

The Adjacency Pairs Analysis of Teacher Students Talks in Hearing Impairment Classroom

Nahar Nurun Nafi'

Universitas Sebelas Maret
Naharnurunnafi@gmail.com

Desika Rinanda

Universitas Sebelas Maret
desikrinanda@mail.com

Sularti

Universitas Sebelas Maret
lrti_art159@yahoo.com

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.18326/rgt.v12i1.81-99>

Submission	ABSTRACT
Track:	<i>The purpose of this study is to investigate the components of adjacency pairs, which appear in a conversation between an English teacher and hearing-impairment students in a special need classroom. Another aim is to find the dominant role of English teacher in the process of adjacency pairs which is related to the students' activeness in the classroom. Data were collected through observing the classroom, recording and transcribing their conversation during the teaching and learning activities. Interview is also done to support the findings. Meanwhile, data analysis is done by identifying, analyzing, and classifying the findings based on Mc Charty's theory of adjacency pairs. The research, then, results 9 kinds of adjacency pairs committed from the interaction between English teachers and the hearing-impairment students. They are (1) compliment / acceptance, (2) information / acknowledgement, (3) greeting / greeting, (4) invitation / acceptance, (5) offer / refusal, (6) question / answer, (7) summons / answer, (8) accusation / denial, (9) offer / acceptance. This study reveals a fact that an active interaction between teacher and students indeed exists through various adjacency pairs occur in the special need classroom, even though the teacher's role is also quite powerful in the special need classroom. The finding of this study may become the reference for the teachers and practitioners who need deep understanding toward characteristics of the special needs students especially for the impairment students.</i>
Received:	
31/03/2019	
Final Revision:	
27/05/2019	
Available online:	
01/06/2019	
Corresponding	
Author:	
Nahar Nurun Nafi'	
Naharnurunnafi@gmail.com	
	<i>Keywords: Adjacency Pairs, Teaching and Learning,</i>

INTRODUCTION

Communication takes an essential role in the teaching and learning process. Materials are occasionally delivered by means of communication between teacher and students in the classroom. Through this research, the writers try to investigate how the structures of adjacency pairs in hearing impairment-students. In addition, related to adjacency pairs, the writers attempt to find the influence of dominant role of English teacher in students' activeness in teaching and learning process. These two findings are obtained through the conversation occurred between teacher and students.

Conversations cannot be separated from long-term communication. As a process of sending and receiving information, conversation is a very important element in most part of communications. Conversation itself consists of a speaker and a listener who occupies their own functions (Baiat et al, 2013; Hagoort & Meyer, 2013). In the conversation, language and contexts are interrelated each other so that in understanding the language, the speaker and listener have to understand the context of the material conveyed through the language. The relationship between language and context is included in the domain of discourse analysis (McCarty, 2002). Conversations also occur in the teaching- learning process where there is a class interaction between teacher-students and student-student. In good interactions, there is always an exchange of role between the speaker and the listener. There are several important things that must be considered, both by speakers and listeners in conversation, one of them is the adjacency pairs.

Adjacency pairs refer to an activity to cooperate between speaker and listener in a private organization of interaction (McCarty, 2000). In addition, Coulthard (1985) defines adjacency pairs as contributive exchanges in conversations that help to determine the first speaker in charge of initiating the conversation and the second speaker as the listener who provides action-based responses initiated by the speaker. Adjacency pairs consists of first pair and second pair parts which each part of the pair is identified by utterance produced by the speaker and listener. Each speaker and listener will propose the similar or different utterance acts during the conversation. It has become a general basis that each speaker has a response in mind that is expected or not expected by the first speaker (Coates, 2004). McCarthy (2000) adds that adjacency pairs are as different types of identical (*hello-hello*), and different second pair-part (*congratulations-thanks*). The most tangible evidence for adjacency pairs are thanking – response, request – acceptance, and question- answer sequences.

The following example illustrates adjacency pairs types taken from Richards and Schmidt (1983:128).

- | | |
|---------------------------|-----------------------|
| A: Hi, (Greeting) | B: Hello (Greeting) |
| A: Ok, See you (Farewell) | B: So long (Farewell) |
| A: Is that what you mean? | B: Yes (Answer) |

Adjacency pairs also occur in the classroom, not only in normal classroom but also in special need classroom especially in hearing-impairment students' classroom. Hearing-impairment students refers to students who lose their whole part or those parts of hearing so they have obstacles in understanding other people's utterance through their own hearing, with or without using hearing aids (Moore, 2001).

Their obstacles in understanding utterances often cause difficulties in the teaching and learning process. Based on the previous experience of researcher in teaching English in one of special need schools in Medan during 2015 to 2017, it comes across the incident in which teacher and students often have miscommunication in interacting each other. Teacher often misunderstands what students mean and vice versa. One of the factors causing the incident is the different ability of hearing-impairment students from normal students in communicating generally. They tend to use signs, the certain codes used by hearing impairment students' fingers to communicate, instead of verbal language in communication. Teacher often has difficulties and make some mistakes in understanding sign languages given by the students.

Children with hearing impairments often show significant delays in phoneme production, vocabulary, and syntax (Schirmer et al., 1985). It is assumed that the children, particularly with hearing impairment, can improve their language through adequate exposure and practice; however, Nelson, Loncke, and Camarata (1993) emphasize that poor input at an early age and severe delay require intensive interventions that focus on enhancing strategies for all components of language. Although being delayed in other areas of language, deaf students often have communicative skills such as making a comment, request, or acknowledgment that match those of their hearing peers (Curtiss, Prutting, & Lowell, 1979; Nicholas, Geers, & Kozak, 1994). Deaf students rely more on nonverbal labeling techniques than would be expected in children with normal hearing, but still to express a full range of communicative skills (Curtiss et al., 1979; Nicholas et al., 1994). These skills are the foundation on which spoken language is later developed (Skarakis & Prutting, 1977).

Serving non-verbal modes of communication in the classroom therefore become the main starting place for students developing their verbal language skills (Nicholas et al., 1994). A researcher argues that belief about spoken and sign languages among informed professionals have serious consequences such as parents who are being advised to make decisions and to construct home and school environments that affect normal language acquisition among deaf children.

In the United States, around 96% of deaf children are born to hearing parents (Moore, 2001) who have no family history of using a sign language. The remaining 4% are born to deaf parents, and in most cases, though not always the primary language of the home is a sign language. Many hearing parents are initially uninformed about fundamental language matters and turn to the medical profession, the internet, their spiritual leaders, and/or their friends and family for advice about the language choices they need to make for their children (Luterman 1979, Gregory 1995, Porter & Edirippulige 2007). Parents frequently tell the best way to acquire spoken language for their child is by raising them without using sign language and they believe that sign is to be chosen only as a last resort (Petitto 1998, Johnston 2006), and that great effort should be devoted instead to the acquisition of speech.

Delay in mastering the language usually results in poor academic success and difficulty communicating in class (Musselman, Lindsey, & Wilson, 1988). Savage, Evans, and Potter (1986) catch that students with hearing impairment regularly start school with a 3-year delay in language skills; hence, they have an average improvement in performance, with the average high school-age deaf student reading at a third-grade level. Savage et al. hypothesize that the problems in academic is mainly caused by the poor communication conducted between the deaf students and the teacher. Savage et al. review research on three types of communication commonly used in classrooms, those are oral-only (lip reading), mainly oral (lip reading and finger spelling), and simultaneous communication (lip reading, finger spelling, and signing). It appears important, therefore, to add the capacity of teacher speech with sign language. These overall scores do not reflect variation in sub scores at the single word, sentence, or syntax levels. Savage et al. found that sign language helps dramatically: comprehension increased to over 86% using the simultaneous communication method.

The result of study of Savage et al. (1986) are further supported by Hyde and Power (1992), who finds simultaneous communication beneficial for both severely and profoundly deaf individuals on a receptive language in the form of comprehension task. For participants with

profound hearing loss, conditions using combinations of lip reading, audition, and finger spelling were all inferior to conditions involving signing.

For those with severe hearing loss, however, the superiority of conditions with signs was less clear. Even so, results from conditions of audition alone are poorer than those of speech and finger spelling or combined signs. The results of this study demonstrate that communication needs of deaf students may differ based on the level of hearing loss yet at the same time confirm previous findings that simultaneous communication may be better than oral-only delivery. Results from Savage et al. (1986) and Hyde and Power (1992) suggest that it is possible to have an effective simultaneous communication environment with a single instructor. They after that test the hypothesis by asking six teachers to tell a short story to three simulated groups of early elementary school students. That is, the teachers are required to pretend they are telling the story to hearing students, deaf students using oral-only methods, and deaf students who used simultaneous communication.

A study by Huntington and Watton (1986) suggests that it should be cautious about the use of simultaneous communication in classrooms with deaf students. This study illustrates the difficulty one person has in providing complex spoken language and manual language input. They investigated teacher speech in oral only, mainly oral (with finger spelling), and simultaneous communication classrooms. Teacher speech was analyzed for mean length of sentence (MLS), proportion of simple to complex sentences, total word output, range of vocabulary, sentence type (declarative, question, and imperative), and closed versus open questions. The results showed that teacher speech in the oral-only settings is highest on all complexity measures. In contrast, teacher speech in the simultaneous communication models consistently ranked below that of the oral-only and mainly oral classrooms. It appeared that the demand of two languages, spoken and signed, reduces the teacher's oral output and linguistic complexity (see also Wilbur & Peterson, 1998). When the teacher applies simultaneous communication, student comprehension has the opportunity to improve, but one language source may come at the expense of richer, more complex spoken language. The limitation of content of sign language is based on indictment of producing both languages simultaneously. Inclusive classrooms with an interpreter may be less predictable to language constriction because sign and speech come from separate language sources. Study that has approached the oral and signed language of such an inclusive classroom does appear. It is a need in order to know the pattern of oral language occur when both a general education teacher and an interpreter are present.

Previous studies and research questions

A number of research related to adjacency pairs have been conducted in term of classroom interaction. A previous study by title “*Classroom Interaction: A Dynamic of Questions and Answers*” written by Pineda (2015) discussing about adjacency pairs in normal class students. The finding reveals that during the interaction between students and teacher in the dynamic of questions answers, teachers hold the main role in starting the conversation and initiating the adjacency pairs even though one and two-way communication occur. This finally causes less students’ active interaction in teaching and learning process. The upcoming phenomena in the hearing impairment students have not been identified.

The similar case also occurs on the study from Hashamdar (2012) entitled “*The Teacher - Student Communication Pattern: A Need to Follow?*” which discusses the adjacency pairs in normal student’s classroom. This research indicates that the teacher always dominates the communication whereas this can trigger the passive participation from students in the active leaning process which promote students-centered learning style. In addition, for the hearing impairment students, aloud voice is absolutely needed by the teacher to condition the classroom with special leaners. Somehow, whether the result of active talk domination from teacher will cause less active students’ participation or not in the hearing impairment students has not been discussed.

The other previous study is in Ghana conducted by Obuku, Asare, and Deku (2016) with the title “*Access to English Language Acquisition in Ghana Schools for the Deaf: Are the Deaf Students Handicapped?*”. The observation is conducted in 15 English classrooms. This research aims to know the challenges faced by hearing impairment students in accessing the provided materials in English language. The research shows that students handicapped by hearing impairments have delays to reach the passing grade standard. At the end, the researchers recommend the national education in Ghana to give the specific attention to the criteria of passing grade for hearing impairment students who have unique and special abilities. This research discusses only challenges experienced by the students not the portrait of how interactive conversation exists between teacher and students. That is why a research about adjacency pairs which depicts the portrait of conversation is needed.

Therefore, in order to fill the gaps found in the prior research related to the adjacency pairs analysis of English teaching and learning in hearing-impairment students, this research

attempts to answer the following questions: (1) What adjacency pairs are found in English teaching and learning in hearing-impaired students? (2) To what extent does the teacher take role in English teaching and learning for hearing-impaired students?

METHODOLOGY

To obtain the objective of the study, the researchers apply suitable methodology to the research conducted. Rajasekar, et.al. (2013) propose the definition of research methodology as a systematic way to solve a problem. It is a science of studying how research to be carried out. Essentially, the procedures by which researchers go about their work of describing, explaining and predicting phenomena are called research methodology. It is also defined as the study of methods by which knowledge is gained. Its aim is to give the work plan of research (Rajasekar, at. Al.: 2013).

This research is conducted at State Special Need School (Sekolah Luar Biasa Negeri) of Surakarta, central Java Indonesia. The total of students in the observed classroom is 7 students. All of them are handicapped by hearing impairments. Communication occurs is mostly carried out through sign language using fingers. But sometimes mimicking through lips is also combined in conveying the lesson.

The researchers collect all the data and collect them in full and detailed elements. The data processed in this study are based on the theory of McCharty (2002) on adjacency pairs.

In this research, the researchers administer qualitative data analysis which has the main role on profound understanding towards investigation of the object and not statistic data analysis. As in confirming that, Hasanuddin WS (2016) asserts that qualitative research is in accordance with “researcher’s understanding towards the interaction among empirically analyzed concepts”. This means that such a research has much to do with the way a researcher views each event or action as empirical data that need to be investigated under the data of speech act and underlying meaning of the data.

The researchers assemble the data by specifying and describing them. The researchers collect the data by recording the classroom’s conversation between a teacher and the students in English subject and transcribing them into a written text to be analyzed. In addition, the interview with classroom teacher is done to strengthen the findings.

To conduct a research, the researchers involve an English teacher and hearing-impairment students in eighth grade of a special need school in Indonesia. There are seven hearing-impairment students consist of four males and three females. There are two classes of deaf students and the participants are selected collectively in one class.

The data instrument in this research is the conversation occurred between an English teacher and students in English subject classroom. The researchers do the data retrieval when the students learn about the material of introduction. Researchers take the data thoroughly from the beginning when the teacher open the class until the end of learning process. Triangulation data was also conducted to compare data from the analysis with preliminary data about the condition of students with special needs, especially students with hearing impairment.

The collection of the data is conducted by recording the conversation between an English teacher and hearing-impairment students using video-recorder and transcribing it. Researchers transcribed the conversation occurred in the first six minutes. It consists of the greeting, opening, and teaching learning process during the English class.

The focus of data analysis is on the interrelation between two utterances that are adjacent, produced by different speakers, hereinafter referred to as adjacency pairs. This qualitative research is analyzed through interactive model by Miles and Huberman (1994). The steps are Data Collection, Data Reduction, Data Display, Drawing Conclusion and Verification. For verifying, the researchers check and compares the data of classroom interaction based on classroom discourse theory by Sinclair and Coulthard to everyday conversation theory by Susan and Gill.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Findings of Adjacency Pairs

After analyzing the two-way communication between English teachers and hearing-impairment students, the result reveals that there are the following categories of adjacency pairs found: (1) compliment / acceptance, (2) information / acknowledgement, (3) greeting / greeting, (4) invitation / acceptance, (5) offer / refusal, (6) question / answer, (7) summons / answer, (8) accusation / denial, (9) offer / acceptance. These categories are explained as follows

Compliment / Acceptance

1. Teacher : Apa yang dia bilang ya? (What did he say?) A. How are you? B. Are you fine? C.

How do you do? dan (and) D. I am fine

Student : Aaa.aaa (*While her fingers are using sign language*)

Teacher: Good answer, (*while her thumbs are up*)

Student: (*Smiling*)

As what has been inferred by Mc Charty (2002) that Adjacency Pairs of utterances in talk are often mutually dependent, the example is like the expression of congratulation will be always followed by gratitude response. The answer can be easily predicted by the first utterance. The teacher compliment one of the students who is able to answer the question from the teacher correctly. As the response from teacher's appraisal, the student takes it by showing the smiling face. Hearing-impairment students cannot talk smoothly as normal people talk. So, instead of talking, sometimes they prefer using smile as a symbol of acceptance.

Information / Acknowledgement

2. Teacher: Okay, nomor selanjutya nomor 3, (The next number is number 3) Apa jawaban nomor 3? (What is the answer for number 3?) (*While her fingers are using sign language*)

Student: Eeeee (*While her fingers are using sign language*)

Teacher: C? (*While her fingers are using sign language and her face are mimicking a doubtful face*)

Student: Aaa..Aaa..

Teacher: Coba perhatikan susunan kalimatnya, (Try to look into its sentence structure,)

nomor 3 A, B, C, atau D? (For the answer of number 3, it should be A, B, C, or D?)

Student: Heee, heee?

Teacher: D? are you sure? (*While her fingers are using sign language*)

Student: Aaa A.a? (*While her fingers are using sign language*)

Teacher: Very good, jawabannya A (The answer is A) (*While her fingers are using sign*

language)

Students: *(They nod their heads and communicate one another using sign language to show the awareness of understanding the materials presented)*

The part of transcribing above, shows how the students with hearing impairment confirms their understanding about new materials / information they already have obtained. Firstly, the question from teacher is answered incorrectly by most of the students. Some of them give C as the answer. The teacher then triggers the students to give other response by showing an uncertainty through her face. The students catch the teacher's intended meaning and then they come up with another answer. A student starts answering with A but the majority say D. The teacher then repeats her doubtful face again and finally the student who give answer A confidently utter his answer and give sign language. The teacher's compliment by saying "very good" is able to catch by the majority of students that the correct answer is not what they think. They finally stare and give confirmation each other about the answer from teacher which is different from their expectation. The normal students probably will express it orally but hearing-impairment students do it in the different way. They communicate using sign language.

Greeting / Greeting

2. Teacher: Assalamualaikum warahmatullahi wa barakatuh, selamat pagi. (May peace be upon to you all, good morning)

Students: Ai...

Teacher: Good morning *(while showing sign language)*

Students: Ning... *(showing sign language)*

In the first meeting, the teacher opens the class by greeting the students. The response is then given by the students. Feeling that the teacher has not engaged the students well, she greets again by saying “Good morning” and use sign language. This is apparently understood more by the students. They then respond it by sign language and uttering good morning. This is in line with what has been mentioned by Kristina (2018: 40) that one of the adjacency pairs is greeting answered by greeting. Even though the spoken language is not carried out as normal people do, but adjacency pairs indeed exist between teacher and students through fingers namely sign language.

Invitation / Acceptance

3. Teacher: Bunga? Are you here, raise your hand, please?

Student: (*Silent*)

Teacher: Bunga (*the teacher uses sign language indicating flower*)

(Bunga): (*Raise her hand*)

The teacher requests a student who has name “Bunga” to give respond when the teacher calls her by raising her hand. The first calling is not catching the student’s attention. The teacher repeats it by using sign language. Her hands shape flower like what the student who has name “Bunga” means. The student gets it and she raise her hand. The request – acceptance occurring in that occasion is going well because the first speaker understands that catching the student’s attention is really fundamental in teaching special need students since their minds are easily distracted.

Offer / Refusal

4. Teacher: Okay, sebelum pulang, Ibu ada hadiah untuk kalian di rumah. (Before going home, I have present for all you at home) (*while writing word*

“Homework” on the board)

Students: Ooo... *Most of them show face of refusal and give sign language.*

The teacher’s offering is responded negatively by the students. When the teacher writes the word “homework” on the whiteboard, the students apparently have understood

that they will be asked to do tasks at home. They refuse the teacher's offering both orally and physically. The refusal is obviously expressed by saying "No" which is not clear and instead it sounds like "Ooo". This is in line with the interview conducted with the teacher of special need classroom about the characteristics of the special need students. They tend to be honest and behave as what their mind thinking. The teacher adds that people who notice seeing the students stand on chair or put their leg on table will think that those students are rude. In fact, they are still evolving.

Question / Answer

5. Teacher: Sekarang nomor selanjutnya (Now it comes to the next question). Ada jawaban (There is an answer) "How do you do," berarti muridnya bertanya apa? (It means that the student asks about?)

Student: eeecccee (*while pointing at one of multiple choice answer on the paper she hold*)

Teacher: Yang mana? Yang C? jawabanya yang C apa? Read!

Students: hmmm ooo uuuuu

Teacher: How do you do. That's right... betul.

In this category, this is tangible that the process of question and answer does happen in the conversation above. The teacher tries to stimulate the students by showing a response of sentence "how do you do". The students utter the letter C loudly while showing the question and answer paper to the teacher who asks. The interviewed classroom teacher states that most of them are confident enough to express their opinion when they want to talk. The teacher adds that many of them will try as maximal as possible to catch the teacher's attention even some will do physical contacts such as touching the teacher's hand.

Summons / Answer

6. Teacher: Sekarang coba kita cek (Now, let us check it together), siapa yang hadir di kelas (who attends the class), raise your hand if I call your name. Alvina mana Alvina? (Alvina, where is Alvina?)

Alvina: (*Raise hand*)

This category is clearly seen on the part of conversation above. The teacher checks the attendance of the students by calling the names one by one. The student whose name is called should give a code by raising a hand. This comprehensible pair of action shows the good relationship between the first utterance and its response which is compatible. This is actually what is defined as adjacency pairs in form of summon and answer.

Accusation / Denial

7. Teacher: What is the answer?

Student: The students are *still crowded*

Teacher: Ya, Budi jawab C (Yes, Budi answered C just now). (*while pointing at one of students*)

Students: Everyone is looking at Budi

Teacher: Budi, jawabanmu C? (Budi, is your answer C?) (*Communicating using finger and*

lip spelling)

Budi: Oo, (*showing "no" with sign language*)

Teacher: Oh, I see, jawabannya A (His answer is A) (*communicating with finger spelling*)

Budi: *Smile and nodding his head many times*

The accusation found in this conversation is visible when the teacher thinks that the answer uttered by Budi is C. In fact, Budi says A. This action is denied by Budi by showing the sign language. He insists on his answer that the correct response for the teacher's

questions should be A. The teacher understands it by confirming once again about Budi's answer.

Offer – Acceptance

8. Teacher: The next question, Nomor 5 (Number 5), adakah yang mau membaca pertanyaanya? (is there anyone who wants to read the question)

Student: (*Silent*)

Teacher: Boni?

Student: (*Showing an enthusiastic face, he wants to do it*)

Teacher: Okay dibaca bersama sama (Okay, let us read it together), repeat after me
“Where
does she live?”

Boni: hee as i ive...

Teacher: Excellent (*while showing her thumbs*), apa jawabannya? (What is the answer?)

The last adjacency pairs are found when the teacher asks one of the students to read the question loudly. He willingly plans to do it. In other words, the student has accepted the teacher's offering to do what has been instructed. The teacher finally guides the process of pronouncing it so that the student does it correctly as expected.

Teacher's Domination

Teachers have important role in the teaching and learning process in the classroom including in hearing-impaired classroom. According to Litchfield and Lartz (2002), in teaching hearing-impaired students, the teacher's roles may vary depending on type of lesson taught. In teaching lessons that are primarily formal and structured such as mathematics, social studies, and science, may require different roles of teacher rather than those needed for informal and less structured lesson. Based on the researchers' classroom observation, focusing on one student outside the classroom seems more effective because the attention from the teacher is given maximally to one student. But, in certain classrooms consisting of 6 to 8 students, there are two teachers needed to condition the classroom.

In this research, it is found that the role of the teacher in teaching English language for hearing-impaired students is quite dominating or it is called as teacher-centered. In this case, the teacher plays a role in determining the topic of learning or the material to be taught. Moreover, the learning activities are almost completely handled by the teacher herself. However, based on the observations, hearing-impaired students are quite active in responding when the teacher asked some questions. They are not afraid or shy when they are appointed by their teacher to answer the questions given even though they tend to answer using sign language rather than verbally. Ranging from observation until transcribing the conversation, nearly all of the initiators of adjacency pairs are from the teachers. This happens because the teacher only discusses the materials during class. Actually, there is a little opportunity for the students to stimulate the adjacency pairs but most of their attention are directed by the teacher to the questions on the book only.

As stated by Sivaranjani et al (2015) effective teaching policy and providing information is a kind of art that needs appropriate strategies and methods. There are many strategies so that the students are able to be active not only at answering the teacher's question but also at starting or initiating the conversation. One of them is through ice-breaking. The entertainment in the classroom is absolutely needed to decrease the boredom inside. From the special need classroom observed, there is no activity of ice breaking like the normal classroom goes. In fact, the students are always so confident to express their opinion in answering the questions. This phenomenon seemingly can be utilized by the teacher to let the students ask, to start or initiate the adjacency pairs. But, some teachers opt to restrict the students' talk domination to make the time efficient. In the interview conducted, the teacher said *"Teaching the special need students is different from teaching the regular students, the teacher of special need students' needs to be powerful and conquer the classroom. This is to make sure that the objectives taught are certainly delivered"*

The teacher's decision to direct the atmosphere of classroom seems to be teacher centered but actually it is the teachers' belief systems which have been built up gradually overtime and they are gradually derived from different sources and factors. Richards and Lochart, (1994: 30) propose the following factors as the influencers of teacher's beliefs. Those are (1) their own experience as language learners, (2) experience of what works best,

(3) established practice, (4) personality factors, (5) principles derived from an approach or methods.

The teacher also adds information in the interview that building critical thinking can always be done with teacher's talk domination in the hearing impairment students. She states "*One of the main purposes of the teacher dominates the conversation is to give lots of exposure to the students of hearing impairment*". The students are not able to sound words correctly, the habit of receiving English expressions and vocabularies aurally by hearing tool and visually by eyes will maximize the input process of language item.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, it reveals that there are nine categories of adjacency pairs found in English teaching and learning in hearing-impairment students, as follows: (1) Compliment / Acceptance, (2) Information / Acknowledgement, (3) Greeting / Greeting, (4) Invitation / Acceptance, (5) Offer / Refusal, (6) Question / Answer, (7) Summons / Answer, (8) Accusation / Denial, (9) Offer / Acceptance. This reveals a fact that various adjacency pairs can exist in the environment where utterances are seldom to produce orally. Moreover, this study of adjacency pairs analysis can also be useful in providing the relevant information to facilitate pre-teachers who will teach English for hearing-impairment students.

Furthermore, in this research, it is also found that the teacher dominates the English class of hearing impairment students. The teacher plays a dominant role in determining the topic of learning or the material to be taught. Nevertheless, the learning objective is able to be conveyed. Moreover, based on the observations, hearing-impairment students are quite active in responding when the teacher asked some questions even though they tend to use sign language rather than verbally.

REFERENCES

- Baiat, G.E., Coler, M., Pullen, M., Tienkouw, S., & Hunyadi, L. (2013). *Multimodal analysis of "well" as a discourse marker in conversation: A pilot study*. Paper presented at 4th IEEE International Conference on Cognitive Infocommunications, Budapest, Hungary.

- Coates, J. (2004). *Women, men, and language: A sociolinguistic account of gender differences in language (2nd ed.)*. London, UK: Longman.
- Coulthard, M. (1985). *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis. Second Edition*. Harlow: Longman.
- Fauziati, Endang. (2016). *Principles of Foreign Language Teaching, Learning, and Researching*. Surakarta: Era Pustaka Utama.
- Hagoort, P., & Meyer, A. S. (2013). *What belongs together goes together: The speaker-hearer perspective. a Commentary on Macdonald's PDC Account*. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 4, 228.
- Hasanuddin WS. (2016). The intangible cultural heritage of Minangkabau traditional expressions: The local wisdom of the society in advising and noble advising. *Humanus*, 15(2), 131-141.
- Hashamdar, Mohammad. (2012). *The teacher- student communication pattern: a to follow*. Islamic Azad University Karaj Iran.
- Huntington, A., & Watton, F. (1986). The spoken language of teachers and pupils in the education of hearing-impaired children. *VoltaReview*, 88, 5–19.
- Isgianto, Lukman. (2016) The Adjacency Pairs Analysis On 'Six Minutes English' Conversation Script of BBC Learning English: A Study of Discourse Analysis International Seminar Prasasti III: Current Research in Linguistics.
- Litchfield, S., & Lartz, M. N. (2002). *Role analysis of teachers certified in teaching students who are deaf/hard of hearing who team-teach in co-enrollment classrooms*. *Teacher Education and Special Education*, 25, 145–153.
- Lovett, F. (2010). *A General Theory of Domination and Justice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press Inc.
- McCarty, M. (2002). *Discourse Analysis for Language Teachers*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- McCharty, Michael. (2000). *Discourse analysis for language teachers*. United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- McCharty, Michael. (2002). *Discourse analysis for language teachers*. United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.

- Miles, Matthew B., and A. Michael Huberman (1994). *Qualitative Research Design*, second edition. Thousand Oaks CA: Sage Publications.
- Moore, D. (1987). *Educating the deaf: Psychology, principles, and practices*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Moore, D. F. (2001). *Educating the deaf: Psychology, principles, and practices* (5th ed.). Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Mudra, Heri. (2018). *Adjacency pairs as uttered in the conversations of Sofia Coppola's lost in translation movie script*. *Humanus: Jurnal Ilmiah Ilmu-ilmu Humaniora*, Volume 17, pp,126-137(12).
- Musselman, C., Lindsay, P., & Wilson, A. (1988). An evaluation of recent trends in pre-school programming for hearing impaired children. *Journal of Speech and Hearing Disorders*, 53, 71–88.
- Pineda, J. (2015). *Classroom interaction: a dynamic of questions and answers*. *Enletawa Journal*, 8 (2), 15 – 33.
- Power, D., Hyde, M., & Leigh, G. (1996). Language of teachers of the deaf to hearing students and deaf students under simulated oral and simultaneous communication conditions. *Journal of the Canadian Association of Educators of the Deaf and Hard of Hearing*, 22,122–129.
- Rajasekar, S., Philominathan, P., Chinnathambi, V. (2013). *Research Methodology*. Electronic address: rajasekar@cnld.bdu.ac.in.
- Ricahrd, Jack C. and Lockhart, Charles. (1994). *Reflective Teaching in Second Language Classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J.C., and Schmidt, R. 1983. *Conversational Analysis*. In J.C. Richards and Schmidt (eds), *Language and Communication*. London: Longman.
- Savage, R., Savage, J., Evans, L., & Potter, J. (1986). Language and reading development in profoundly hearing impaired children—Intelligence, learning and communication factors: A review. *Current Psychological Research and Reviews*, 5,62–73.
- Schirmer, B. (1985). An analysis of the language of young hearing-impaired children in terms of syntax, semantics, and use. *American Annals of the Deaf*,130,15–19.

- Seewald, R., Ross, M., Giolas, T & Yonovitz, A. (1985). Primary modality for speech perception in children with normal and impaired hearing. *Journal of Speech and Hearing Research*, 28,36–46.
- Sivaranjani, Swathy, B., Nithiyantham, S. (2015). Value of Understanding and Accepting for the Students of Professional Studies, *Journal of Education and Practice*, v6 n25 p117-126.