7) ((little sister cries in background))
M: Bangla mato igure khita khoi Bangla khita khoi
in Bengali speak it what called in Bengali what it
called
speak in Bangla what is it called what is it called
in Bangla
F: faki faki=
bird bird=
bird bird=
Kh: =bird
F: BIRD
S: faki faki
bird bird
((little sister starts to cry))
M: ((to father)) Englishe khoysa ba (1.7)
in English you said it (1.7)
you said it in English (1.7)
((to Kh)) ar ita bangla khita khoi
and these in Bengali what called
and these what are they in Bangla
S: "balloon"
Kh: balloon
M: mm
F: balloon

M: *eh gura tar naam khita* (0.9)
   *this horse his name what* (0.9)
   what's the name of this horse (0.9)

Kh: old (1.4) man
(3.2)

M: *ar ino khita kare tara*
   *and here what doing they are*
   and what are they doing here

Kh: they waiting for the train
M: mm=

KH: =going in a London Bridge (0.8) London Bridge

((sound of F comforting the little sister))

S: (unintelligible)

Kh: I don’t know uh London Bridge

M: *ita khita kare*
   *they are what doing*
   what are they doing

Kh: they (0.9) looking at (.) they making (1.2) they
   making hair nicely
(2.3)

M: mm (1.7) *ar khita kare*
   mm (1.7) *else what doing*
   mm (1.7) what else are they doing

(9.5) ((Kh attends to a different picture on the opposite
   page, he pulls the book nearer to him; I turns towards camera
   and whispers loudly; S makes a comment about the picture. M
   then turns to look at I, then looks back at Kh))

Kh: a kangaroo (2.2) (for the throw in the) fire
(5.8)

Kh: a policeman

M: ((to interpreter )) *English matto fare arkhe khita mate*
ki hoggole itta bujto pare na
in English speak can but what he says=
he can speak in English but not everyone can=

Kh: a policeman (2.8)

M: =hoggole itta bujto pare na
=everyone pick up can not
=pick up what he says=

K: the old lady

M: ((looks back at book)) mm

Kh: the children giving the m money (1.1) um (1.2) this holding it=

M: =eh beta khita
=eh this man what
=what are these

Kh: it's the t- (1.2)

M: huh

Kh: the policeman

(4.1) ((M turns the page; glances over to I; Kh looks over at a picture))

Kh: du:cks::

(4.2) ((M and Kh scan the picture, M points vaguely across the page))

grass

(3.7) ((M starts to turn the page, both are looking down at the book))

Kh: leaves

M: ((M turns the page)) mm

(3.2) ((Kh and M scan the page))

M: kita kare
he what doing
what's he doing

Kh: ((points to picture)) mm

M: mm

Kh: ((Kh looks down at the book)) cooking (0.8) up (.)
food and the ma::n
(2.1) (M looks towards I; F distracts her; Kh continues to look down at the book)

M: u
Kh: man eating (. the the saus
M: zhure khow
loudly speak
say it louder ((M continues to look at F))

Kh: he eating UP(.SAUSAGES
M: huh ((M looks back at book))
Kh: EATING SAUSAGES
M: mm (1.3) ((glances at I then looks back at book))
M: hera khita khore
they are what doing
what are they doing
Kh: making sausages
M: ar
and

Kh: and (1.3) see (. the old lady frightened (. that
(1.6) that (. one (1.2)

M: ((addressing the other adults in room)) dekh ni nai hay
Bangla matto fare Bangla nyu mate na te
want to see if he Bengali can speak bengali but speak
won't
I: mm Bangla English dunote
mm Bengali English both
Kh: ami English mattam sai
English to speak want
I: thik ase oshubida nai
o.k. problem not
M: te khoallam
I said
Kh: old (. the old lady sitting in (. a chair (3.3) everyone
(1.1) everyone (. look in a book for one dog the
old man (1.2) stuck with the (. with gold (. one

M: dat nai kene
teeth hasn't got why
Kh: (laughs)
M: (hhh) laughs

M: cow betqa khita kore
    say man what doing

Kh: oh playing with the (.) boxing

M: mm

Kh: boxing
    (2.9)

M: ar hay khita khore
    and he what doing
    (8.7)

Kh: making a man

M: ((addressing interpreter)) aphner gar ni na flat
    you have house or flat
APPENDIX 4.3.3  KH WITH MOTHER (CHAT) (COLLOQUIAL TRANSLATION)

Kh is a deaf boy, aged 6 years 10 months. In this segment he and his mother (M) are chatting.

In this transcription, the talk has been translated from Sylheti into colloquial English. To indicate the translated talk, different typefaces are used as follows:

All utterances which are said in English are printed like this.

All utterances which have been translated from Sylheti to English are printed like this.

* indicates a new photo.

In this interaction, there are interruptions from father (F), sister (S) baby, and older cousin (C). R (the researcher) and I (the interpreter) also occasionally contribute to the conversation.

M sits on the floor, Kh on a low stool. They are facing each other. M looks at Kh throughout the interaction except where indicated. I is sitting to M's left, F, S and baby are also to the left.

M:  What does your miss do (.).what does your miss teach you
     (1.9)
Kh:  and (.). she (.). we (.).play outside (2.5)
M:  [(nods)] hmm
Kh:  with (.). the ball
M:  mm
Kh:  a:nd uh
     (5.0)
M:  who takes you in the morning
S:  car=
Kh:  =car
M:  mm
     (2.0)
Kh:  and (1.9) and (2.4) (unintelligible)
S:  \(\text{ba}\)
F:  *tell him to speak in Bangla*
M:  =say in Bangla what do you do=
Kh:  =I eat (.). I eat some (1.4) dinner
I:  no it’s o.k. for him to speak in English
Kh:  \(\text{na (.). why}\)
M:  Then you have to speak Bangla or you can’t be filmed
Kh:  I can’t speak in Bangla (shakes head)
I:  it’s alright in English
M:  alright
I:  let him speak in English it’s o.k.
M:  do you want to speak ? (1.3) is she good (1.7) eh?=
Kh:  =yes:: (1.7) little bit (.).she’s a
M:  the girl you go with where’s her house (0.9) where is her house (.). your teacher what’s her name (2.6) say it then

356
Kh: Davey
M: say it properly
Kh: Miss Davey Miss Thomas
M: mm (.) and say (.) (unintelligible)’s name
Kh: Miss Brownson
M: mm (2.0) and the one that you go with that lady
what’s that girl’s name
Kh: Sarah
M: is Sarah like this ((nods)) (1.9) is she not like
this (( )) ((shakes head))
Kh: no
M: then
(2.6)
Kh: u::m
(8.2) ((noise in background; Kh gives sidelong glance at
baby))
M: What did I say have you been listening to me ((nods))
Kh: ((nods))
F: =what does he eat eat dinner
M: =then (.) what do you what do you eat for dinner
(4.2)
Kh: anything (1.1) what mean (.) like
(2.0)
M: ((laughs)) what what sorts of things do you eat (.)
say it then say the names of the things you eat
Kh: fishfinger
M: mm
Kh: a::nd (.) chips
M: and what else
Kh: °hambur(ger)° (3.4) cake
M: eh ?
Kh: cake
M: and don’t you drink ((shakes head)) any drink
Kh: and sometime I eat choc (.) sugar (.) and biscuit
(2.3) I eat pudding (.) pudding ((gestures eating with a
spoon))
S: (unintelligible)
M: pudding don’t get up sit down
(3.5)
(M and I giggle)
M: (addressing I) she said for you to sit down (1.8)
((to Kh)) alright what else do you do (.) what
homework do you do
Kh: homework
M: do you read at school ((nods)) (0.9) do you read
Kh: ((nods))
M: (1.5) what do you read what does the lady teach
Kh: they don’t teach anything
M: don’t you read anything ((shakes head)) (.) then what do
you do there
Kh: I do number work (1.4) and
M: what work do you do
(2.2)
Kh: four take away five ((holds up fingers))
M: eh:
Kh: "four take away" (0.8) ((looks down at hands; doing the sum))
M: no ((taps Kh’s knee)) what do you do over there what do you do at school (.) at school what does your miss make you write (1.5)
Kh: and (2.5) uh I don’t know
M: do you understand what I say
Kh: mm
M: what did I say
Kh: you said what writing does the teacher give
M: yes ((looks at I))
I: he understood
Kh: sometime she find something in the book
M: and that day where did you go (.) with your miss (.)
Kh: seaside (.)
M: what's the name of the seaside
Kh: Finton
M: mm what did you do when you got there (3.0)
Kh: I play in the water
M: and
Kh: and I eat
M: you eat (.) what did you eat (1.3) what did you take
Kh: hm ?
M: what did you take
Kh: ("unintelligible") (2.9)
M: (unintelligible)
Kh: chocolate
M: mm
Kh: and uh (2.9) crisps (.) and um (5.7) banana (4.1)
M: what's the name for banana in Bangla
Kh: banana ((laughter))
M: Then did you eat it
Kh: no
M: what's the name for chicken in Bangla
Kh: chicken something (4.7)
Kh: um (4.3)
I: ((to M, instructing her on what to say to Kh)) do you have many friends at school
M: ((to Kh)) how many friends do you have
Kh: eh ?
M: in your school (.) how many children (19.5) ((F talks in background; Kh looks down and counts on his fingers; baby comes to sit on M’s lap))
M: say their names (.) I’ll understand
Kh: Matthew
M: mm
Kh: Joseph (3.1) Fabian (1.3) and (1.6) Marios (2.3) Matthew
APPENDIX 4.3.4  KH WITH MOTHER [CHAT] (WORD FOR WORD TRANSLATION)

Kh is a deaf boy, aged 6 years 10 months. In this segment he and his mother (M) are chatting.

This Appendix is the word for word translation of the same segment presented in Appendix 4.3.3. Full details of conversational scene and overlaps are not included in this transcript.

In this transcription, different typefaces are used as follows:
All utterances which are said in Sylheti are printed like this.
All utterances which are said in English are printed like this.
All utterances which have been translated from Sylheti to English are printed like this.

* indicates a new photo

In this interaction, there are interruptions from father (F), sister (S) baby, and older cousin (C). R (the researcher) and I (the interpreter) also occasionally contribute to the conversation.

M sits on the floor, Kh on a low stool. They are facing each other. M looks at Kh throughout the interaction except where indicated. I is sitting to M's left, F, S and baby are also to the left.

M: te tumar misse khita khore misse khita phorai
then your miss what do your miss what teach (1.9)
Kh: and (.) she (.) we (.) play outside (2.5)
M: ((nods)) hmm
Kh: with (.) the ball
M: mm
Kh: a:nd uh (5.0)
M: shokale tore khetai loya zhai
morning you who with go
S: car=
Kh: =car
M: mm (2.0)
Kh: and (1.9) and (2.4) (unintelligible)
S: (ba)
F: °Banglai khaylai to farbo °=
  °Bengali will say can° =
M: =Banglai (khoyla) khita (khoros)=
Kh: =I eat (.) I eat some (1.4) dinner

M: **Banglai mat**
   Bengali you speak

I: **nna aicha thik ase English**
   no o.k. right is English

Kh: **khene Banglai (mattam)**
   why Bengali

M: **te Banglai (matte) naile alto (unintelligible)**
   then Bengali you speak otherwise (unintelligible)

Kh: **Banglai (mattam) fari na** ((shakes head))
   Bengali (I speak) can no

I: **na English oyce thik ase**
   no English (to be )right is

M: **aicha**
   alright

I: **English khoke thik ase**
   English speak right is

M: **mattai ni (1.3) bala ni (1.7) eh?=**
   you speak is it (1.3) good is it (1.7) eh?=

Kh: =yes:: (1.7) little bit (.) she’s a

M: **ah te zhe furir loge zhow igur ghor kuwi (0.9)**
   ah then that girl go with her house where (0.9)

   house **khonano (. ) tor miser nam khita**
   house where (. ) your miss name what
   (5.4)

Kh: Davey

M: **khoe te**
   you say then

Kh: Miss Davey Miss Thomas

M: **mm (. ) ar tor (. ) ooh nam khoyla no**
   mm (. ) and your (. ) ooh that name you say

Kh: Miss Brownson

M: **mm (2.0) ar zeghur loge zhow ze betty**
   mm (2.0) and the one with go that woman

   oh furir nam khita
oh that girl name what

Kh: Sarah ?

M: Sarah ola ni (1.9) ola nai ni
Sarah like this (1.9) like this not

Kh: no

M: te
then

(2.6)

Kh: u::m

(8.2) ((noise in background; Kh gives sidelong glance at baby))

M: ami khita khoylum tui honre ni
I what I said you listening=

Kh: ((nods))

F: =dinner khai khita dinner khai=
dinner eat what dinner eat=

M: =tui khita dinner khita khas=
you what dinner what you eat

(4.2)

Kh: anything (1.1) what mean (.) like
(2.0)

M: khita khita kas kho te nam kho te
what what you eat you say then name you say then

Kh: fishfinger

M: mm

Kh: a:nd (.) chips

M: ar khita
and what

Kh: °hambur(ger)° (3.4) cake
M: eh?
Kh: cake
M: ar drink (ink) khas nani
and drink you drink isn’t it
Kh: and sometime I eat choc (.) sugar (.) and biscuit
(2.3) I eat pudding (.) pudding ((gestures eating with a
spoon))
S: (unintelligible)
M: uhs na bo ne
get up no sit
(3.5)
((M and I giggle))
*M: ((addressing I)) boytai khoyra (1.8)
((addressing I)) you sit she said (1.8)
((to Kh)) ar khita khoros (.) ar homework khita khoros
((to Kh)) and what you do (.) and homework what you do
Kh: homework
M: schoolo phoros ni (0.9) phoros ni khita phoros
school you read (0.9) read is it what read
Kh: ((nods))
M: (1.5) betti khita phorai
(1.5) woman what teach
Kh: khunta phorai na
something teach no
M: kunta phoros na ((shakes head)) (.)
something you read no ((shakes head)) (.)
te khita khoros ghia
then what you do go
Kh: I do number work (1.4) and
M: work khita khoros
work what you do
Kh: four take away five ((holds up fingers))
M: eh:
Kh: °four take away °(0.8) ((looks down at hands; doing the sum))
M: na ben ((taps Kh’s knee))
   no ((taps Kh’s knee))

khoy nino ghia khita khoros (.)
I said over there go what you do (.)

ischoolo khita khoros uschoolo ischoolo khita lekai
misse
school what you do school school what write miss
(1.5)

Kh: a:nd (2.5) uh I don’t know
M: tui buzre ni ami khita khoi
   you YOU understand I what I say

Kh: mm
M: khita khoysi
   what I say

Kh: you said missle khita lekha deh
   you said miss what writing give
M: oi ((looks at I))
   yes ((looks at I))

I: buche he
   understands he

Kh: sometime she find something in the book
M: ar en din kwai gesle (.) missor loge
   and that day where you go (.) miss with
   seaside (.) nam khita
   seaside (.) name what

Kh: Finton
M:  mm hino ghia khita khoros
    mm over there go what you do

(3.0)

Kh:  fani khelasi
    water I played

M:  ar
    and

Kh:  ar khaisi
    and I eat

M:  khaison (.)khita khaisos (1.3) khita loyslai
    you eat (.) what you eat (1.3) what you took

Kh:  hm ?

M:  packed lunch

Kh:  ("unintelligible")
    (2.9)

M:  angul hora
    finger more

Kh:  chocolate

M:  mm

Kh:  an:d uh (2.9) crisps (.) and um (5.7) banana
    (4.1)

M:  bananar nam khitar Banglai
    banana name what Bengali

Kh:  chola
    banana

    ((laughter))

M:  te khosos ni
    then you eat
M: ar chicken or nam khita Banglai
and chicken name what in Bengali

S: murghi (unintelligible)
chicken (unintelligible)

(4.7)

Kh: um
(4.3)

I: ((to M, instructing her on what to say to Kh))
tar friend und ase ni schoolo
his friends there is school

M: tor khoy zon friend ase
((to Kh)) you how many persons friend there is

Kh: eh?

M: tor friend khoy zon tor ischoolo (.). khoy *
your friend how many persons your school (.). how many children

(19.5) ((F talks in background; Kh looks down and counts on his fingers; baby comes to sit on M’s lap))

M: nam khoya khoya go (.). buzmu ne ami
name you say you say go (.). I understand

Kh: Matthew

M: mm

Kh: Joseph (3.1) Fabian (1.3) and (1.6) Marios (2.3)
Matthew
APPENDIX 4.4  W WITH FATHER

W is a deaf boy aged 6 years 11 months. In this segment, he is looking at a family photo album with his father (F).

* indicates a new photo
There is an occasional contribution from the researcher (R)

1 F: know when we played cricket (0.4) when we
2 played against the girls (1.5) ((chat in
3 background between little brother and mother))
4 d’you know when we bowled the ball (1.6) when
5 we first started to bowl the ball ((gestures
6 bowling)) what did we used to do (0.6) because
7 we were playing against Peter (0.7) and Peter
8 couldn’t hit the ball
9 2.75
10 W: because if you need to throw it under= ((mimes
11 an underarm throw))
12 F: =underarm (0.6) but then when you get a big boy
13 what do you do with the ball (1.6) what was we
14 practising
15 W: you go o:ver= ((mimes overarm throw))
16 F: over an and you ran faster
17 W: ((nods))
18 F: you run up to the stumps and you bowl it (0.7)
19 faster (0.6) ((mimes bowling overarm)) doesn’t
20 it
21 W: yeah (0.3) and then you could get it and then
22 you catch ((gestures catching))
23 F: pardon
24 W: run and kick it a:n a then you catch= ((mimes
25 batting and catching))
26 F: daddy ((points to self)) was hitting the ball
27 very high in the air (0.5) and you had to
28 W: [yeah and then
29 nearly catch pff ((mimes a ball dropping out of
30 his hand))]
31 F: but but why did you drop the ball can you
32 remember
33 W: because (0.5) when I was catching it fell down
34 ((mimes catching and dropping the ball))
35 F: but what else was stopping you catching the
36 ball (0.5) what got in your eye (0.8) ((points
37 to his own eye and looks up)) when you looked
38 up to the sky
39 W: you can see the sun=
40 F: yeah haha and the sun made you drop the ball
41 (0.8) didn’t it
42 W: ((nods))
43 F: cause you couldn’t see=
44 W: =I know=
45 F: =do you remember that=
46 W: =yeas:
47 F: and how many bats did we have down the caravan
48 2.1
49 W: two
F: two bats (0.5) why did we have
W: [unintelligible]
F: but why did we have
two bats ((holds up two fingers))
W: because we have a lot of people some people go
in the when they got it in the run ((mimes batting))
F: someone hits the ball (0.3) and then the other
one gets a turn
W: yea they run ((demonstrates running))
F: right (1.1) in between ((nods))
W: I haven’t got the words now (1.3) it gone in the bin now=
F: (hhhh) a:w (.7) just come here for a minute just for minute (.5) William Daddy just wants you for a minute ‘cos I want you to tell me about this (.4) in Austria (.8) ‘cos it’s important (1.3)
W: ((sits down; makes an impatient gesture))
F: ‘cos I can’t remember (.9) I can’t remember
W: ((points to the photo album)) you can see and remember
F: I know but ((looks at a photo))
W: ((looks at the same photo))
F: we I was (.8) try and get it ((mimes throwing a ball)) (1) u::m uh (1.1)
W: every morning you used to say to=
F: =me before we had breakfast come and play basketball and we hadn’t had our breakfast (3.9) ((W smiles at F and F smiles back))
F: did we (1.2) Daddy was hungry and you wanted to play basketball (1.7) ((they both look at the photo))
F: who was the BEST (.7) at playing basketball
W: me
F: na::w
W: who was it then
F: me ((points to himself))
W: no everybody
F: everybody
W: but not Patricia (.5) cant throw proply ((mimes throwing basketball))
F: you used to throw over your head (.5) backwards you wern’t even looking
W: I know but I’m goin try and throw my backwards ((mimes a backwards throw)) (before I didn know and have a run)= ((mimes turning round, throwing ball))
F: =(hhh)I know you threw it backwards and it went in (.8) and we all laughed
W: yeah=
F: =we all said that was clever
W: I know
F: didn we=
W: I go li tha ((mimes throwing))
F: °yea°
W: wye:::
(2.5)
F:* I think that was a lovely house we stayed in
W: yes
F: did you like your bedroom
W: ((looking at toy)) What ((looks up))
F: did you like your bedroom
W: yes
F: was it big
W: what
F: was it big
W: no
F: it was big
W: it wasn’t pink (.5)
F: no not pink BGG ((gestures))

W: big

F: ((nods))

W: yes

F: it was big

W: you can see it (.5) look ((turns to the camera and shows photo of the room)) (.6) Big big big

F: (hhhh)

R: fantastic

F:* and what was in our room (1.2) what=

W: huh

F: did you use to watch of a morning

W: ((looks at F))

F: what did you turn on every morning (3.2)

W: ((shrugs))

F: ((looks at him enquiringly))

W: have a shower ((mimes shower))

F: no::: yeaye

W: had a shower (.5) no you used to watch the television (2.4) but we couldn’t understand it could we why couldn’t we understand the television

W: we have to put a machine in

F: had to put a machine in

W: a machine so we can see the word

F: AHHH yes

W: °like at home°

W: oh we rent a video and and they hadn’t had it (we) got to wait for the lorry come

F: they got to wait

W: idn’ it

F: for the lorry to come

W: yea (1.3) idn it mum ((looks to mother for confirmation))

M: for a long time you got to wait for a long time (1.5) That’s for the caption machine

W: what’s that ((gets up to attend to something else))
E is a normally hearing boy aged 5 years 4 months. In this segment he is looking at a picture book with his sister (S).

In this transcription, the talk has been translated from Sylheti into colloquial English. To indicate the translated talk, different typefaces are used as follows:

- All utterances which are said in English are printed like this.
- All utterances which have been translated from Sylheti to English are printed like this.
* indicates a new photo

(Note: 'Ujol' is the family's nickname for E)

S:* Ujol what is this
E: hHelicopter
S:* wWhat uh kind of 's this
E: uh: (2.1) rocket
S: no: nearly=
E: uh
S:* =wha are these these fighter planes innit(1.0) the war planes (1.2) they shoot people down=
E: =there front gun
S: gun
(6.7)
E: that looks wicked isn't it
S:* ((turns page, points to picture)) plane look=
E: ((looks at picture)) Plane
S:* =What's this
(2.5)
E: huh=
S: one country to another country they go isn't it
E: *yes*
S: =like usLon
E: =it goes high up in the sky isn't it
S: =mmm high they (. ) um go above the clouds=
E: *=yes*
S: and (. ) but what do they do= ((points to picture))
E: ((points to same picture)) we have seen in television=
S: =um: how many people are there
E: (hhh)
S: hundreds and hundreds isn't it
E: (hhh) tFire engine ((points to picture))
S: u:::(0.9) haven't you seen fire on television suddenly it catches fire=
E: =after that it goes under the water=
S: =hm you see there is a bonfire in the water (1.9) you see *(. ) picture look such long wings (2.4) isn't it (0.9) so long wings=
E: =(nods) after that something happens in the water
S: mm (1.3)((turns the page))* what are these
E: do you mean these
S: mmm
E: uh you have done something haven't you
S: here the balloons (. ) a airship
E: eh but (. .) these are something hard names isn't it =
S: no see they like a little basket in a balloon they go
really high they so big look (1.0) they not small like
this balloons they bigger
E: more (. .) they more big than this one isn't it =
S: mm they take people up higher and higher (. 8) little
people like you stay below * that big*
E: (looks up, away from book) yeah =
S: * look (looks down at book and turns page)
E: = but
S: concorde Ujol (0.8) by plane =
E: (looks down at picture) * concorde ° concorde
S: so sharp nose
E: yeah so if it crashes where can it do something
isn't it
S: umm
(3.0)
S: mmm ((turns the page))
(1.4)
E: * oh look at what these are (points to the picture)
S: rescue (. ) thing (. ) yea
(4.2) ([S turns the page]) [overlap with voice of another
child in the room]
S: (leave it)
(1.8)
E: more speedy fly
S: mmm
(2.3) ([S turns the page and then looks at E])
S: d'ya wanna be a pilot Ujol
E: hm
S: d'ya wanna be a pilot
E: hmm
S: when you grow up d'ya wanna fly a plane
E: yeah
S: d'ya want to fly high: in the air
E: yes
S: yes why
E: u::h (1.2) I don't really know it looks nice
S: you like it
E: I could be able to see if there was anything nice
S: (and don't rip it then)
E: * okay
S: * what are these
E: uh:
S: look goes (0.8) (points to new picture) it has two wings
one two one at the front and one at the back (. .) so it
goes more faster
E: so it goes (. .) more speedy fly
S: um (0.7) look * (0.8) (points to a different part of the
picture) the rescue planes (. .) see (. .) when
people crash (0.7) ships (1.4) they (. .)
save people from the sea
E: that that two and that's one=(pointing to the
same picture)
S: mmm
E: one day I bought something you know (0.8) those two
things (. .) the helicopters that I bought
S: * look ([S turns the page and
points to a different picture) on that plane they can fly
towards the air and they can go in the water
E: yeah because they
got this on their mouth= (points to the same picture)
S: = ee: so they won't drown (.)= isn't it
E: [yeah but not these
ones= (points to a different part of the picture)
S: = not these ones because its not close to that
E: these don't have them on their mouths just these ones
S: mm
E: =they can
S: yes (1.7) (turns the page) *like a model plane (1.0)
they fly upwards using control=
E: = yeah here are their control (points to the picture of
the controls)
S: mm (1.2) they fly like a kite (1.3) (points to a
different picture on the page) see
E: like a kite
M: mm
E: * and what is this one I don’t know (points to another
part of the picture)
S: No idea=
E: = at the back at the back looks exactly same isn’t it
S: mm
E: Exactly
S: * look (unintelligible) (turns the page) see (1.3)
they’ve got one type of plane their colours are the
same do you see (1.0) (.). There’s different colours on
the top= E: =yes one day I saw a helicopter it goes very fast
S: * eh (1.1) there’s a parachute (1.3) people stay like
this underneath=
E: * = so long wings more longer (points to the next picture)
S: * Gliding they’re doing gliding
E: where they land it looks very long=
S: =look (1.2) police have got a plane (.) they’ve got
cars
E: when they land they look so long and when they fly
they look so small isn’t it
S: mm because we stay below and (.) as soon as that goes
up it gets smaller
E: oh
S: when it gets smaller you’ll see it
E: and the lower it gets the more you’ll be able to see
it getting larger isn’t it
S: * you move what is it Ujol what is this
E: uh a helicopter
S: uhm (.) no it’s a (1.2) sh chinook
(2.5)
S: uh let me find something else (0.9) um (1.6) um
E: * is it a (.). Concorde if it comes
S: =yeah it will burst and::= E: =make it burst * what’s this
S: it’s a balloon so if this one bursts everyone (.)
really quickly they will fall down and they’ll get injured isn’t it
E: they are going to get injured isn’t it
S: yes
E: yes
S: (unintelligible)
E: it’s so light and cold they’ll get flu isn’t it
S: * mm (1.4) that’s a nice plane isn’t it
different colours
E: (unintelligible)
S: so bright (0.9) you can notice it isn’t it
E: mm
S: which one do you want to go on now you show me which
one you show me Ujol
E: mm
APPENDIX 4.5.2  E WITH SISTER (WORD-FOR-WORD TRANSLATION)

E is a normally hearing boy aged 5 years 4 months. In this segment he is looking at a picture book with his sister (S)

This Appendix is the word for word translation of the same segment presented in Appendix 4.6.1. Details of conversational scene and overlaps are not included in this transcript.

In this transcription, different typefaces are used as follows:
All utterances which are said in Sylheti are printed like this.
All utterances which are said in English are printed like this.
All utterances which have been translated from Sylheti to English are printed like this.

* indicates a new photo
(Note: 'Ujol' is the family's nickname for E)

S:*  Ujol what is this
E:  helicopter
S:*  what uh kind of 's this
E:  uh: (2.1) rocket
S:  no: nearly=
E:  uh
S:*  =wha are these these fighter planes innit(1.0) the war planes (1.2) they shoot people down=
E:  =ou fronto bonduk
    =in front gun
S:  gun
(6.7)
E:  igu lage wicked nani
    this looks wicked not it
S:*  plane look=
E:  plane
(2.5)
E:  huh=
S:  one country to another country zai nani one country to another country go not it
E: °oy°
  °yes°

S: =like amra Lon
   =like us Lon

E: skyo di oofre zhai nani
   up sky high up goes doesn’t

S: =mmm high(.) tara(.) um cloudser oofre zhaigi=
   =mmm high(.) they(.) um clouds above go=

E: oy
   yes

S: and(.) but what do they do=

E: amra television deksi
    we have seen in television

((coughs))=

S: um:ino khoto manush takoyn
   =um: there how many people are

E: (hhh)

S: hundreds and hundreds nani
    hundreds and hundreds not it

E:* (hhh) fire engine

S: u::: (0.9) agun jalai nani televisiono
    (1.1) adkha agun doriyai=
        u::: (0.9) fire catch in television (1.1)
        suddenly fire catches

E: =iggu bade fanir tole jaigi=
    that after water under goes

S: =hm fanita bon fire lagse (1.9) you see(.) picture
    look such long wings (2.4) isn’t it (0.9) so long
    wings

=hm in water bonfire there (1.9) you see(.) picture
    look such long wings (2.4) isn’t it (0.9) so long
    wings

E: =bade phanit kita oijai
    after in water something happens

S:* mm (1.3) what are these

E: ota ni
    that one mean

S: mmm
E: (uh) **tumi khita korsila jani**
(uh) you something have done haven't

S:* here the balloons (.) a airship

E: eh but (.) **ita aro khita** hard names nani=
eh but (.) **this more what hard names not it**=

S: **=na** no see they like a little basket in a balloon
they go really high they so big look (1.0) they not
small like this balloons they bigger

E: **aro (.) ota ota taki aro** big nani=
more this one big than that one not it

S: **=mm manushre tara oofre nega** higher and higher (.8)
**tumi nise takbai** little people °that big°

**=mm people they higher up take higher and higher**
(.8) **you below stay little people °that big°**

E: yeah=

S:* look

E: =but

S: **concorde Ujol** (0.8) by plane=

E: °concorde° concorde

S: so sharp nose

E: yeah so **zudi kunta crashoi to kunta oi khorto** farboni
yeah so if it crashes something can do not it

S: umm

(3.0)

S: **mmm ((turns the page))**

(1.4)

E:* oh **dheko ita khita**
oh look these are what

S: rescue (.) thing (.) yea

(4.2)

S: (leave it)

(1.8)

E: more speedy fly

S: **mmm**

(2.3)

S: **d'ya wanna be a pilot Ujol**

E: hm

S: **d'ya wanna be a pilot**
E: hmm
S: when you grow up d'ya wanna fly a plane
E: yeah
S: d'ya want to fly high: in the air
E: oy
yes
S: oy why
yes why
E: u::h (1.2) I don't really know shundar lage
u::h (1.2) I don't really know nice
S: you like it
E: oh ami dekhtam farmu kunta shundar ota ase ni
oh I to see could be able if there something nice
S: (and don’t rip it then)
E: okay
S:* ita khita
these are what
E: uh:
S: look goes (0.8)((points to new picture)) it has two
wings one two one at the front and one at the back
(.) so it goes more faster
E: so it goes (.) more speedy fly
S: um (0.7) look *(0.8) ((points to a different part of the
picture)) the rescue planes (.). see (.). when people
crash (0.7) ships (1.4) they (.). save people from
the sea
E: ogu ogu duita ar: ogu ek=
that that two and that one
S: =mm
E: oyze ami ek din khita anchi (0.8) oyzen duita khita aj
helicopter je anchilam
you know one day I bought something (0.8) those two
things (.). today helicopter I bought
S:* look ota plane air mukh fly carto fanir
maze flu carto fare
look that plane air in fly can and they water in fly
can
E: yeah because muko ita ase=
yeah because mouth this got=
S: = ee: so they won't drown (.) nani
= ee: so they won't drown (. ) not it

E:* yeah but ita nai=
yeah but these not=

S: =ita fara nai itar kase nai
=these cannot that to close not

E: =fara mukho ita nai nani khali ogu oyo to farbo=
don’t have in mouth these only that one can

S: mm

E: =farbo
=can

S:* ye:s (1.7) like a model plane (1.0) tara control di
oofre di fly core plane=
ye:s (1.7) like a model plane (1.0) they control
with upwards using fly plane

E: =yeah ono tar tarar control
=yeah here their control

S: mmm (1.2) oyze kitor lahan fly core tara(1.3) see
mmm (1.2) kite like fly do they (1.3) see

E: like a kite

S: mm

E: ar ikta kita ami jani na
And this what I don’t know

S: No idea=

E: =peeto:f peeto:f exactly same lage nani
=at back at back exactly same looks not it

S: mm

E: exactly

S:* oy dheko see (1.3) tara ekta plane ase tara ekh zat
colour do you see (1.0) ufre=
yes look see (1.3) they one plane have got they are
same colour do you see (1.0) on top=

E: =there’s different colours oy ami ekh dun oh khita
helicopter deksi ze fant ze zai
=there’s different colours yes I one day some
helicopter have seen very fast it goes

S:* eh (1.1) oy ze parachute (1.3) manush ola nise take=
eh (1.1) there a parachute (1.3) people like
underneath stay=

E: =zhe lamba wings aro lamba =what a long wings more longer

S:* gliding tara glide khore
gliding they glide do

E: zeno tara lando lage je lamba=
where they land looks very long

S: =oy dhek (1.2) policer plane ase(.) tarar gare ase
=yes look (1.2) police plane have got (. ) they cars got

E: zhemno igu nani land oy lagho ze lamba are zhemna
ogu oofre zhai lage je sutu nani
when they land they look so long when they fly they
look so small not it

S: mm because amra nu nise toki ( . ) ar igu oofre gele
zhoto oofre zhaibo oto suto oy
mm because we stay down below (. ) and that up goes
as soon as it get smaller

E: oh
S: suto oyle tumi dekhbai
smaller it gets you will see it

E: ar zhoto nise zhai oto dektai farbai ze lamba nani
and more lower it gets more you will be able to see
getting more longer not it

S:* tumi horo what is it Ujol what is this
you move what is it Ujol what is this

E: uh a helicopter

S: u : m (. ) no it’s a: (1.2) sh chinook
(2.5)

S: uh let me find something else (0.9) um (1.6) u : m

E:* it a (. ) concorde u:: zodi ogure fatai laibo aiya nani
is this is

it a (. ) concorde if that will burst comes not it

S: yeah ogu burst oy zhaibo ar:=
yeah it will burst and:=

E:* =what’s this

S: igu balloon so igure burst corle shob (. ) really
quickly (1.2) nise forba (. ) ar tara injured oyba
nani
it a balloon so if this one burst everyone (. ) really quickly (1.2) down fall (. ) and they will injured get not it

E: tara injured oiba nani they are injured going to get not it

S: oy yes
E: oy yes
S: ( )
E: khoto (. ) fatla khoto tanda lag (. ) jor oybo nani so (. ) so cold seems (. ) flu will get not it

S:* mm (1.4) igu nice plane nani different colours mm (1.4) that nice plane not it different colours
E: u:h=
S: =so bright (0.9) you can notice it (1.7) nani =so bright (0.9) you can notice it (1.7) not it
E: uh
S: tumi kuntat sorbai (1.1) tui amare dekho okhon (. ) you show me Ujol which one want to go on (1.1) show me which one( . ) you show me Ujol
E: mm
APPENDIX 4.6    J WITH MOTHER

J is a normally hearing boy aged 6 years 11 months. In this segment, he is looking at family photos with his mother (M).

* indicates a new photo

M:* who’s that then
J:  that’s (.) Lily
M:  (wonder up)=
J:  mummy (.)
M:  =that was on the Heath
J:  she=
J:  =mummy she used to be (.) she she she’s (.) got short hair now and now Lily’s: got long hair=
M:  =mmm she didn’t have any=
J:  no
M:  =hair at all when she was born did she=
J:* =thas me (.) I don’t have that coat anymore (.) mum mummy I don’t
M:  no yes you do=
J:  =I dont=
M:  =is at home=*
J:  I do but it don’t fit me=
M:* =there’s you being silly
J:  hahaha no I’m not being silly=
M:  =how old were you then you were about=
J:  =about five
M:  =Lily’s age weren’t you=
J:  =’bout five=
M:  =were you=
J:  =’bout five(.)
M:* there’s that one (.)* that’s a good one thas in the enclosure
J:  =that’s old°
M:* there look
J:  lemme have a look° oh yeah I don’t have braces anymore
M:  no (1.4)* who’s this
J:  (hhhh) hahahaha thas Russ (HHH) hahaha thas Russell thas me (1.0) thas (. ) Li Lily
M:  thats before we had any grass in the garden as well isn’t it
J:  I know and there’s Pete and
M:  yeah (2.4) (thats all the building) * who’s that=
J:  =tha thats daddy
M:  (with/he’s got) a silly hat on=
J:  =yeah where is that hat at home
M:  I don’t think it’s at home it must a been Hank’s or somebody’s it’s it’s not ours is it=
J:  =who=
M:* =that’s you with the Thunderbirds are go (1.7) tracksuit
J:  (hhhh) hahaha it’s not like that anymore (2.2)
J:* what is that=
M:* and there’s Lily
J: where is that
M: baldy Lily you know (that)
J: (hhhh) heheh (.) thats when we had that
(2.0) oh yes we two that's when we had those ummm
that in the kitchen look can you see that there
M: sort-of black and white lino tiles
h yea=
J: =umm
(1.4)
M:* mmm all on the Heath
J:* there’s me go (.)* there’s Lily
M: Lily
J: I’m climbing on the (lee climb) (hhh) uh (.)
*look at Lily (.) (hhh)hahaha
M:* yeah she’s sweet she’s got a belly there
J: HAHAHAHAHA
M: uhahahahah=
J: =e:hahaha(hhh)
M: d’ya remember when she was born she had no hair=
J: =yeah oh yeah look at (.) that’s one of me with one
o’ those horrible floorboards
M: horrible floorboards
J: yeah horrible (.)* look at me cross (.) don wanna go
home=
M: =You didn’t want your photo taken there did you
J: no (..) * there’s Hank
(.
M:** these aren’t very these aren’t very um ((M flips
through a few photos))
J:* is gone all dirty (.) look=
M: =it’s got someone’s fingerprint there=
J: =oh oh mummy look I’m gonna throw some (hhh) grass
t you=
M: °I don’t know°
J: =there’s Pippa there’s Pippa’s bottom=
M: =(hhhh) haha
J: hahaha=
J: =yea but it is mum
M: I know
J: (hhhhh)
M: I know it is=
J:* =mmmm
(.
M:* oh this is one when we were in France remember this
J: oh yeah ( )
M: magic stones what were they called=
J: =but magic what they don I don know
(1.5) ((M and J look at each other))
M: I can’t remember what they were called=
J: =no I can’t remember=
M: =there was a a big circle wasn’t there
J: gi
(3.0)
J:* mum where is that in the garden
M: yeah I think so (.) ”you can see the houses in here°
and there (Lisa is) on the sofa
J: there’s Phillip=
M:* =what’s this
J: thas €:(.) Thas me doing (.)
M: where is it
J: is in is in our house=
M: =is it=
J: =look
M: you were stripping wallpaper
J: yeah (.) I'm doing it there=
M: =what's that
J: I had a cut on my lip look
M: d'ya remember how you got that
J: no I can't no (hhhh) no I can't=
M: =can't remember=
J: =no
(1.0)
J: oh I hit myself on the lip actually=
M: hit yourself on the lip=
J: =yeah (hhh) hit myself on the lip (1.0) no I was
trying to do (1.6) get enough off and I hitting on
on there on the wall it scratched my ((points to his
lip))
M: oh I don't remember that (you go)
.
.
.
M: what's that
J: 'nother jet (.) British Airways=
M: =what's that say ((pointing to the label under the
picture))
J: Concorde
M: () yeah:
J: still a jet (1.5) same thing (1.9) is it
M: I don't know if it is ( ) I think maybe
J: 3.8 ((M turns over a few pages))
M: * these are all passenger planes
.
.
.
M: What's this (.) you've got one of these it's a car
J: =remote control=
M: =yeah (.) remote control
J: I got a remote control car and this is a remote
control aeroplane
Jo is a normally hearing boy aged 7 years. In this segment, he is looking at a picture book with his sister (L).

* indicates a new photo

L: okay go on Jo what’s happening in this picture
Jo: that (is)
L:* don’t read it jus see what’s coming from the picture what’s happening
Jo: I don know they might be (1.0) they walking around
L: well how many dinosaurs are there
(7.0) ((Jo counts the dinosaurs))
Jo: seven
L: seven (2.4) how many like can you see what they’re all doing ( ) what they doing
Jo: the:: ( ) one’s eating a gra: um (.) tree (.) another one eating (0.9) they all eating grass
L: they’re eating grass=
Jo: =yeah ((turns the page))
L:* what about here
Jo: here
L: yeah uh whas whas this one doing
Jo: they’re nickin it uh taking eggs
L: taking eggs
Jo: yeah=
L: =d’you know why they taking eggs Jo
Jo: I don’t know
L: you don know
Jo:* an this one=
L: =wha wha you think (.) he’s doin there ( ) look
Jo: taking away
L: d’ya think he might be eating them
Jo: yeah (0.7) ((points to another picture)) and that one stealing ri all the ( ) all of the ( . ) * dinosaurs are running away ( . )
L: oh=
Jo: =this big one
L: the big one ( . ) why
Jo: I don know ( . ) he mus be s scary ((turns the page))
L:* ((laughs) and what about these ones what these ones ( . ) whats special about these dinosaurs
Jo: they’re fly they’ve got wings
L: an there what=
Jo: u: h
L: =they doing
Jo: in they’re flying about
L: ((turns the page)) they’re flying about
Jo: yeah ( . ) ((turns back to a previous picture)) there none here
L: ((points to same picture)) what about these ones d’ya think these ones can fly
Jo: no ( . ) they can walk around tho
L: why can’t they fly
Jo: because they haven’t got wings (8.5) ((L turns the page; both look around, distracted by the friend; whispering))
L:* and what are look these ones then
Jo: which
L: who about these dinosaurs
(4.7) (both are distracted again; friend is removed from the
room; more whispering)
L:* (turns the page) have a look at these ones Jo whas
these ones=
Jo: these are (. ) these are the swimming ones=
L: swimming ones
Jo: yeah ( ) this is a dinosaur oh that one=
L: where are where are they swimming
Jo: under the sea
L: under the sea=
Jo: and that's a swor fish=
L: oh look (1.9) u:::h lets see (turns the page)
Jo: oo
L:* these ones (. ) where do these these ones look like
( . ) where are they
Jo: they
L: they in to the desert aren't they=
Jo: no if they in the desert they'll die (looks up at the
camera)
L: (laughs)
(1.8) (L. turns the page)
L: 't about these ones
Jo: these ones have white little cuckoo head
L: and them (. ) what they look li are they doing=
Jo: they fighting
L: no:::
Jo: they running=
L: they're running away from something
Jo: yeah no: they running away from everyone
(1.6) (L turns the page)
L: let's see shall we go on to another book
Jo: a alright let me do this one no I wanna do air craft
((Jo takes another book))
L: air craft
(5.9) (both look at new book; Jo turns pages; selects a
page)
Jo:* looks like a shark
L: why
Jo: look at his head
L: o.k. then
Jo: uh (L helps Jo to turn two pages; she selects next
picture)
L: let's see (1.2) this is interesting
Jo: ah=
L:* what's this
Jo: this is (. ) kind of starry air um (. ) air line look
(1.5)
L: where is it
Jo: goes to into the a
L: (whats this) what is it
Jo: (rainbow)
L: where are they
Jo: in the airport
L: and that is
Jo: that's in (. ) near where it comes from (. ) near (. )
the: helicopter
L: uhum ((turns the page))
Jo: °oh God°
L:* that's it (.) what about this airplane Josh have you
Jo: that will come (.) that's an older one
L: where've you seen have you been in one it's an older one
Jo: oldest
L: what kind of airplane did we get on= ((turns page))
Jo: =to come to London
Jo: Kuwait airways
L: is that an old airplane no
Jo: no it's a new one
L: it's a new one
Jo:* look at that one (0.7) we've seen those ones (1.8)
((turns the page)) the these these (.) are the kind (.)
that's the one (.) look
L: =that kind of airplane
Jo: yeah
L: but not on concorde we didn't get on concorde
Jo: no concordes are too fast ((turns the page))
L: a::nd
Jo:* that one's a sea (0.8) that comes on the sea (.)
look at that one (2.5) ((Jo turns the page))
L: u:m let's see (1.4)
Jo:* that's um (0.9) u: war (.) that's the war one
L: war one ?
Jo: you know when (.) war happened
L: °oh (.) right°
(2.3) ((L turns the page))
Jo: there some ("thing else")
L:* what about there who are these (.)
who's that
Jo: they might (.) be (.) coming from space
L: coming from space
Jo: yeah (.) space helmets
(2.2) ((Jo turns the page))
L:* oh look at (1.9) these ones what
Jo: they's (.) life guards
L: sort of rescuing people
Jo: [yeah ((turns the page)) * that's a an
ambulance (.) * what is that
L: which one
Jo: there
L: dunno (1.8) ((looks at a different picture)) * oh look
flying boats they flying boats and flying plane
(1.7) ((L turns the page))
Jo:* look at those=
L: =and what about these=
Jo: =he he he's try he's controlling that (.) um plane
( .) with a remote control
L: remote control what about him
Jo: he's got (.) um thingy
L: no it's a hand glider
Jo: oh and (.) kite
L: so these are other things that can fly look
Jo: a frisbee
L: frisbee
Jo: kite um one of these what are they called again
L: that's a kite
Jo: no that ain't= ((looks at L))
L: =it is
Jo: when they fall from the plane
L: oh parachute
Jo: yeah parachute (0.4) look at that long (board board)=
L: =hmm
Jo: and there's another parachute
(1.7)
L: and ((turns the page))
Jo:* look at all these planes
L: these are all special planes
Jo: there's one there ((points to a toy transformer plane on
the table))
(1.9)
L: uhumm
Jo: "I know to transform it" ((turns the page)) * (uh: police uh ) o:::h "I wanna read this" ((he reads))
"use for aircraft..."
L: let's go on to the other book
APPENDIX 4.8  K WITH MOTHER

K is a normally hearing boy aged 4 years 9 months. In this segment, he is looking at family photos with his mother (M).

* indicates a new photo

K: an last year I did have those trainers
M: oh yea=
K: =they’re black and
M: no they’re navy and green (.5) dark blue
K: yeah an (.) and I had LA:CES
M:* alright who’s this
K: (hhh) (1) me (1.2) who who do you think that is
M: I think that’s Rory
K: Rory Saoirse
M: and who’s Saoirse
K: huh
M: who’s Saoirse
K: my sister ((looks up at camera))
((M nods briefly at camera))
(2.2)
M:* there’s you two
K: me (.8) me and my sister (2.6) we playin te: we were playing tennis (1.7) ((drops photo and gets off chair to retrieve it)) °but the ball wen°
M:* come here a minute (.9) look can you tell me who this is (3.2)
K: °uh uh ° uncle Shame
M: ((looks at camera)) his real name is uncle Shane and ((looks at K)) K calls him uncle Sham:e
K: (hhh)
M:* oh look
K: I can’t say it properly
M: who’s that
(3)
K: ss ss Saoirse and Fenaz
M: and who’s Fenaz
K: my sister’s friend in India
(3.6)
M:* °that’s you there°
K: that’s me when I was a baby
M: mmm
K:* that’s still me when I was a baby
(4.9)
K:* me as a baby
M:* remember that=
K: =yeah
M: wha what were you doing there
K: I w’z on a (.9) I w’z on a pony=
M: =mm where was that
K: uh in India=
M: =whereabouts in India
K: aaw forgot=
M: no you haven’t
K: I HA::VE

388
M: Bombay
K: Bombay
(4.9)
what are you doing there
K: ((to R, showing some cut out photos)) my mummy cut these out didn you=
((K and M look at each other
M: =mmm (1.5) I was gonna stick them all to a picture (1.7) make a picture of all the photographs but I haven't done it yet (.6) what are you doing here
K: crying=
M: =yeah=
K: =that was mine ((points to a toy in the photo))
M: oh yeah "wonder what happened to that" (1.8)
K: I thin I lost it (1.7) remember=
M: =mmmm=
K: =I'm too big for it now=
M:* =who's this=
K: =I I wa I wa I want my Thundercat my Thundercat= ((points to same toy in photo as above))
M: =mmmmhmm (.8) we'll have to go and get it
K: yeah=
M: =who's this
K: Daddy
M:* ((puts photo in front of K))
K: me and my sister (6)
((K gets up and takes a tape off the shelf))
M: what are you doing no we can't listen to music now and you don't even know what it is put it back (. ) come on sit down (. ) just for a minute it won't take long
K: (hhhh) hehe
M: let me see if there's anything else what about when you were oh I know what you would like to look at (1.3) *when you went on holiday last year tell me about this (.9) where's that
K: u:::h in America
M: where is that
K: u:::h (1.6) um somewhere somewhere um where where you want to look for what you want for Christmas=
M: =yes Christmas World or something isn't it=
K: =yeah
M: and who was that with you
K: ma ma Monnen
M: and who is Mullen
K: my my my: ( ) cousin
M: yeah
(1.7)
M:* oh what are you doing here (4.4) what's that=
K: =e:::r (1.5)
M: what are you dressed up as
K: A CLOWN (3.8)
M:* same one (2)
M:* what are you wearing here (1) know what that's
called
K: no
M: I’ve forgotten what it’s called as well (1.9)
M:* who’s that
K: Granny
M: and what happened to granny (1.4)
K: WHOOO::GH I nearly went backwards on my [chair
M: ’hmm’ you need to be careful don’t you
K: cos (1.4) that one’s wobbely °this
M:* one’s wobbly one°=
K: =Who’s this (1)
M: =Kavita
K: =and who’s she
K: =my other cousin
M: =uhuh (2.3)
M: ’lemme see where’s a good one° (1.3) OH WHO IS THAT
BOY [THERE=
K: =HAHAHA
M: =with a baseball hat=
K: =me (1.2)
M: you look very American (1.5) ’what’s° (.8) tell me *
*about this one look that’s a good photograph (.9)
look at this (1.3) what was happening
K: =they:: (.8) um (.8) (hhh) hot air balloon=
M: =’hmm (.6) just behind the house you were staying in
K: =yea (1.8)
M: =would you like to go up in a balloon
K: =no way (hhhhh)=
M: =no (hhh) (3.2)
M:* =who’s that (2)
K: =uh:::h (3.6)
M: =have you forgotten
K: =yea (.9)
M: =uncle Ram
K: =yea uncle Ram (2)
M:* =there’s Granny::: they’re all finished what about
K: =GRANNY::: these
M: =well we can look at some of them but I don’t I
thought you were bored looking at photographs (2)
M:* =who’s that (2.7)
K: (hhh)
M:* =can you recognise it from that
(1.8)
K: auntie Shelley=
M: =mmm (.6) and where’s auntie Shelley (.9) now (1.7)
K: here
M: yea she’s upstairs (3)
M:* who is that
K: me
M: that’s you on your first birthday °you don’t remember that° (1.2) °we’ve done this one° (1.9)
K: that me when I was a~baby
M: Lmmmmmm oh look you were having a picnic there with Saoirse and Fenaz (1.9)
K: what was I eating (2.5)
K: Saoirse was eating a (.8) banana mmm
M:
K: I was eating (.4) bread mmm
M: looks like it (1.7)
K: and there is biscuits (.4) yum yum ((K wriggles on his chair))
M: careful
K: I didn’t do it on purpose (3)
K:* that’s me=
M: =mmm=
K:* °that’s me° (5)
K: that’s enough
In this Appendix, all the fragments quoted or referred to in the text are presented. They are each numbered as in the text, and are presented in the following order (as for Appendices 3 and 4):

A with Mother .....................................................................393
Kh with Father ...................................................................397
Kh with Mother...................................................................399
W with Father ....................................................................403
E with Sister .....................................................................405
J with Mother......................................................................408
Jo with Sister ....................................................................410
K with Mother.....................................................................412
Fragments quoted for A and his mother

Fragment A1
1 M: o.k. come listen here who’s this ((pointing to R))
2 what’s their name name
3 A: is Merle=
4 M: hm ( ) hm ?
5 A: Merle
6 M: o:h
7 I: Merle Merle their name Merle
8 M: how is it then is it like this or like that
9 ((indicates that she wants A to fingerspell the name))
10 A: Merle ((fingerspells “m” correctly))
11 M: Merle ((fingerspells “m” incorrectly))
12 A: ((looks at R, fingerspells “m” again)) that Merle
13 M: ((fingerspells “m” correctly))
14 R: that’s right yes
15 M: ((laughs))
16 A: ((looks at R)) Margaret Merle ( ) ((looks at M)) mum 17
18 ((fingerspelling “m” with each word))
19 M: ((laughs))
20 R: That’s right
21 A: ((looks at R)) same
22 R: very good ( ) Altab=
23 A: =same
24 M: same= 
25 R: =same
26 M: that the same and Ingrid ( ) is it Ingrid=
27 A: =Ingrid not same ((shakes head))
28 I: (unintelligible)
29 M: not same ((shakes head)) then how is Ingrid ( )
30 like this
31 A: no
32 M: let me see (. ) show me then
33 I: sit down here sit down here
34 A: Ingrid
35 M: hm ?
36 A: I want car
37 M: (unintelligible) talk about your son
38 A: I want
39 Altab come Altab Altab
40 A: o:w
41 M: ((to I)) he doesn’t want to sit with me oh Altab

Fragment A2
1 M: * Who’s that ((points to a new photo))
2 A: My dad
3 M: mm ((points to another person in the photo))
4 A: he brother
5 M: mm
6 A: look ((pointing to photo and holding the book up to the camera))
7 M: * who’s that ((points to a different photo))
8 A: look= ((he is attending to a different photo))
10 M: =mm 
11 A: who he got ....

Fragment A6
A: ((A points to a different photo on same page)) * =look the my baby 
M: ALTAB ((looks at Altab)) 
A: (laughs)=
M: ="you baby"
A: (1.8) ((smiles up at camera; looks at mother; turns over page; turns back page)) look

Fragment A7
1 A: Who that ((pointing to his sister in the same photo))
2 M: Shani
3: h he (.) your sister ((looks at M))
4 M: mm
5 ((A turns the page))

Fragment A8
1 M: ((points to another photo on same page)) * who's that (1.5)
2 dadi^1
3 (2.0)
4 A: ((turns over page; points to a photo)) * Who's that 
5 M: mm Is that mummy ((pointing to the same photo))
6 (3.4)
7 M: Is that baby (1.7) (unintelligible)=
8 A: =What that ((points to the same photo again))
9 M: mm (3.2) ((points to a different photo on same page)) * Is that affa^2
10 that affa
11 (2.8)
12 A: Who that ((points to the photo M is still pointing at))
13 M: affa ((keeps pointing to the photo)) (3.4) mm
14 ((sound of baby breathing))
15 A: affa ((turns attention to another photo on same page)) LOOK MY DAD

Fragment A10
1 (2.1) ((A turns the page; M points to a new photo))
2 M: * Shani (1.6) * Altab ((pointing to another photo on this page)) (1.6) little baby (1.5)
3 4 A: me big he small * who that ((points to another photo; looks up at mother))
5 M: (laughs gently) Altab
6 A: Me I'm big
7 M: ehh (1.0) ((points to another photo on this page))
8 * Shani::
9 (2.5) ((A laughs, puts both hands to head copying pose of Shani in photo; M laughs; A looks to the right, towards Shani))

^1 Dadi means paternal grandmother.
^2 In Sylheti, affa means sister or girl cousin.
13 A: look you
14 M: (laughs) (1.6) ((looks towards Shani, points to picture))
15 A: (laughs) you (1.5) ((still looking at Shani, addressing her) that you
16 M: mm
18 A: y you’re a baby ((turns the page))
19 M: eh ((points to a new photo)) . . .

Fragment A11
1 A: ((turns his attention to another photo on same page))
2 * my bicycle
3 M: ((points to this photo and nods)) uh Shani
4 (2.3)
5 A: Shani bicycle ?
6 M: mm (. ) bicycle
7 A: my bicycle ?
8 M: um ((nods))
9 A: LOOK MY BICYCLE ((looks at camera))
10 M: ohya They have seen they have seen your bicycle
11 A: [Look my
12 bicycle (1.2) LOOK=
13 M: =They have seen =((gives Altab a gentle push
14 with her shoulder))
15 A: =look my bicycle
16 M: uh (. ) Altab’s bicycle
17 (2.9)

Fragment A13
1 A: * who that ((points to a woman in the photo))
2 M: mm (. ) affa
3 A: * him ? ((points to a second woman in the photo))
4 M: kalama
5 A: =he brother your brother ?= ((points to a man in the photo))
6 M: =Who’s that who’s that ((she points to a third woman))
7 A: your mum
8 M: (ne)= ((shakes her head))
9 A: =that your brother ? ((looks at mother; points back to the man))
10 M: mm ((nods her head)) sister
11 A: ((looks at camera, shows photo)) it she sister ((points to mother))
12 M: mm (. ) sister ((nods her head))
13 (2.2) ((M turns the page))
14 M: Mama ((M points to a man in a new photo. Other family members including his mother are also pictured.))
15 A: (A looks down at the same picture) mama (. ) my (. ) mama
16 (A points to the same photo))
17 M: mm
18 A: that my (. ) THAT my mum ((looks up at camera; holds

---

3 In Sylheti, affa means sister or girl cousin.
4 In Sylheti, kalama means maternal aunt.
5 In Sylheti, mama means maternal uncle.
the same photo up to the camera; points towards the photo)

M: mm

(2.3)

Fragment A14

1 M: * ((points to a photo))
2 A: LOOK
3 (1.0) ((points to the same photo as M))
4 A: MY PLANE
5 (1.3) ((holds up a photo for the camera))
6 M: "plane" ((looks at Altab))
7 R: Plane lovely
8 A: MY BANGLA
9 M: (1.5) ((smiles and crinkles eyes)) Bang
10 A: LOOK MY BANGLA (1.7)
11 ((shows photo to I on left)) my ((points to himself))
12 M: o: Bangl Is he from Bangladesh
13 I: His plane from Bangladesh ((I talks to sister in Sylheti))
14 M: ((looks left; is momentarily distracted))
15 A: Yes (1.5) ((addresses to I; nods and points to himself)) I got Bengali
16 (1.6)
17 (1.6)
18 M: mmm (0.8) In Bangladesh (unintelligible)
19 A: looo:: me plane
20 M: oh:=
21 A: =and (0.9) hey (1.2) hey (1.8) ((looks up at camera and gestures to R to get her attention)) I got I got big (.)
22 plai: (...) my (1)
23 ((A looks at a new photo on the same page))
24 M: "aeroplane" * Who's that ((pointing to granny in the photo A is attending to))
Fragments quoted for Kh and his father

Fragment Kh1
1 F: ....(0.9) who got the jacket (1.3)
2 Kh: daddy
3 F: daddy (0.8) ((F nods)) good boy (1.0) * what else
4 there (1.0) what this
5 Kh: this
6 F: mum
7 Kh: flowers
8 F: flower (. ) what colour is (.) look
9 Kh: Red green (1.3)
10 F: Red and green
11 Kh: um
12 (2.8) ((Kh and F look closely at the photo))

Fragment Kh2
1 F: * who are them (1.7)
2 ((sound of sister’s voice))
3 Kh: Dad and mum
4 F: Your mum and dad (.) where your mum (3.2)

Fragment Kh3
1 F: * Whe where is this picture (0.7) can you tell me ((F
2 picks up the album, shows Kh, looks at Kh))
3 Kh: Hmm ? ((looks at F))
4 F: Where is that ((puts album down))
5 Kh: By his (not) in a sand ((looks down at album,
points down))
6 S: (unintelligible)
7 F: In the sand (. ) where is it ((looks at Kh))(1.5) ((looks
8 down at photo)) you remember that
9 Kh: ((nods))
10 F: ((picks album up again, but continues to look
  down at photo))
11. (1.5) where you are (1.1) did you find where the
12 Khaim here (2.0) no (. ) can’t see it
13 Kh: ((points to himself in the photo and looks up at F))
14 F: oh yes it is you it is
15 ((telephone rings; Kh looks up towards it))
16 F: Seaside (0.9) seaside ((looks up at Kh and nods))(1.1)
17 Kh: ((nods)) ((nods))
18 F: yeah (1.3) seaside
19 Kh: Same like say it same like that (0.8) one
20 ((points behind him ))
21 F: Where=
22 Kh: =Finton
23 F: In Finton (.) yes ((nods emphatically)) nice=
24 Kh: =Same
25 F: Finton ((looks down at album))
26 Kh: Sister under in the water ((points to a particular
27 section of the photo of Finton))
28 F: You been there haven’t you ((looks at Kh)) (0.8)
29 Kh: ((nods))
30 F: you been there (0.7) did you ((nods))=
397
31 Kh: ((nods)) ((nods)) two times
32 F: =Two times (. ) twice you been twice (1.9) good

Fragment Kh4
1 F:* what this (1.0)
2 Kh: sister
3 F: what’s: ( . ) she got(1.6)
4 Kh: a ball
5 F: what she got a ball
6 Kh: mum ( . )
7 F: your mum
8 Kh: and me (1.6) I got a ball=
9 F: =you got a ball too(0.9) big ball
10 Kh: yeah

Fragment Kh5
1 Kh:*Where that where uh see it (. ) water (0.8) a boat=
2 F: what is this
3 F: =what is is what is this Khaim
4 (4.2)
5 Kh: Bridge
6 F: Bridge a bridge good boy (1.0) well done is that
7 (2.8)
8 Kh: My mum (1.2) (kgi) (0.8) standing up wi water wi wi
9 sand
10 F: Mummy
11 (7.2)
12 F: Who is she (. ) your teacher (. ) say your teacher for
13 me
14 Kh: (Ah mi::d) say say
15 F: Who who who is she who is she
16 Kh: Miss Door
17 F: Miss Tool
18 (15.6) ((K turns over a few pages; sister walks into picture))
Fragments quoted for Kh and his mother

Fragment KhM1.
1 M: * Alright who’s that then ((points to a picture))
2 Kh: The baby
3 M: Mm (1.8) * and who’s that ((points to a different picture))
4 Kh: ( a bird) (1.3)
5 M: Alright
6 ((much interruption from Father and cousin))

Fragment KhM3
(Kh holds the book on his lap and looks at the pictures)
1 Kh: * Big great teddy bear
2 ((M looks over at book, and glances up at Kh))
3 M: Mm
4 Kh: The ambulance (1.8) the fire engine
5 ((M takes book and turns the page))
6 M: Speak loudly (0.8) the way you said it before
7 Kh: I said=
8 M: =And what are these who’s that *( (points to a picture))
9 Kh: Boat
10 M: and ?
11 Kh: And childrens (2.0)
12 * ((M points to a different picture))
13 Kh and the (.)(girl is ((he points to same picture as M))
14 little sister starts to cry)
15 (3.7) ((little sister continues to cry; father picks her up 16 and stands next to Kh, looking at the book))
17 M: Speak in Bangla what is it called what
18 is it called in Bangla ((she points to a new picture))
19 F: bird bird
20 Kh: =Bird
21 F: BIRD
22 S: Bird bird
23 ((little sister cries))
24 M: ((to father)) You said it in English (1.7)
25 ((to K)) * and these what are they in Bangla=( (points to a new picture))
26 S: =°Balloon°
27 Kh: Balloon
28 M: mm
29 F: Balloon
30 M: What’s the name of this horse (0.9)
31 Kh: Old (1.4) man
32 ((M looks at I, then looks back down at book; then turns the page)
33 (3.2)

Fragment KhM4
1 Kh: * the old lady((points to picture)
2 M: ((looks back at book)) mm

---

6 There is no Sylheti word for 'balloon'. The English word has been incorporated into the language.
Kh: The children giving the m money (1.1) um (1.2) This holding it
M: * What are these ((smiles up at sister; points to another picture))
Kh: it’s the t (1.2)
M: huh ?
Kh: the poli::ceman
(4.1) ((M turns the page; glances over to I; Kh looks at the picture))
Kh: ducks:
(4.2) ((M and Kh scan the picture, M points vaguely across the page))
Kh: grass
(3.7) ((M starts to turn the page; both are looking down at the book))
Kh: leaves
M: ((M turns the page)) mm
(3.2) ((Kh and M scan the page))
M: what’s he doing
Kh: ((points to a picture)) Him ?
M: mm
Kh: ((Kh looks down at the book) Cooking (0.8) up (.) food and the ma::n
(2.1) ((M looks towards I; F distracts her; Kh continues to look down at the book))
Kh: man eating (.) the the saus
M: Say it louder ((she is still looking towards F))
Kh: He eating UP(.).SAUSAGES
M: Huh ? ((M looks back at book)
Kh: EATING SAUSAGES
M: mm (1.3)((glances at I then looks back at book)) * what are they doing ?
Kh: Making sausages
M: * And ((M points to a picture))
Kh: and (1.3) see (.) the old lady frightened (.) and that(1.6) that (.) one (1.2)
M: ((addresses the interpreter in Sylheti)) they want to see if he can speak Bangla but he won’t speak it

Fragment KhM5
Kh: ((points to a picture)) * Old (.) lady sitting in (.) a chair
(3.3) ((Kh and M look at the picture; M turns the page))
Kh: everyone ((He points to a picture, keeps his finger on this picture)) (1.1) everyone (.) look in a book for one dog the old man (1.2) stuck with the (.) with gold (.) one
M: ((smiles up at Kh)) He hasn’t got any teeth
Kh: (laughs)
M: (hhhh)(laughs)
Kh: (laughs)(unintelligible)
M: Say what the man’s doing ((both Kh and M look down at a different picture on the page))
Fragment KhM6
1 M: What does your miss do (. ) what does your miss teach you
2 (1.9)
3 Kh: and (. ) she (. ) we (. ) play outside (2.5)
4 M: (nods) mm
5 Kh: with (. ) the ball
6 M: mm
7 Kh: a:nd uh
8 M: who takes you in the morning
9 (5.0)
10 S: car=
11 Kh: =car
12 M: mm
13 (2.0)

Fragment KhM7
1 M: no ((taps Kh’s knee)) what do you do over there
2 what do you do at school (. ) at school what
3 does your miss make you write
4 (1.5)
5 Kh: a:nd (2.5) uh I don’t know
6 M: do you understand what I say
7 Kh: mm
8 M: what did I say
9 Kh: you said what writing does the teacher give
10 M: yes ((looks at I))
11 I: he understood
12 Kh: sometime she find something in the book
13 M: and that day where did you go (. ) with your
14 miss (. ) seaside (. ) what’s the name of the
15 seaside

Fragment KhM8
10 M: mm (2.0) a:nd the one that you go with that
11 lady what’s that girl’s name
12 Kh: Sarah ?
13 M: is Sarah like this ((nods)) (1.9) is she not
14 like this (( )) ((shakes head))
15 Kh: no

Fragment KhM9
1 Kh: and (1.3) see (. ) the old lady frightened (. ) and
2 that(1.6) that (. ) one (1.2)
3 M: ((addressing the other adults in room)) they want to
4 see if he can speak Bangla but he won’t speak it
5 I: mm he’s speaking Bangla and English
6 Kh: I want speak English
7 I: that’s o.k. it’s not a problem
8 M: then I said
9 Kh: ((points to a picture)) old (. ) lady sitting in (. ) a
10 chair
11 (3.3) ((M turns the page))
Fragment KhM10

1. F: °tell him to speak in Bangla°=
2. M: =say in Bangla what do you do=
3. Kh: =I eat (. ) I eat some (.4) dinner
4. M: speak in Bangla
5. I: =no it’s o.k. for him to speak in English
6. Kh: (na (. ) why
7. I speak in Bangla
8. M: Then you have to speak Bangla or you can’t be
9. filmed
10. Kh: I can’t speak in Bangla ((shakes head))
11. I: it’s alright in English
12. M: alright
13. I: let him speak in English it’s o.k.
14. M: do you want to speak ? ...
Fragments quoted for W and his father

Fragment W1

6  F: ... * what did we used to do (0.6) because
7    we were playing against Peter (0.7) and Peter
8    couldn't hit the ball
9    2.75
10 W: because if you need to throw it under= ((mimes
11    an underarm throw))
12 F: =underarm (0.6) but then when you get a big boy
13    what do you do with the ball (1.6) what was we
14    practising
15 W: you go o:ver= ((mimes overarm throw))
16 F: over an and you ran faster
17 W: ((nods))

Fragment W2

1  F: William just come and tell me about these (.8)
2    before we go (1.4)* where did we go on holiday (1.5)
3    wha
4  W: hotel
5  F: Yeah but what was the name of the country
6    (2.9)
7  W: ((shrugs))
8  F: ((looks at him quizzically))
9  W: Austria
10 F: =Austria (. ) and how did we go to Austria (1.1)
11    How did we get there did we fly in an aeroplane
12 W: No (.8) we went in a car and then in a boat and
13    then in a car
14 F: In the car to the boat (.5) then in the boat
15    that's right we did (.8) What did we do on the boat
16    °wha° did you go in the playroom
17 W: Yeah
18 F: Was there other children in there
19 W: Yeah::
20    (2.0)
21 W: ((plays with a toy car)) brrm brrm

Fragment W4

1  F:* and what was in our room (1.2) [what=
2  W:
3  F: =did you use to watch of a morning
4  W: ((looks at F))
5  F: what did you turn on every morning
6    (3.2)
7  W: ((shrugs))
8  F: ((looks at him enquiringly))
9  W: have a shower ((mimes shower))
10 F: no::: yea (you=
11 W: 2yee=9
12 F: =had a shower (.5) no you used to watch the
13    television (2.4) but we couldn't understand it
14    could we why couldn't we understand the
15 television
16 W: we we have to put a machine in
17 F: had to put a machine in
18 W: a machine so we can see the word
19 F: A:::HHH yes
20 W: like at home° oh we rent a video and and they hadn’t
21 had it (we) got to wait for the lorry come
22 F: they got to wait
23 W: idn’ it
24 F: for the lorry to come
25 W: yea (1.3) idn it mum ((looks to mother for
26 confirmation))
27 M: for a long time you got to wait for a long time
28 (1.5) That’s for the caption machine
29 W: what’s that ((gets up to attend to something
30 else))

Fragment W5
1 F: Who was the BEST(.7) at playing basketball
2 W: Me
3 F: Na:::w
4 W: Who was it then
5 F: Me ((points to himself))
6 W: No everybody
7 F: Everybody
8 W: But not Patricia (.5) cant throw properly ((mimes
9 throwing basketball))
10 F: You used to throw over your head (.5) backwards
11 you weren’t even looking
12 W: I know but I’m goin try and throw my backwards
13 ((mimes a backwards throw)) (before I didn know and have
14 a run)= ((mimes turning round, throwing ball))
15 F: = (hhh) I know you threw it backwards and it went in
16 (.8) and we all laughed
17 W: yeah=
18 F: = We all said that was clever
19 W: I know
20 F: didn we=
21 W: = I go li: tha ((mimes throwing))
22 F: “yea°
23 W: whee:::
24 (2.5)((W and F smile at each other))
Fragments quoted for E and his sister (S)

Fragment E1
1 S:* Ujol what is this
2 E: Helicopter
3 S:* What uh kind of 's this
4 E: uh: (2.1) rocket
5 S: no: nearly=
6 E: uh
7 S:* =wha are these these fighter planes innit(1.0) the
8 war planes (1.2) they shoot people down=
9 E: =there front gun ((points to gun))
10 S: gun
11 (6.7)

Fragment E2
1 E: that looks wicked isn't it ((points to picture))
2 S: ((turns the page)) Plane look=
3 E: (looks at picture) Plane
4 S:* =What's this
5 (2.5)
6 E: huh=
7 S: =one country to another country they go isn't it
8 E: "yes"=
9 S: =like us Lon
10 E: =it goes high up in the sky isn't it
11 S: =mmm high they (. ) um go above the clouds=
12 E: ="yes"
13 S: *=and (. ) what do they do= ((points to picture))
14 E: ((points to same picture)) we have seen in television=
15 S: =um: how many people are there
16 E (hhh)
17 S: hundreds and hundreds isn't it
18 E: (hhh) fire engine ((points to picture))
19 S u::h(0.9) haven't you seen fire on television
20 suddenly it catches fire=
21 E: =after that it goes under the water=
22 S: =hm you see there is a bonfire in the water (1.9) . .

Fragment E3
1 ((S turns the page and then looks at E))
2 S: d'ya wanna be a pilot Ujol
3 E: hm
4 S: d'ya wanna be a pilot
5 E: hmm
6 S: when you grow up d'ya wanna fly a plane
7 E: yeah
8 S: d'ya want to fly high: in the air
9 E: yes
10 S: yes why
11 E: u::h (1.2) I don't really know it looks nice

7 "Ujol" is E's family nickname.
12 S: you like it
13 E: I could be able to see if there was anything nice

Fragment E4
1 S: mm (1.3)* what are these ((points to hot air balloons in picture))
2 E: do you mean these
3 S: mmm
4 E: uh you have done something haven’t you
5 S: here the balloons (.) a airship
6 E: eh but (.) these are something hard names isn’t it=
7 S: =no see they like a little basket in a balloon they
8 go really high they so big look (1.0) they not small
9 like this balloons they bigger
10 E: more (. ) they more big than this one isn’t it=
11 S: =mm they take people up higher and higher (.8) little
12 people like you stay below “that big”
13 E: ((looks up, away from book)) yeah=

Fragment E5
1 S: um (0.7) look *(0.8) ((points to a different part of the
2 picture)) the rescue planes (.) see (.) when people
3 crash (0.7) ships (1.4) they (.) save people from the
4 sea
5 E: that that two and that’s one=
6 ((pointing to the same picture))
7 S: =mm
8 E: one day I bought something you know (0.8) those two
9 things (.) the helicopters that I bought
10 S:* hook ((S turns the page and
11 points to a different picture)) on that plane they can fly
12 towards the air and they can go in the water

Fragment E6
1 S: uh let me find something else (0.9) um (1.6) u:m
2 E: *is this
3 S: is it a (.) Concorde u:::=
4 S: yeah you right
5 E: =if this crack will come isn’t it
6 S: yeah this burst will go and:::=
7 E: =make it burst * what’s this ((looks at different picture
8 on same page))
9 S: It’s a balloon so if this one bursts everyone (.)
10 really quickly they will fall down (1.2) and they’ll
11 get injured isn’t it
12 E: They are going to get injured isn’t it
13 S: Yes
14 E: Yes
Fragment E7
S:*  =What's this (2.5)
E:  huh=
S:  one country to another country  don't they go
E:  yes=
S:  =like us London
E:  it goes high up in the sky doesn't it
S:  =mmm high they (.) um go above the clouds=
E:  yes
Fragments quoted for J and mother

Fragment J1
1 M: *oh this is one when we were in France remember
2 this
3 J: oh yeah (unintelligible)
4 M: Magic stones what were they called=
5 J: =but magic what they don I don know
6 (1.5) ((M and J look at each other))
7 M: (I’m) not sure what they were called=
8 J: =No I can't remember=
9 M: There was a a big circle wasn't there
10 J: (hu)
11 (3.0)

Fragment J 2
1 M: Thas before we had any grass in the garden as well
2 isn't it
3 J: I know and there's Pete and....

Fragment J 3
1 M: =You didn't want your photo taken there did you
2 J: No (...)* there's Hank

Fragment J5
1 M: *=What's this
2 J: thas e: (.) that me doing (1.6)
3 M: Where is it
4 J: Is in is in our house=
5 M: *=is it=
6 J: =Look ((points to photo))
7 M: You were stripping wallpaper
8 J: Yeah (. ) I'm doing it there=
9 M: =What's that
10 J: I had a cut on my lip look
11 M: D'ya remember how you got that
12 J: No I can't no (hhhh) no I can't=
13 M: =can't remember=
14 J: =No
15 (1)
16 J: Oh I hit myself on the lip actually but=
17 M: Hit yourself
18 on the lip
19 J: =Yeah (hhh) hit myself on the lip (1) no I was
20 trying to do (1.6) get enough off and I hitting
21 on on there on the wall it scratched my ((points to
22 his lip))
23 M: Oh I don't remember that (you go)
Fragment J6
1 M: What's this ( . ) you've got one of these it's a car
2 J: remote control=
3 M: =yeah ( . ) remote control
4 J: I got a remote control car and this is a remote
5 control aeroplane
Fragments quoted for Jo and his sister (L)

Fragment Jo1
1  L: Okay go on Jo what’s happening in this picture
2  Jo: That (is)
3  L:* Don’t read it jus see what’s coming from the
4  picture what’s happening
5  Jo: I don know they might be (1.0) they walking around
6  L: Well how many dinosaurs are there
7  (7.0) ((Jo counts the dinosaurs))
8  Jo: Seven
9  L: Seven
10  (2.4)
11  L: how many like can you see what they’re all doing
12  ( ) what they doing
13  Jo: The:: ( ) one’s eating a gra: um (. ) tree (. )
14  another one eating (0.9) they all eating grass
15  L: They’re eating grass=
16  Jo: =Yeah ((turns the page))

Fragment Jo2
1  L:* =What’s this
2  Jo: This is ( . ) kind of starry air um (. ) air line
3  look
4  (1.5)
5  L: Where is it
6  Jo: Goes to into rthe a
7  L: (whats this) (what is it)
8  Jo:
9  L: Where are they
10  Jo: In the airport
11  L: and that is
12  Jo: That’s in ( . ) near where it comes from ( . ) near
13  ( . ) the: helicopter
14  L: Uhum ((turns the page))

Fragment Jo3
1  L: That’s it ( . )* what about this air plane Josh
2  have you
3  Jo: That will come (. ) that’s an older one
4  L: where’ve you seen have you
5  been in one it’s an older one
6  Jo: Oldest
7  L: What kind of airline did we get on= ((turns page))
8  Jo:
9  L: =to come to London
10  Jo: Kuwait airways
11  L: Is that an old airpl no
12  Jo:
13  L: It’s a new one
14  Jo: Look at that one (0.7) we’ve seen those ones
15  (1.8) ((turns the page)) * the these these ( . ) are the
16  kind (. )that’s the one (. ) look= ((he shows L a
17  picture of a plane which illustrates his point))
18  L: =that kind of airline
18 Jo: Yeah
19 L: But not on Concorde we didn’t get on Concorde
20 Jo: no Concorde’s are too fast ((turns the page))

Fragment Jo4
1 Jo: ...(.) what is that
2 L: which one
3 Jo: there
4 L: dunno (1.8)

Fragment Jo5
L: *an there what=
Jo: u::h
L: =they doing
Jo: in they’re flying about
L: ((turns the page)) they’re flying about
Jo: yeah (.)((turns back to a previous picture)) there none here

Fragment Jo6
L: ((turns the page)) *have a look at these ones Jo whas these ones=
Jo: =these are (.) these are the swimming ones=
L: =swimming ones
Jo: yeah ( ) this is a dinosaur oh that one=
Fragments quoted for K and his mother

Fragment K1
1 M: .. (.6) what are you doing here
2 K: Crying=
3 M: =Yeah=

Fragment K 2
1 M:=mm where was that
2 K: uh in India=
3 M:=Whereabouts in India
4 K:aaw forgot=
5 M: No you haven't
6 K: I HA::VE
7 M: Bombay
8 K: Bombay
9 (4.9)

Fragment K3
1 M: what's it called= (elicitation)
2 K :=u:::m (.4) wagon (label)
3 M: wagon yeah that's right (third turn receipt)

Fragment K5
1 M:*Oh what are you doing here
2 (4.4)((both look at the picture))
3 M: what's that=
4 K:=e:::r ((looks at photo))
5 (1.5)((M smiles at K))
6 M: What are you dressed up as
7 K: A CLOWN
8 (3.8)((M smiles, nods and looks at the next photo))

Fragment K6
1 M: Let me see if there's anything else what about
2 when you were oh I know what you would like to look
3 at (1.3) when you went on holiday last year tell me
4 about *this (.9) where's that
5 K: u:::h in America
6 M: Where is that
7 K: u::h (1.6) um somewhere somewhere um where where
8 you want to look for what you want for Christmas=
9 M: =Yes Christmas World or something isn't it=
10 K: =Yeah
11 M: And who was that with you
12 K: ma ma Monnen
13 M: And who is Mullen
14 K: My my my: (.) cousin
15 M: Yeah
16 (1.7)
Fragment K7
1 M: and who was that with you (elicitation)
2 K: ma ma Monnen (label)
->3 M: and who is Mullen (receipt, elicitation and embedded correction)
4 K: my my: (.) cousin (label)
5 M: Yeah (receipt)

Fragment K8
1 M:*all right who's this
2 K:(hhhhh) (1) me (1.2) who who do you think that is
3 M: I think that's Rory
4 K: Rory Saoirse
5 M: And who's Saoirse
6 K: Huh
7 M: Who's Saoirse
8 K: My sister ((looks up at camera))
9 (( M nods briefly at camera))
10 (2.2)

Fragment K9
1 M: wha what were you doing there
2 K: I w'z on a (.9) I w'z on a pony=
3 M: =mm where was that
APPENDIX 6

COPIES OF LETTERS
Special Education Inspector for Islington,
Islington Education Department,
Highbury Station Road,
Highbury Corner,
London N1

21 March 1992

Dear Ms ,

I am a lecturer in Audiology at the above college, and am currently registered for a doctorate at the University of London. As you can see from the enclosed abstract of my research proposal, my project concerns the use of spoken English by deaf and hearing children from Bengali/Sylheti-speaking families.

Prior to my current post, I worked for several years as a Specialist Speech Therapist with Deaf People at School Hearing Impaired Unit. I now do an honorary weekly session at the Unit. I have discussed my project with the head of the Unit, , and she is willing to allow some of the children to be subjects in my study. I have also discussed the project with the head of the main school, , who is equally willing for me to draw some of my control subjects from the main school register. Inclusion of children in the study will of course depend on their parents/guardians giving their permission.

Please could you let me know if there is any formal application that I need to make to the Local Education Authority, or to other bodies, for consent to conduct the research at Laycock School. I would like to start detailed planning for the study as soon as possible. I can readily supply you with further details about the study as and when necessary.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Many thanks,

Yours sincerely,

Merle Mahon
(Lecturer in Audiology)
Ms Merle Mahon,
The National Hospital College of Speech Science,
Chandler House,
2 Wakefield Street,
London. WC1 IPG

June 15th 1992

Dear Merle,

A MUCH belated letter to confirm that Islington Education Department authorises your undertaking your project, with the provisos, as we have already discussed, that

1) explicit parental permission is given, with translations if needed,
2) no individual child be identified
3) Islington Education Department receive a copy of the findings.

I hope all goes well with you.--It seems ages since we met.--you have even changed your name!!

All the very best with the project.

Jackie M.Blount
How Deaf Children Learn English Project

June 1994

Dear

I am studying the way young children who are hearing impaired and young children who can hear normally learn to speak English.

The Head Teacher of School has agreed to let me do my research project in this school.

I am writing to ask you to allow your child to take part in the project. Each child will do two tests for understanding English words. The tests will be done at school sometime before the summer holidays.

If you would like to talk about the research, please call me at one of these number at any time: 071 (home) or 071 (College).

If you do NOT agree to your child taking part in the project, please sign this letter and return it to school tomorrow.

Thank you very much.

Merle Mahon
(Lecturer in Audiology
and Specialist Speech and Language Therapist for Deaf People)

I do NOT give permission for my child to take part in the project:

Child’s name: ...............................................................

Parent/guardian’s signature: ...........................................
এইচইড়ু
পিছ পিতাকাছ/নির্দিষ্টকল্পনা
বিচিত্র পালন করান আপনার অজস্র ও অবাধ
চেয়ে সত্য সাধন পূর্ণ ইচ্ছিত পারে
তাদের নিজের একটি গল্প নন করিনো আছে।
জননা অনেকে বিশেষ কিছু রাখেন আপনার বিবাহ প্রতিষ্ঠার কাজ কেবল করব না।
অপনার একটা একটা প্রক্ষেপে প্রথম (নমুনার
জন) অপনাদের আদর্শ কাছে চলিয়েছিল।
পত্তার উল্লেখ পূর্বে দুইবারের দিবস একটি শব্দ
ইচ্ছিত কাজের অবাধ অপরাধ এবং ইচ্ছিত বাক্যের।
দীর্ঘ এবং প্রস্তাবনা ২০১২ কোন এক স্থানে কুল
এই উল্লেখ নয়।
এই প্রক্ষেপের অন্যটি অপনার তেমন কেবল বাইরে
নেতার পুরো অপনার অপার্চ করে অপনারি
গুলো সম্ভাবনা আমাদের নীচের একে দুইতলি
করো একবার ও একবার ২০১২ অপরাধের পূর্বে কুল
এই উল্লেখ নয়।
ধনুনাথ
মোরে লাহোর
(অনিবার্য বক্তব্য এবং লিখী অনুযায়ী)
অপনার তেমন এই প্রক্ষেপে অপক্ষ গ্রহণ করার
অনুমতি দিতে আমি প্রত্যাহার করি।
ছন্দ এবং নাগর
পিতামাতা/নির্দিষ্টকল্পনা দুটিতে
11 July 1994

c/o School, Street, London

How Deaf Children Learn English Project

Dear

Thank you very much for allowing me to test your child in June 1994, in the first stage of my research.

The tests the children did were simple tests of understanding English words and sentences and did very well. The results have made it possible for me to select some children I would like to include in the next stage of the research and Ms has suggested that I may approach you with a request for to take part.

Some hearing-impaired children and their parents from have already agreed to help me in the second stage.

The second stage of the research

In the second stage, I will be collecting examples of ordinary conversation that the children have with family members at home. The reason for this is to investigate how the children use speech and language in a natural setting. What is of interest is how the children contribute to the conversation, not what they say.

What I am asking of you

This second stage of the research will involve me visiting your home. As I am trying to investigate the use of language in as natural a situation as possible, I would like to record talking to one or both of you, and if possible to one of his older sisters, brothers, cousins or friends. I will bring with me some games and activities for you to do together.

I would ideally like to make a video recording as gesture and facial expression are very important, but if you do not like this idea, then I will be happy to use audio recording only. I can guarantee that the tapes will only be used for this research, and will be happy to give you copies if you want them.
I know how difficult it is to find time with young kids, and I will fit in with whatever timing suits you - after school, or at the weekend. I would like to make the recordings before or during the summer holidays if possible.

I am very aware of how much I am asking of you, but I would be very pleased if you would be prepared to consider letting take part.

If so, please could you return the enclosed form to by Friday 15th July.

If you would like to have a chat or want to know more about the research, you can contact me on either of these numbers:

071 (home) or 071 (College)

It would be best to call me at home in the evening.

You can also contact , Ms or Ms at School for more information.

Thank you very much, and I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Merle Mahon
(Lecturer in Audiology
and Specialist Speech and Hearing Therapist for Deaf People)
বীর বিজয়ী কিছুতে তেজ হয়ে ওঠেন — তখন অবিনাশ

ক্রিকেট ২২২

চলাচল

২২২-এ প্রথম দিনে মূলধনের ফলে এমন অপরিসরণের ফলে

কারণে বিনাশ নেয়া গেল শান্তির শান্তি,

পুকুর পাড়ে কাজ বন্ধ করা হল, অঞ্চলকার বিহার দিয়ে এসে আরামের পথ প্রায় করে আলাপ।

বসন্ত জগতে বিলুপ্তপ্রকাশের আর্মিন পালের শিক্ষায় শুরু হয়েছে সুদীর্ঘ দেরী।

- দুর্বলতা মন্ত্রী আরো অন্য একটি কথা বলেন।
- আসলে তাঁদের অনেক বক্তব্য থাকে কিন্তু。

কি প্রক্রিয়া করা?

বিশেষ করে একটি আঘাতের পর তিনি রক্ষা করতে চেষ্টা করেছেন।

তথ্য এবং নিয়মের ক্ষেত্রে আরেকজন বিনিময় অবস্থা ছিল।

- এই ক্ষেত্রে প্রথমে বিষয় নিয়ে আলোচনা করা প্রয়োজন।
- আমি 'কেবল কর্ম' মনে করি।
- আমি আরো জেনে নন এই প্রক্রিয়া।

হেলিন চালু হলে প্রথমে প্রস্তাব করা হয় এবং অনুশীলন করা হয়।
জমির ওলাম-সাগুজা। তাঁর তিন বছর ধরে উল্লেখ
'আমি ওলাম-সাগুজা' নামে পাকিস্তানে আগমন করেন। তাঁর অভিজ্ঞতা এবং প্রশিক্ষণ করে উল্লেখ, জলাশয় ও উৎপাদন করতে পারে। তাঁর বিশ্বাস ছিল যে 'আমি ওলাম-সাগুজা' নামে আগমন করেন।