

April 2021

Instructional Experiences: A Case Study of Perceptions of High School American Sign Language Teachers Who are Hearing

Rhonda S. Leslie
University of South Florida

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarcommons.usf.edu/etd>



Part of the [Special Education and Teaching Commons](#)

Scholar Commons Citation

Leslie, Rhonda S., "Instructional Experiences: A Case Study of Perceptions of High School American Sign Language Teachers Who are Hearing" (2021). *Graduate Theses and Dissertations*.
<https://scholarcommons.usf.edu/etd/8814>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at Scholar Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Graduate Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Scholar Commons. For more information, please contact scholarcommons@usf.edu.

Instructional Experiences: A Case Study of Perceptions of High School American Sign
Language Teachers Who are Hearing

by

Rhonda S. Leslie

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy in Special Education
with a concentration in Curriculum and Instruction
Department of Teaching and Learning
College of Education
University of South Florida

Major Professor: David Allsopp, Ph.D.
Vonzell Agosto, Ph.D.
Elizabeth Shaunessy-Dedrick, Ph.D.
Jeannie Kleinhammer-Tramill, Ph.D.

Date of Approval:
May 22, 2021

Keywords: foreign language, culture, deaf, education

Copyright © 2021, Rhonda S. Leslie

Dedication

I dedicate my dissertation work to my family and friends. A special feeling of gratitude to my loving parents, Rodney (2016) and Joanna (2018) Sawyer whose words of encouragement and push for tenacity ring in my ears although they are not here to see this day come. I dedicate this work and give special thanks to my best friend, my husband John. Without his support I could not have made it to this point.

I also dedicate this dissertation to my friend Patricia Tyson and colleague Dr. Phyllis Jones as they weather life storms alongside me. I will always appreciate all they have done, and especially Hope Zipki for the many hours of proofreading.

Table of Contents

List of Tables	iv
Abstract.....	v
Chapter One: Introduction	1
History of ASL	2
ASL Teaching and Learning Standards.....	4
Legal Framework and Deaf Education.....	6
Statement and Significance of the Problem.....	7
Purpose of the Study.....	10
Research Questions	11
Theoretical Framework	12
Definition of Terms	14
Cheremes	14
Morphology	14
Native ASL users.....	14
Non-native learners	14
Pedagogy	15
Phonology.....	15
Socio-cultural Theory.....	15
Socio-linguistic.....	15
Syntax	16
Target language	16
Organization of the Study.....	16
Chapter Two: Literature Review	17
Review of the Literature.....	17
SLA Theories and Their Relevance to ASL Teacher Instructional experiences with Hearing Students (Section A).....	19
Vygotsky’s Socio-Cultural Theory (Process Theory)	19
Schumann’s Acculturation Model (Process Theory)	24
Krashen’s Monitor Model (Competence Theory)	28
Chomsky’s Universal Grammar (Competence Theory).....	32
Summary of Section A	34
Section B (Applied Research Findings)	36
Instructional Approaches and ASL Vocabulary.....	36
Implications for hearing second language teachers’ views	46
Deaf and Hearing Cultures and ASL.....	47
Teaching Signs and Non-Manual Signs	52
Implications for teacher perceptions in teaching signs and non-manual	

signals	54
Knowledge Gaps and Need for this Study	55
Summary.....	57
Chapter Three: Research Methodology	59
Methodology.....	59
A Qualitative Research Approach	60
Interpretivism	61
Case Study and Bounded Single Case Study	61
Bounded Single Case Design	62
Participants and Settings.....	63
Table 1 Research Participants	64
Purposive Sampling.....	64
Setting	64
Data Collection Methods/Procedures	66
Semi-structured Interview	66
Field notes	67
Reflexive Journal.....	69
Data Collection Process.....	70
Informed Consent	71
Case Study Interview Process	72
Table 2 Research Questions and Data	74
Trustworthiness Criteria	75
Credibility.....	75
Transferability	75
Dependability	76
Confirmability	76
Data Analysis (Interviews).....	76
Analysis of My Reflexive Journal.....	79
Summary.....	79
Chapter Four: Findings.....	81
Overview of the Findings	81
Table 3 Summary of Data Collection Procedures and Timelines	82
Making Deaf and Hearing Culture Connections	83
Theme 1 Summary and Researcher Reflection	87
Importance of Diversifying Instruction	90
Theme 2 Summary and Researcher Reflection	92
Instructional Challenges in Sign and Non-Manuals	94
Theme 3 Summary and Researcher Reflection	97
Summary of Findings	99
Researcher’s Reflexivity	102
Chapter Five: Discussion and Recommendations	105
Discussion and Recommendations	105
Research Question 1	105

Implications of these findings for ASL teacher, ASL curriculum/instructional designers and school administrators	108
Hearing ASL Teachers	108
Curriculum/Instructional Designers	109
School administrators	109
Research Question 2	110
Implications of these findings for ASL students and hearing non-native ASL Teachers.....	113
Hearing ASL students	113
Hearing non-native ASL teachers	113
Research Question 3	114
Implications for Policy, Praxis and Future Research	116
Policy Implications	116
Praxis Implications	119
Future Research Implications	121
Researcher Reflexivity	122
Hearing ASL Teacher Reflexivity.....	125
Limitations and Delimitations	128
Summary	128
References	129
Appendices	144
Appendix A: Semi-Structured Interview Protocol	144
Appendix B: Informed Consent.....	148
Appendix C: Letter to Principals	152

List of Tables

Table 1 Research Participants	63
Table 2 Summary of Data Collection Procedures and Timelines	74
Table 3 Research Questions and Data	82

Abstract

A significant gap has been identified in research-based findings and classroom instructional practices of hearing ASL teachers in high schools in the U.S. (Rosen, 2015). Research has shown the absence of standardized ASL instructional guidelines, rules, and procedures has created a significant gap in teaching and learning practices at the high school level, and research-based findings about the most suitable pedagogical approaches that should be used in ASL induction and immersion programs. This study aims to understand hearing teachers' perceptions of their ASL instructional practices and choices, using a qualitative research approach and a case study design. Based on a review of the literature on classroom instructional practices of hearing ASL teachers in the high school classroom, 4 separate interviews were conducted with 3 hearing ASL teachers at the high school level in one school district. Findings revealed that teachers' diversified vocabulary instruction, hearing and deaf cultural language etiquette were found to be important in teaching ASL as a second language, and teachers saw teaching of signs and non-manual signals as challenging. The results indicate that hearing ASL teachers encountered several challenges in teaching ASL to hearing students. A major barrier to successful teaching was the dichotomous relationship in deaf and hearing language cultures. On this basis, it is recommended that guidelines be developed to integrate deaf cultural experiences in teaching ASL to hearing students. Further research is needed to understand the effects of integrating hearing and deaf cultural etiquette in teaching ASL to high school students who are hearing.

Chapter One: Introduction

American Sign Language (ASL) has become a second language of choice for hearing students in high school teaching and learning environments in the United States (US) for the last two decades (Quinto-Pozos, 2011). Rosen (2008) found a significant increase in the number of high schools in the United States offering ASL as a foreign language option to students with credit towards graduation. A nationally representative survey in 1996 revealed ASL was offered in 1% of the sample surveyed and the demand for ASL has seen a 100% growth in the last decade. ASL has become an elective of choice in high schools because more colleges and universities are considering this minority language in their admission processes (Rosen, 2008).

The growing demand for American Sign Language in hearing populations has ignited a vibrant debate about how hearing teachers view ASL student-teacher instructional experiences in high school. Limited scholarship of acceptable ASL instructional practices, modalities, and theoretical approaches exists in literature (Quinto-Pozos, 2011). ASL instructional activities have been predominantly guided by socio-cultural and socio-linguistic philosophies rooted in instructor realities and the biases of curricula content developers. Instructional approaches developed by both hearing and deaf educators have facilitated engagement of different student populations of high school students with dissimilar outcomes (Quinto-Pozos, 2011).

The prevalence and incidence of deafness in the U.S. population has evolved in the last 200 years. A survey in the early 1900's revealed the deaf and hard-of-hearing population was 2.2% and this percentage has gradually moved to 13% of the total population by the mid 1940's

(Mitchell & Karchmer, 2004). In 1999-2000, a prevalence survey was conducted with a sample of 11,397 educational institutions and 30,970 school-aged participants (Mitchell & Karchmer, 2004). Results revealed 67.5% of student participants with hard-of-hearing mothers had hearing fathers, 77.1% of students with deaf mothers had deaf fathers, and 76% of student-participants with one hard of hearing parent were more likely to also have at least one hearing parent (Mitchell & Karchmer, 2004).

The American Speech-Language Hearing Association (2018) revealed over 13,000,000 children, three years or older, were diagnosed with hearing loss in 1971, over 14,000,000 in 1977, just over 20,000,000 in 1991, and almost 25,000,000 in 1993. In 2000, almost 30,000,000 citizens in the U.S. were diagnosed with hearing loss. Approximately 15% of children living in the U.S. have been diagnosed with high or low frequency hearing dysfunction, and 11% of children experience early loss of hearing (American Speech-Language Hearing Association, 2018).

My aim for this study was to assess and evaluate hearing teachers' perceptions of their ASL instructional practices and choices, using a qualitative research approach and a case study design. In this chapter, I discuss the history and evolution of the problem, explain the need and relevance for this study, identify the main components of this problem in the statement of the problem, and I outline the purpose of the study. Other components of this chapter I include are the significance and justification of the study, research questions, a conceptual framework of second language acquisition (SLA) theories, operational terms, and an outline of the organization of the remainder of the study.

History of ASL

ASL is a non-verbal system of communication that integrates hand signals, facial expressions, and movements of the body. This system of communication is mainly used by deaf and partially hearing individuals in North America (National Institute on Deafness and Communication Disorders, 2016). Drasgow (2016) defined ASL as a comprehensive means of expression and communication with similar characteristics to established spoken languages. This language or medium of communication is also used by deaf populations in Canada.

The origin of ASL can be traced to the American School for the Deaf (ASD) in 1817. The pioneer of this language, Thomas Gallaudet, infused Francophone pedagogical approaches with a mixed group of learners from different parts of the United States (U.S.), such as Maine, New Hampshire, and Massachusetts (Roberson & Shaw, 2015). The initial program recruited 71 students who entered the instructional program with individually unique methods of communicating. For example, some learners brought to their ASD experience domestic sign language patterns used to communicate at home, and these patterns were amalgamated with pedagogical approaches used by the first sign language instructor at the ASD, Laurent Clerc. The French influence on language for the deaf evolved, and was consolidated into ASL (Roberson & Shaw, 2015). As the language gained popularity and influence, more schools for educating deaf and hard of hearing learners emerged in the U.S. These schools were supported by non-governmental advocacy groups such as the National Fraternity and the National Association for the Deaf (Roberson & Shaw, 2015).

Gradually, ASL gained acceptance and respectability in the 1950's and is attributed to the work of language expert William Stokoe. Stokoe was propelled and inspired by the spirit of the civil rights advocacy movement and developed a structured and well-organized program to

support instructional aims and objectives of deaf education. He emphasized ASL was not dissimilar to the dominant oral language and developed a structure and method of transliteration that transformed how deaf and partially hearing learners were instructed (Roberson & Shaw, 2015).

Kurtz and Taylor (2008) noted ASL syntax and grammar are equivalent to spoken language forms. Signed languages, including ASL, are not characterized by scripted variations because of the reliance on bodily and gestural techniques. This reliance creates difficulties in surveying the phonology and morphology of the language. These difficulties are not insurmountable because ASL is disposed to the use of poetic and dramatic expressions in deaf and hard of hearing populations (Kurt & Taylor, 2008). Objectives of well-planned, organized, and structured ASL induction programs for deaf and hard of hearing learners are designed to: (1) integrate deaf and hard of hearing learners in the regular school system, (2) infuse ASL in instructional approaches to assist hard of hearing and deaf learners in developing English language skills, (3) enhance communicative processes in families of deaf and hard of hearing learners, (4) enhance communication processes in deaf and hard of hearing populations in work places, (5) encourage deaf and hard of hearing learners to enroll in sign language teacher preparation programs, and (6) facilitate training programs for deaf and hard of hearing individuals to explore career paths, such as interpreters, in different sectors of the economy and society (Kurt and Taylor, 2008).

ASL Teaching and Learning Standards

ASL teaching standards can be encapsulated in five goals, each related to the above listed objectives. These standards are designed for learners in kindergarten to grade 12. The first goal of ASL teaching and learning standards is designed to support students in sharing new

knowledge and learning through empathetic and conversational encounters, as well as opinion sharing (Ashton, 2011). The aim of this standard is to guide learners in interactive communication in a culturally and linguistically appropriate context. This standard also requires learners to understand the role of culture in communication processes, appreciate elements of ASL dialogue, and infuse components of cultural appreciation in sharing ideas, thoughts, and feelings in intra and inter group dialogue (Ashton, 2011).

The second goal requires learners to understand the deaf culture in the U.S. This is exemplified in understanding how cultural cuisines, fashion, and food affect language acquisition. The aim of this standard is to appreciate how deaf and hard of hearing people amalgamate and synthesize language in interactive processes. The epicenter of this goal is to assist learners in understanding the effect and centrality of deaf cultural practices in shaping the experiences and texture of ASL (Ashton 2011).

The third goal integrates an interdisciplinary approach to guide students in knowledge acquisition through ASL. Knowledge acquisition is facilitated through an eclectic learning approach, where ASL is used to learn content areas in various disciplines and infuse vocabulary development to assist the process of meaning making. Applied sciences, social sciences, and applied economics are examples of content areas disposed to the application of ASL (Ashton, 2011).

The fourth goal allows learners to immerse themselves in the nuances of the language. The goal of this process is to compare the anatomy of ASL with native languages by understanding how the dominant aural language differs from a language that predominantly uses signs and gestures. The intended outcomes of these standards, goals, and objectives, are for learners to reflect on the nature of language, understand the dimensions of ASL, and compare the

ASL vocabulary with a dominant spoken language. Students' understanding of the operational dynamics of signed and oral languages are useful in making language learning a rich and fulfilling encounter (Ashton, 2011).

Finally, goal five prepares learners to apply ASL outside controlled and clinical educational settings. Learners are prepared to use this language at home, school, work, and in other areas both within and outside of the deaf community (Ashton, 2011). The overall aim of goal five is to build confidence and understanding of the language among its learners, strengthen awareness of linguistic applications of ASL in real-world communication contexts, and help students appreciate the value and relevance of ASL in supporting career advancement goals and objectives. Students' awareness of the powerful effects of ASL as a tool for bridging communication gaps is a major outcome of this goal (Ashton, 2011).

Legal Framework and Deaf Education

A legal framework is a group of laws, rules, and regulations that have been designed to guide the execution of common laws that facilitate equity and fairness for citizens in a county or locale (National Resource Governance Institute, 2015). The legal framework governing the education of deaf children in ASL is affected by Federal and State laws in the U.S. The aim of laws supporting the education of the deaf in their accepted and natural language is to guarantee civil liberties, moderate levels of discrimination, and provide educational experiences in the least restrictive environment (Humphries et al., 2013). In 1973, the Rehabilitation Act was enacted to protect persons with disabilities from institutional discrimination. In the U.S., the legal framework that governs screening and educational opportunities for deaf and hard of hearing children include the National Institutes of Health Consensus Development plan for postnatal assessment. The aim of early screening is to determine levels of hearing loss and prescribe

appropriate language support interventions (Humphries et al., 2013). Case law underpinning this legal framework includes *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka*, and *Mills v. Board of Education of District of Columbia*. These cases mandate inclusion of learners with disabilities, such as hearing loss, in regular school settings within the context of the least restrictive environment. The 14th Amendment grants equal protection to all citizens in the U.S. and includes legal protection from discriminatory and exclusionary practices for deaf and hard of hearing children. The American with Disabilities of Act of 1990 was revised in 2008 to strengthen language support programs by Federal and State government (Humphries et al., 2013).

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) is the most profound piece of federal legislation that affects the education of deaf and hard of hearing children and instructional practices of their hearing teachers (Moore, 2011). This act mandates that children with disabilities, including children with hearing loss, should be educated in the least restrictive environment. The least restrictive environment clause has facilitated inclusion of deaf and hard of hearing children in regular educational settings. This special provision allows for curricula content to be designed to address unique language realities of learners. With respect to IDEA, deaf children can also be identified with other disabilities such as specific learning disabilities and speech and language disorders (Moore, 2011).

Schlesinger (2016) reported the State of Florida has a significant number (211,049) of individuals age 18-64, who have been diagnosed with some degree of hearing loss. Almost 400,000 students were enrolled in Florida schools from 2010 to 2011 under IDEA. This number represents 13.4% of the student population in the state. Almost three percent of students classified as disabled in Florida have been diagnosed with some level of hearing loss (IDEA Data Center, 2018).

Statement and Significance of the Problem

There is disagreement among ASL teachers about the most effective instructional techniques to engage hearing students at the high school level (Rosen, 2015). This disagreement in pedagogical approach and design has affected instructional practices and teaching and learning outcomes. For example, as the primary investigator in this study, I have observed that some hearing teachers of ASL have integrated socio-cultural and socio-linguistic philosophies in choosing instructional approaches, techniques, and strategies to engage their students. Other teachers have utilized strategies that have been supported by evidence-based findings (Rosen, 2015). The absence of standardized ASL instructional guidelines, rules, and procedures has created a significant gap in teaching and learning practices at the high school level. Research-based findings about the most suitable pedagogical approaches should be used in ASL induction and immersion programs. Teachers of ASL have been instructing, and linguistic researchers have been researching. A significant gap has been identified in research-based findings and classroom instructional practices of hearing ASL teachers in high schools across the U.S. (Rosen, 2015).

Inconsistent ASL instructional approaches have produced unfavorable and undesirable learning outcomes in the hearing student population in learning signs and understanding what these signs represent. Teachers who used socio-linguistic and culturally influenced instructional approaches reported hearing students were unable to identify iconic representation, even with instructional guidance and support. Hearing ASL instructors who used technological instructional methods and media, reported learners were more excited and enthused to learn about iconic signs and phonological patterns (Rosen, Turteltaub, Delouise, & Drake, 2015).

The general population, or the largest unit of participants in this study, included all hearing non-native ASL teachers at the high school level in one southeastern United States school district. The hearing high school student population affected by this problem included all students who were enrolled in a general educational program in ninth through twelfth grades, who were exposed to ASL instruction, and who chose ASL as a second language elective (Rosen et al., 2015). In this study I examined hearing non-native ASL teachers' instructional contexts. Assessment of hearing ASL teachers' instructional contexts, experiences, and thoughts about instructional practices helped to identify pedagogical factors and processes these teachers considered to be most important in teaching ASL to second language learners (Rosen et al., 2015; Henner, Caldwell-Harris, Novogrodsky, & Hoffmeister, 2016). ASL is a difficult language to learn. This study explored the contexts, experiences, and ideas of hearing non-native ASL teachers.

I employed a descriptive case study approach and single-case design to explore identified gaps in literature in this study. I abstracted data using semi-structured interviews, field-notes with teacher reflexive notes, and a researcher's reflexive journal of the qualitative research process. Participants were allowed to share their perceptions of student-teacher instructional experiences in a naturalistic setting, and I thematically analyzed data patterns to determine the truths of the instructional contexts and experiences of the teachers in this study.

This research contributed to an advancement of the current body of literature in the field by describing the context that informs hearing non-native ASL teachers' instructional experiences. A study of this nature aids in highlighting and demarcating strategies that hearing ASL teachers consider to be useful in supporting ASL instructional goals, objectives, and practices. Fundamentally, this study added value to existing ASL instructional literature by

providing rich, thick, and descriptive accounts of how hearing non-native ASL teachers perceive the effects of school culture and ASL research-based findings on teacher-instructional choices and preferences.

Addressing the stated problem through the case study methodological approach added value to the population, community, and society in different ways. The general population of hearing ASL teachers benefited from findings of this study because they were exposed to shared stories of the most effective instructional strategies non-native ASL teachers use to engage hearing ASL learners. These shared experiences extended their understanding of the moderating effects of school culture, teacher perception, and instructional choices on pedagogical effectiveness, success, and relevance in ASL classroom settings.

The community and society derived benefits from this study because findings exposed the hearing non-native ASL teaching community to new and insightful experiences about instructional practices. This new knowledge may advance their efforts in understanding what factors and processes affect second language acquisition (SLA) in hearing ASL learning communities. Highly trained second language learners will be able to apply their new learning to macroeconomic development goals, social cohesion, and integration efforts, and augment social capital within communities, which could close the communication gaps between deaf and hearing cultures.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to understand non-native ASL hearing teachers' perceptions of student-teacher instructional experiences using a case design with a small sample of hearing non-native ASL teachers in one school district offering ASL at the high school in the southeastern United States. I explored contexts and experiences of hearing non-native ASL

teachers' instructional approaches used to teach ASL vocabulary to hearing learners in high school and their perceptions of culture in teaching ASL as a second language. Fundamentally, I captured hearing non-native ASL teachers' experiences of teaching signs and non-manual signals to non-native hearing ASL learners in high school.

Rahman (2017) argued a qualitative research approach produces non-numerical findings that give primacy to participant's subjective experiences of a phenomenon. Qualitative studies accept several realities of truth, and these realities are considered equally credible and important. Advantages of qualitative research include copious and rich accounts of participant's thoughts, affections, encounters, and understandings of a problem. In language research, this approach can be effective in assessing effects of culture, teacher preferences, and choices in teaching ASL (Rahman, 2017). Whereas quantitative research accepts that knowledge is nomothetic, the qualitative research paradigm accepts that knowledge is idiographic, and each participant's voice echoes a value of truth. Researchers in qualitative studies often immerse themselves in research sites and settings by interacting with participants just as I did in this study. This process allowed for an understanding of the context and the realities unique to those sites (Rahman, 2017). I immersed myself in this theory because it seems like a good fit for a relatively new area of educational research. This theory allows the hearing teachers to voice their perspectives of teaching ASL to hearing learners at the high school level.

Research Questions

- (1) What views have hearing ASL teachers formed of instructional approaches used to teach ASL vocabulary to non-native learners in high school?
- (2) How do hearing ASL teachers perceive culture in teaching ASL as a second language in high school?

- (3) What are the perceptions of hearing ASL teachers of teaching signs and non-manual signals to non-native learners in high school?

Theoretical Framework

From a theoretical perspective, several theories that have relevance for SLA helped to frame how instructional encounters between hearing ASL teachers and learners were understood in this study. These theories included (a) Vygotsky's Socio-cultural Theory, (b) Schumann's Acculturation model, (c) Krashen's Monitor model, and (d) Chomsky's Universal Grammar (UG). Turuk (2008) argued the Vyotskyian influence on SLA is embedded in language process, techniques, and approaches. Processes approaches to language acquisition emphasize the centrality of the learners' sociocultural background, and prior metacognitive competence (Compernelle & Williams, 2013). ASL second language learners are exposed to a systematic medium of language learning inquiry. This process empowers second language learners by exposing them to goal setting strategies, approaches to develop and articulate language learning ideas, and guides principles that allow K-12 language instructors to develop, articulate, and integrate pedagogical strategies (Turuk, 2008).

Acculturation is viewed in different ways by different researchers. For example, Lopez-Class, Gonzalez-Castro, and Ramirez (2011) view acculturation as an interactive encounter between people of diverse cultural, social, educational, linguistic, and ethnic backgrounds. This level of interaction is sometimes affected by sociological factors including classism, racism, ethnocentrism, sexism, ageism, and linguicism. The process of acculturation is mediated by individuals of an ethnic or cultural group embracing the norms, beliefs, and attitudes of another group (Lopez-Class et al., 2011). In today's multicultural society, acculturation is conceived as a

multistage process including socio-cultural metamorphoses in verbal and non-verbal communication.

Abukhattala (2013) argued Krashen's Monitor model was developed to support second language learners in developing their language skills through the process of automaticity and sub-conscious acquisition practices. This model is characterized by learners who: (1) monitor their acquired language capabilities excessively, distrust their newly acquired skills, and constantly question their non-verbal articulatory skills, and (2) careless or indifferent monitor users who place limited emphasis on acquired skills and fail to assess and review, adaptation and compliance with the rules and norms of the acquired language (Abukhattala, 2013). These users prefer to communicate in their first language rather than in their acquired second language, and (3) conveniently communicate in their acquired language when it is necessary, such as during ASL learning exercises or tests.

Dolati (2012) stated Chomsky argued language acquisition and learning are intricate processes which develop at a very fast pace. The accelerated pace of this process makes it difficult to assert that first and second language learning are acquired simply through observational or imitative processes. Hearing ASL learners learn more about this native language by listening to what others say and share about the language, which is precipitated and facilitated because these learners are born with an internal disposition to learn and acquire language (Dolati, 2012). Chomsky reasoned humans are born with unique attributes that help them to explore and identify rules of language through independent processes.

The theoretical frameworks applicable to this study were subdivided into competence and process theories. Vygotsky's Socio-Cultural Theory and Schumann's Acculturation Model were classified in this study as process theories, because they described and delineated modes and

procedures of language acquisition, while outlining general guidelines for navigating the language culture of the native user. Krashen's Monitor model and Chomsky's UG were classified in this study as competence theories. Competence theories are more specific and describe levels of knowledge, awareness, and competence that second language users should possess before he or she can be described as proficient in the target language. Chomsky was a pioneer in defining competence SLA theories. Competence and process theories are discussed in greater detail in chapter two of this study.

Definition of Terms

Cheremes, morphology, native ASL users, non-native learners, pedagogy, phonology, socio-cultural theory, socio-linguistic, syntax, and target language were conceptual terms that required clarification in this study. Defining these terms helped to deepen the scholarly understanding of the phenomenon under review and assisted the average reader in appreciating the nature and scope of this study.

Cheremes. This term describes a basic component of communication in signed languages and is equivalent to a unit of sound in spoken languages. Linguists have abandoned and replaced this term with "phonemes," which is used to draw parallels between signed and spoken languages (Wang, 2014).

Morphology. Morphology describes the study of the internal configuration of words. This term is applicable to aural and gestural languages such as ASL. Morphological rules and principles can be applied synthetically and analytically (Haspelmath & Sims, 2010).

Native ASL users. This term describes deaf and hearing-impaired users of ASL who have been exposed to ASL as their first language (L1) from birth, or during critical language development periods (Mitchell, Young, Bachleda, & Karchmer, 2017).

Non-native learners. A non-native learner in the context of this study is a student whose first language is not ASL. These learners acquire ASL as a second language (L2) or a foreign language. Non-native learners in this study are often hearing students who take an ASL class as an elective for graduation, or to gain extra credits for college admission (Chun, 2014).

Pedagogy. Pedagogy describes instructional approaches and techniques used by teachers and instructors to support learning. The art and science of teaching can also be described as pedagogy because this describes the interpersonal learning and instructional encounters between teachers and students. Instructional methods and approaches are affected by intercultural and cross-cultural dynamics, values, norms, and idiosyncratic mores. For this study, pedagogy is described as all instructional approaches used by ASL instructors to mediate sign language learning (Child Australia, 2016).

Phonology. This describes the study of different speech sounds. Phonology explains sounds of a language, how they can be integrated into words, and specific phonetic patterns that are useful in speech. For this study, phonology involves gestural patterns and arrangements that are unique to ASL (Roach, 2009).

Socio-cultural theory. The socio-cultural theory proposes that language and culture affect cognitive processes. An intermingling of culture, situational realities, and language imperatives affect how individuals assimilate new learning across different educational settings. In this study, the socio-cultural theory explains ASL teachers' use and infusion of instructional approaches in teaching hearing non-native students (Zubaidi, 2015).

Socio-linguistic. This term describes the exploration of language in the context of socio-cultural realities, regional and sub-regional differences, race and class, local dialect, differences in sex and gender, and bilingual culturalism (Georgeiva, 2014).

Syntax. Syntax is defined by how words, idiomatic and axiomatic expressions are composed and organized to create meaningful and effective sentences. Syntax is unique to most languages, including ASL (Smith, 2017).

Target language. A target language is a second or foreign language that students aim to learn. In the context of this study, the target language is ASL (Gomez-Laich, 2016).

Organization of the Study

In the first chapter, I introduced, described, and discussed the background to the problem, narrowly defined the problem in a statement of the problem, discussed the significance of the problem to the general, targeted, and accessible populations, outlined the purpose of the study, articulated three exploratory and explanatory research questions, discussed the theoretical framework of the study, enumerated and defined a list of terms, and outlined the remainder of the study.

In chapter two, I delineated the theoretical framework of this study, reviewed the findings of applied literature, and synthesized these findings in the context of this current study and the research questions. In chapter three, I described the methods related to the descriptive case study approach utilized in this study, non-probabilistic sampling approaches and techniques, research setting/context, study protocol, informed consent, application of trustworthiness criteria to ensure validity and reliability of findings, justification and design of interview instrument, researcher's reflexivity, and a comprehensive description of first and second level coding techniques and approaches. In chapter four, qualitative findings are revealed via a thematic thread in the context of the research questions. In chapter five, I examined major findings as compared with the literature, along with any strengths and limitations. The final components of chapter five include recommendations, conclusions, and identification of areas for future research.

Chapter Two: Literature Review

Review of Literature

A growing number of hearing high school students in the U.S. are opting to take ASL as a second or world language option and this growth has precipitated instructional challenges for hearing ASL teachers (Rosen, 2014). Reagan (2011) revealed ASL is recognized by several states in the U.S. as an acceptable foreign or world language option. The state of Florida authorized private and public educational institutions to offer ASL to students who want to acquire foreign or world language credits for graduation or matriculate to institutions of higher learning. Missouri recognizes ASL as a foreign language option and allows elementary and secondary educational institutions to grant credit to students enrolled in this program. ASL also qualifies in Missouri to meet foreign language requirements when applying for access to higher educational institutions (Reagan, 2011).

A principal goal of instructing hearing ASL learners is to guide them in transferring their new learning to different educational contexts. Fundamentally, instructional approaches used by hearing ASL teachers are designed to stimulate and maximize learning opportunities in the hearing classroom culture, but several observers have argued teacher-instructional choices of some ASL teachers are pedagogically flawed and should instead be underpinned by findings of evidence-based research (Rosen, 2014). Campbell (2017) opined that foreign or world language instructional practices are affected by several factors such as meta-cognitive capabilities of learners, teachers' instructional choices, physical arrangement of the classroom, and limitations

of second language teachers in applying SLA theories to signed languages. These factors pose several challenges for ASL teachers in using modern instructional approaches to stimulate and model desired learning outcomes (Campbell, 2017). Non-native teachers of ASL are further challenged in using instructional approaches at their disposal to instruct second language learners in ASL grammar because of limited exposure to the native language culture. Teachers often encounter difficulties in exposing learners to communicative, dialectal, and behavioral components of the ASL curriculum (Campbell, 2017).

This chapter is organized into Sections A (theoretical framework) and B (applied research findings). I designed the theoretical framework of this study to critically assess and evaluate existing and new knowledge affecting the phenomenon of teacher perceptions of ASL instructional practices (Green, 2014). Applied research findings were also described by evaluating relevant research findings contextualized within the broader framework of this study.

Section A synthesizes the extant theories of SLA in the context of high school teachers' perceptions of their instructional experiences with hearing ASL learners. The SLA theories I examined included (a) Vygotsky's Socio-cultural Theory, (b) Schumann's Acculturation Model (c) Krashen's Monitor Model, and (d) Chomsky's Universal Grammar (UG). Section B establishes the empirical basis of this study by critically appraising findings of applied literature affecting three areas in this study: (a) instructional approaches used to teach ASL vocabulary to non-native learners, (b) culture in teaching ASL as second language, and (c) teaching signs and non-manual signals to non-native learners in high school. The central argument was that instructional choices, views, and experiences of hearing ASL teachers were shaped by the perceptions of their student-teacher instructional experiences. I established and consolidated the

basis of this argument by exploring the intersectionality between SLA theories and empirical data relating to the three research questions in this chapter.

SLA Theories and Their Relevance to ASL Teacher Instructional Experiences with Hearing Students (Section A)

SLA theories were classified as competence or process theories because each theoretical construct unearths different metalinguistic outcomes (Stefansson, 2013). Competence theoretical models were distinguished by knowledge of standards and guidelines of linguistic form and structure. These models defined and delineated appropriate directions and lexical functions useful to understanding norms of a language (Bialystok, 1990). Conversely, process theories were characterized by guidelines of storage and retrieval and how those rules can be easily accessed. Process theories clearly outlined when and how a language user mastered a grammatical or vocabulary system of a language and captured instances where language acquisition skills and norms have not been acquired or mastered (Stefansson, 2013). Essentially, process and competence theories explained how well a language user can communicate in an acquired language and how the process of communication is governed by the rules of that language (Bialystok, 1990). This discussion navigated these complex and interdependent classifications by reviewing and synthesizing Vygotsky's Socio-cultural Theory, Schumann's Acculturation Model (which are considered process theories) as well as, Krashen's Monitor Model, and Chomsky's UG, which are classified as competence theories.

Vygotsky's Sociocultural Theory (Process Theory)

In the case of Vygotsky's Sociocultural theory, Mirzaee and Maftoon (2016) postulated that Vygotsky's scholarship was pivotal to later work on cognitive and developmental processes in SLA. Vygotsky understood advanced mental process as output of social and interactive

communication processes (Lantolf & Pavlenko, 2008). He (Vygotsky) reasoned that language and communication processes were moderated by psychological factors that affected how knowledge and information flowed in human cultures. In the 1980's, Vygotsky's postulations about private speech were infused in a general hypothesis that private speech in the adult population was affected by regulatory procedures and norms in SLA (Mirzaee & Maftoon, 2016; Lantolf & Pavlenko, 2008).

Furthermore, Turuk (2008) revealed the Vyotskyian influence on SLA is found primarily in language process, techniques, and approaches (Compernelle & Williams, 2013). ASL second language learners were exposed to a systematic medium of language learning inquiry. This process empowered second language learners by exposing them to goal setting strategies, approaches to develop and articulate language-learning ideas, and guiding principles that allowed K-12 language instructors to develop meaningful pedagogical strategies (Turuk, 2008). Socio-cultural experiences of teachers and learners are important in a second language classroom of hearing ASL students and instructors. ASL in the second language classroom should be viewed as an instrument of bridging the structural gaps between native language learners and their acquisition of second language competencies and skills (Compernelle & Williams, 2013). Importantly, second language acquisition in Vygotsky's view is a socially mediated process that views communication as a tool and creature of the language learners' social and cultural milieu (Turuk, 2008). Second language learning is affected by contextual meaning construction where learners and teachers are immersed in understanding the centrality and symmetrical advantages of integrated approaches to learning ASL vocabulary and grammar (Turuk, 2008).

Task-oriented learning is another approach that facilitated the infusion of the sociocultural theory in second language teaching and learning environments. This style

highlights the relevance of ASL learners' and teachers' community and social assimilation dispositions and preferences (Compernelle & Williams, 2013). Task-based or task-oriented learning undertaken through a sociocultural context explored how teachers and students situated themselves in task accomplishments, and how hearing ASL learners' community learning processes can be mobilized and strategically applied to strengthen learning outcomes (Turuk, 2008; Compernelle & Williams, 2013). Scaffolding techniques were used by teachers to support students in developing non-verbal ASL communication techniques and strategies. Hearing learners in ASL, L2 classrooms were encouraged to work collaboratively on tasks and teachers were also encouraged to use Vygotsky's zone of proximal development (ZPD) to maximize benefits of collaborative peer engagement. Tasks should be designed, structured, and organized to facilitate inter-group communication in the second language classroom (Compernelle & Williams, 2013). Teachers were further advised that task sequencing is important in applying ZPD because this allows learners to learn and acquire second language skills at their initial level of competence (Turuk, 2008). Acquisition of facts and content about a language is important, but Vygotsky's sociocultural theory emphasized the role of abstract thinking and multi-tasking in the second language classroom. The objective of this graded approach to learning was to enable teachers to move from simple to more complex tasks and this was best facilitated by exposing learners to tasks which challenged their initial levels of language proficiency and forced them to activate and utilize their critical thinking skills (Turuk, 2008). Repetitive and regurgitated facts were often deleterious and harmful to the second language learning and acquisition phases. Second language teachers were encouraged to immerse hearing ASL learners in a rich and productive process of developing and mastering language acquisition strategies that are useful to knowledge construction and meaning making (Turuk, 2008; Compernelle & Williams, 2013).

Undoubtedly, second language educators experienced challenges in implementing ZPD in the second language classroom (Lantolf & Poehner, 2014). Teachers should investigate and identify the operational parameters in which the ZPD can be best implemented in an ASL classroom, and the parameters that should be explored in this type of classroom (Turuk, 2008; Lantolf & Poehner, 2014). Reciprocal teaching and learning were at the heart of the ZPD as teachers actively determined learners' strengths and weaknesses. Teachers were further asked to explore what asynchronous learning tasks students were able to manage and identify synchronous learning activities that required their feedback and peer collaboration (Lantolf & Poehner, 2014). A delicate balance between students' basic academic capabilities and frustration levels should be determined and managed in the clinical setting. Second language learning should be accompanied by tasks that force learners to synthesize, analyze, evaluate, and develop novel solutions during the process of problem solving (Turuk, 2008). Learners should not be ensconced in their comfort zone of recalling facts and repeating processes but should be challenged metacognitively to develop independent thinking skills (Lantolf & Poehner, 2014).

Scaffolding was an important instructional tool in second language classrooms and this tool moderated the interaction of hearing ASL learners and teachers in hearing and deaf cultures. Native language approaches were not always useful to teach L2 students and were accompanied by evidence-based findings (Turuk, 2008; Lantolf & Poehner, 2014). For example, first language grammar texts were not always appropriate models for L2 instruction because of second language learning barriers. Fundamentally, ASL is a non-verbal, gestural language, which presents unique challenges for basal reader developers, hearing ASL teachers and students, and curriculum planners (Lantolf & Poehner, 2014). Hearing ASL learners should be appropriately guided and supported by their world language teachers. These learners cannot be expected to

acquire and develop language skills at a comparable rate to native language learners. Second language learning must be sequenced, graded, and tailored to learners' initial proficiency levels (Turuk, 2008; Lantolf & Poehner, 2014).

The goal of Sociocultural Theory in the L2 or second language classroom environment was to interlock and interweave language learning with culturally relevant dynamics (Lantolf & Poehner, 2014). Culture served a mediating function by narrowing the language learning gaps in hearing and deaf cultures. Successful ASL immersion meant that hearing ASL learners were exposed to the language culture of native ASL speakers. Invariably, these speakers offered useful insights about the culture and subculture of their language (Turuk, 2008; Lantolf & Poehner, 2014).

A fundamental tenet of Vygotsky's Sociocultural Theory was linking new learning to prior knowledge and this was best achieved by helping students activate what they already knew by building linkages with new patterns of learning (Ortega, 2013). The ZPD was essential to activating prior knowledge and assimilating new learning (Villamizar, 2017; Ortega, 2013). The first step in infusing the ZPD in the ASL classroom was to develop or identify a really challenging problem that required a meaningful solution (Ortega, 2013). The second step involved engaging L2 learners in developing a plan of action to solve this problem (Ortega, 2013). The teacher was often seen as an instructional expert who used pedagogical expertise to assist novice learners to overcome identified learning challenges. Second language acquisition was best supported by input and output processes. Input processes involved exploring the vocabulary and grammar of a language, and these two steps helped hearing ASL learners become familiar with essential language structures (Villamizar, 2013; Ortega, 2013). Teachers must expose learners to unambiguous and direct second language instructional experiences. The

purpose of explicit language instruction was to assist learners in acquiring language competencies comparable to native users of ASL. Input flood and textual enhancement were two approaches that were used by teachers to support and augment language immersion capabilities (Ortega, 2013). Teachers ensured the success of input processes by assessing academic competencies of learners, developing teaching and learning materials to support the ASL learner, and designing tasks and activities that challenged students to think outside their zone of comfort (Villamizar, 2017; Ortega, 2013). Schumann's Acculturation Model was another process theory that had implications for understanding the context and relevance of this study.

Schumann's Acculturation Model (Process Theory)

Acculturation was conceptualized in different ways. For example, Lopez-Class, Gonzalez-Castro, and Ramirez (2011) conceived of acculturation as an interactive encounter between people of diverse cultural, social, educational, linguistic, and ethnic backgrounds. This level of interaction was sometimes moderated by sociological factors of classism, racism, ethnocentrism, sexism, ageism, and linguicism. The acculturative process was accompanied by individuals of an ethnic or cultural group embracing norms, beliefs, and attitudes of another group (Lopez-Class et al., 2011; Schumann, 1985). Schumann's Acculturation Model conceived acculturation as a multistage process encompassing sociocultural metamorphoses in verbal and non-verbal speech, socioeconomic stature, evolution in norms, attitudes, and mores. Acculturation was not a single-stage process that occurred in a predefined moment in time but was a constant process of social and cultural integration in host countries or social groups with different linguistic realities (Lopez-Class et al., 2011; Schumann, 1985). For example, non-native ASL students enrolled in a second or world language program navigated different stages during the SLA process. Some learners chose to separate themselves from the native language and

culture, some chose to assimilate with the native language culture by temporarily abandoning their native culture, and others eclectically infused their native language culture with the second language culture through bicultural hybridization.

This two-factor acculturation paradigm proposed two separate forms for cultural identity. These were (a) associating with the minority ethnic culture, and (b) relating to majority or popular culture. This two-factor framework was also supported by a quadratic structure with different acculturation outputs (Lopez-Class et al., 2011). These outputs were: marginal or limited participation with native language (L1) and second language (L2) cultures; high participation in L1 culture and limited participation in new L2 culture; high participation in L2 culture and low or restricted participation in native language culture; and intense assimilation and association with native and non-native language cultures. The two-factor cultural framework was construed by many scholars as useful, but others criticized it because of unclear and ambiguous application and absence of empirical data to support its postulations and assertions (Lopez-Class et al., 2011).

Schumann's Acculturation Model postulated that acculturation was mediated by context, which essentially described factors that regulated and governed how this phenomenon occurred. Context was often affected by environmental situations such as second language learner's initial exposure to ASL, the existing second language culture, the size of the population of non-native learners, and unique cultural characteristics of the group of learners. Other influences on acculturation included cohesiveness of social groups, cultural sphere, and parochial factors such as population size (Lopez-Class et al., 2011; Schumann, 1985).

Schumann (1985) reasoned that SLA must be viewed and studied in the context of existing culture. Language acquisition in bicultural populations was often affected by

internalizing and externalizing variables (Lopez-Class et al., 2011). For example, ASL second language learners sometimes sought to immerse themselves in the culture of the language, but that process of linguistic assimilation was often limited from the outset. Hearing ASL learners may have challenges internalizing the lexical realities of their second language culture because of limited communicative skills, internal prejudices of the acquired language, and attitudinal and behavioral dispositions that are deleterious to cultural assimilation (Lopez-Class et al., 2011; Schumann, 1985). Externalizing factors included resistance of native ASL users to hearing ASL encroaching on their culture, prohibitive subcultural differences in native and non-native ASL populations that were prohibitive to the language acculturation process, and other unknown barriers that arose when minority language users interacted with second language learners (Lopez-Class et al., 2011; Schumann, 1985).

Acculturation was transformational and multidimensional. This experience facilitated structural and linguistic changes in individuals and learning communities. These changes were often activated by local community realities and broader variables of ASL policies, enrollment patterns of L2 learners in high schools, and changes in hearing and deaf cultures that can affect how ASL is perceived, accepted, and utilized in different language populations (Schumann, 1985). Twenty-first century L2 users were empowered with greater opportunities of cultural exploration, but these explorations had to be approached with sensitivity, respect, and care for the existential realities of non-native populations (Lopez-Class et al., 2011).

Ward and Geeraert (2016) asserted a process acculturation model can be used to appraise acquisition of minority languages. The process approach incorporated unique aspects of a culture in learning about, using, articulating, and sharing ideas in a second language. Acquisition difficulties were created because of dissimilarities in hearing and deaf cultures. Deaf cultures

used a gestural, non-verbal language and communication system, but this system differed significantly from an oral or verbal language system, where speech and phonological patterns dominate communication channels (Ward & Geeraert, 2016). Second language learners felt disaffected or disenfranchised from the ASL culture because of hearing and speech biases. These hearing and speech biases impeded their acculturation endeavors and created faults or rifts in their language proficiency goals. Conversely, the dominant spoken language of non-native ASL students, created psychological stressors for this population (Ward & Geeraert, 2016).

Jiang, Green, Henley, and Masten (2009) investigated the association between SLA and acculturation in a sample of 49 (46.9% males & 53.1% females) Chinese students. This study was conducted in the context of literature that revealed that second language acquisition emerged as an academic choice of different ethnic minorities in the U.S. and age was identified as a variable that affected second language proficiency after puberty. Learners who pursued a second language option such as ASL or English, were more disposed to experience acquisition challenges during puberty than learners who pursued these languages during pre-pubescent developmental stages (Jiang et al., 2009). The closure of the pre-pubescent language development window means that L2 learners will have to exert significant effort to acquire the language of choice. A learner's social environment was a significant variable that affected the quality and pace of his non-native language learning experiences (Jiang et al., 2009). Empirical evidence revealed that constraining effects of late exposure to a second language could be moderated by intense and strategic immersion in the targeted language, as well as by taking steps to moderate effects of gender on acquisition practices. It was argued that second language learning was simply a feature of the process of acculturation, and not a defining factor.

In other words, acculturation was not the single most important factor that facilitated receptivity of the non-native language in hearing ASL populations. Another factor influencing this process included cultural affectivity that was sometimes supported by psychological linkages (Jiang et al., 2009). The more the mind was attuned to the non-native language, the more disposed the learner was to successful acquisition of the fundamentals of the language. Success or measured proficiency in the second language was achieved through cultural identity integration, participation in socially and culturally relevant activities of the non-native culture, and construction of healthy social networks (Jiang et al., 2009). Having reviewed Vygotsky's Socio-Cultural Theory and Schumann's Acculturation, a discussion of Krashen's Monitor Model and Chomsky's UG is necessitated to further establish the context and relevance of this study, as well as to consolidate the theoretical basis of this research.

Krashen's Monitor Model (Competence Theory)

Abukhattala (2013) argued Krashen's Monitor Model was designed to support second language learners in developing their language skills through the process of automaticity and sub-conscious acquisition practices. This model was defined by learners who monitored their acquired language capabilities excessively, distrusted their newly acquired skills, constantly questioned their non-verbal articulatory skills, careless or indifferent users who placed limited emphasis on acquired skills, and who failed to assess and review adaptation and compliance with the rules and norms of the acquired language (Abukhattala, 2013). These users preferred to communicate in their native language rather than in their acquired language and were described as convenient monitor users who only communicated in their acquired language when it was necessary, such as during ASL learning exercises or tests. These monitors often portrayed a

superficial picture that they were more proficient in the second language than mediocre users of the language because they synthesized acquired and learned aptitudes (Abukhattala, 2013).

In Krashen's view, learned competence was not easily acquired. For example, in the U.S. where ASL is a minority language, communication between hearing populations and native ASL users is very limited. Second language learners used several opportunities to develop their acquired and learned competence by exploring the language culture of native ASL users (Abukhattala, 2013). Hearing ASL teachers provided opportunities for their learners to autonomously sharpen and expand their vocabulary, sharpen their gestural skills, and monitor their use of grammatical patterns unique to that language. Undoubtedly, teachers of a second language assisted learners in developing language acquisition capabilities by narrowly exploring gestural patterns unique to that language (Abukhattala, 2013). For example, students and teachers pursuing ASL focused their conversational encounters on use of body language, facial expressions, and the significance of these nonverbal patterns in meaning making explorations in the second language classroom. Krashen's SLA theory has several implications for the design and execution of ASL learning experiences in hearing student populations. Teachers were encouraged to tailor this theory to their unique teaching and learning realities to achieve the best outcomes of this model (Abukhattala, 2013).

Conte-Morgan (2002) stated that content learned in second language classes underpins the operational dynamics of Krashen's Monitor Model. Materials acquired through learning can be utilized by students to evaluate their language learning progress or performance. The monitor hypothesis proposed that SLA occurred when new knowledge moderated the intervening effects of the second language learner's environment, aversive attitudes, and social constraints. Linguistic filtering was a barrier to full mastery and acquisition of a second language, but the

effects of filtering were mediated by effectively processing and infusing rules, communication standards, and gestural patterns of the newly acquired language (Conte-Morgan, 2002).

ASL teachers prepared for the pedagogical act by developing and facilitating an inviting and engaging environment for learners, planning for student-teacher learning encounters, facilitating large and small group interactions in diverse student populations, enlivening the classroom environment with humor, and creating real opportunities for students to extend their learning (Conte-Morgan, 2002). The communicative process in the second or world language classroom was best enabled through awareness of students' language capabilities, strategic facilitation of language comprehension, explication of simple and precise language acquisition guidelines exposing learners to different non-verbal gestural examples, supporting productive discussions between students, and incorporating a three-pronged strategy of teaching, revising, and consolidating. Diversifying teaching styles was an important pillar of Krashen's Monitor Model, and this was best achieved by varying conceptual teaching and learning, infusing of participatory group and individual learning in pedagogical plans, integrating different technological media in the teaching and learning process, differentiating instructional approaches to meet differentiated teaching and learning goals, observing students' progress, and giving relevant and timely feedback (Conte-Morgan, 2002). Culture was another important variable in SLA, and this variable affected the application of Krashen's Monitor in the second language classroom. Instructors moderated effects of culture by considering socio-demographic factors of ethnicity, age, sex, and nationality in planning for second language instruction, used components of native and non-native language cultures to deepen conceptual awareness, infused students' background knowledge in instructional planning, developed and supported inquiry of native ASL

cultures, and engendered a classroom culture of appreciation for the sociological backgrounds of other learners (Conte-Morgan, 2002).

Krashen (2009) indicated the monitor hypothesis can be used by second language students to appraise, evaluate, and assess their language learning progress. Non-native learners of ASL explored principles and practices of that language, and then edited or monitored their progress to test the quality of their learning. During this process, students learned to self-correct and refine their language output measures (Krashen, 2009). Krashen noted however that mindfulness of lexical rules was only part of a broader process (2009). The monitor hypothesis suggested students enter the second language classroom with the goal of acquired competence, then gradually develop skills of learned competence, which are used to monitor the quality and cogency of ASL output (Krashen, 2009).

Systematic language rules were deemphasized in the monitor hypothesis because second language learners do not always utilize conscious application of ASL grammar. Time, form, and non-native language rules were arguably three important components of the SLA process. For example, hearing ASL learners need time to familiarize themselves with intricate gestures and rules associated with the language (Krashen, 2009). Conversational use in class was one approach that gave learners exposure to the rudiments of the language, but even that activity was limited by timetabling constraints. Second language teachers were encouraged to develop systematic learning activities, which exposed students to meaningful learning experiences that helped them to edit and monitor their use of the language in non-native and native conversational settings. Another ingredient in monitoring use of the ASL was understanding the form or appropriate use of the language (Krashen, 2009). Attention was given to morphological and syntactical correctness. It was well known that non-native or second language students will never

fully acquire or develop a working knowledge of all the rules in a language and these learners may sometimes circumvent these rules by using unconscious metalinguistic processes. However, it was crucial that learners were exposed to general rules of the language and develop functional abilities in managing use of morphemes and graphemes. Critical monitoring allowed second language learners to sharpen their independent acquisition skills by overcoming the hurdles and pitfalls of conscious grammar and by interweaving their semantic experiences within their error reduction pursuits (Krashen, 2009). However, as was demonstrated in the next topic, Chomsky's UG sheds light about SLA competencies from a different scholarly perspective.

Chomsky's Universal Grammar (Competence Theory)

Dolati (2012) noted that Chomsky argued language acquisition and learning were intricate processes that developed at an accelerated pace. The accelerated pace of this process made it difficult to assert that the second language is acquired through simple observational or imitative activities. Hearing ASL learners learn more about this native language by listening to what others say and share about the language, and this was also precipitated and facilitated because these learners were born with an internal disposition to learn and acquire language (Dolati, 2012; Chomsky, 1986). Chomsky hypothesized that humans are born with unique qualities and abilities to explore and identify rules of language through independent processes. The internal component or mechanism to acquire language was referred to as the linguistic acquisition device, or universal grammar (UG). The UG (sometimes referred to as systematic acquisition device), captured the conceptual rules inherent to most languages. These rules enabled learners to develop and construct limitless sentences. The aim of linguistic scholarship was to explore general grammatical rules that measured competency as opposed to performance skills (Dolati, 2012; Chomsky, 1986).

Hawkins (2001) stated UG is a collection of systematic rules and guidelines used to determine the boundaries and parameters of grammatical usage and functions in human language systems. For example, a grammar or system of rules (for a non-verbal and minority language such as ASL) determined how sentences were constructed, and this system also helped to define and delineate relevant output and significance of sentence structures. UG was outside the scope of individual grammatical systems and was sometimes determined by genetic antecedents. Second language learners derived or extrapolated their grammatical principles from UG. This means that L2 and L1 acquisition patterns were symmetrically aligned (Hawkins, 2001; Chomsky, 1972).

Hulin and Na (2012) identified several challenges with second language acquisition and UG. The first challenge was a disparity in acquisition patterns of native and second language learners. It was understood that first language acquisition patterns were automatic and unconscious, as compared to second language acquisition practices, which were more structured and conscious. UG grammar proposed that children were more disposed to acquiring their native language because mental vulnerabilities made language learning a naturally occurring process (Hulin & Na, 2012). While children tended to be immature, adults were cognitively mature, which meant that not all principles of UG applied to adult second language programs. Input approaches also differed, as first language learners acquired language through different input modes such as hearing, and ASL minority learners acquired language through non-verbal and gestural processes in their environment. Also, adults acquired a minority language through verbal and non-verbal approaches (Hulin & Na, 2014; Saeipoor, Mustapha, Isamil, & Krauss, 2011).

In the case of ASL, hearing learners had the advantage of hearing teachers who facilitated the process of interaction, and sometimes relied on second language exposure to explore difficult

aspects of the non-native language. Fundamentally, it must be noted that motivational imperatives of second language learners differed from native language learners. High school students enrolled in a world or second language programs would have acquired and developed a sound language learning foundation, and this language learning foundation would have changed how they approached a non-native language such as ASL. It was argued that UG is perhaps not the most appropriate theory to explain SLA acquisition because of an inordinate focus on native language acquisition practices. A more appropriate explanatory and explicatory theory would be Krashen's Monitor Model (Hulin & Na, 2014; Saeipoor et al., 2011).

Summary of Section A

This section reviewed four SLA theories, which formed the theoretical foundation of this study. These theories were important because they defined the study's focus, contextualized the research problem, established a research-based platform for this inquiry, and laid the foundation for the central argument of this chapter in that hearing ASL teachers' student-teacher instructional experiences have implications for their instructional choices, as well as their shared and individual experiences. Process SLA theories developed and articulated by Vygotsky and Cole (1978), and Schumman (1985), were relevant to this study's context because they defined and established the role of culture in SLA, outlined second language acquisition processes, and described implications of hearing teachers experiences of different language cultures for their student-teacher instructional processes in the second language classroom. Process theories supported the three main issues (ASL vocabulary, culture in teaching ASL as a second language, and signs and non-manual signals), which were examined in this study by revealing and unmasking the role of the dominant language culture (spoken English) in the second language (ASL) acquisition process. These theories further revealed that second language learners'

responses to their teachers' instructional approaches were factors, which informed the instructional agenda and were the focus and mandate of hearing ASL teachers' instructional choices. Process theories strongly suggested the instructional choices and experiences of hearing ASL teachers were formed and molded by their interactions with deaf and hearing cultures, their instructional experiences in teaching hearing ASL students, and their level of exposure to a non-native language culture (ASL).

Similarly, points of convergence were drawn with the focus of this study and competence theories. The focus of this study was to understand and unmask the views of hearing non-native ASL teachers regarding student-teacher experiences with hearing ASL learners. Krashen's Monitor Model and Chomsky's UG helped to frame the focus of this study by demonstrating that second language learners' understanding of ASL grammatical rules, forms, and conventions have significant implications for hearing ASL student-teacher instructional stories, as well as their instructional choices. Competence theories supported the main issues in this study by describing principles and guidelines to determine SLA proficiency and capability.

Process and competence theories helped to frame this study's context and the research problem by helping the researcher to construct a strong theoretical foundation of principles and practices that affect SLA. Furthermore, this theoretical foundation provided depth of knowledge of the research problem by describing factors that affect second language acquisition, defining parameters of second language acquisition, and revealing important issues world or second language teachers should consider in planning and designing ASL instructional experiences. Importantly, the theoretical framework discussed in Section A sets the platform for a critical appraisal and synthesis of applied research findings in Section B.

Section B (Applied Research Findings)

In this section I discuss literature related to instructional approaches used to teach ASL vocabulary to non-native learners, assess the role of culture in teaching ASL as a second language and, review empirical literature on teaching of signs and non-manual signals to non-native learners. These research findings were reviewed and synthesized in the context of the research problem and research questions. Importantly, applied research findings established the need for and relevance of this study through a systematic and thorough discussion of empirical data relating to the three research questions articulated in Chapter 1. In addition, this literature further reinforced the need for this study by discussing knowledge gaps I attempted to narrow in this study.

Instructional Approaches and ASL Vocabulary

A controversial debate emerged about the role of spoken language in teaching ASL as a second language to hearing ASL learners (Rosen, Delouise, Boyle, & Daley, 2014). The debate concerned second language teachers' use of learners' spoken English language during instructional encounters with students. Second language purists argued that ASL should be taught without reference to learners' native spoken language, while others postulated that voice and speech should be used to support ASL vocabulary development in the world language ASL program. Primarily, a voice or speech instructional approach integrated learners' native language with components of the target language (ASL).

This approach contrasted sharply with the exclusive target language emphasis where voice is not used, but ASL iconic properties are used without reference to learners' native language (Rosen et al., 2014). This debate also cascaded into the discussion about using native language of learners to augment target language success. Opponents argued that target language

only approaches were ideal for teaching ASL to L2 learners, but proponents of an integrated approach (target and native language), reasoned that this approach helped to enhance and strengthen target language skills in the hearing ASL student population (Rosen et al., 2014).

Rosen et al. (2014) examined three different experiments, which measured the dominant language used in second language classrooms and their effects on ASL vocabulary development. The first experiment was in a middle school with a sample of 75 students (50 males & 25 females) from three ASL streams. Participants were between 11 and 13 years old. The native language of the sample was English. Content materials were selected from texts used in the ASL program and included 44 English vocabulary words. The intervention involved assigning three groups three different dominant language approaches. Group 1 used the target language exclusively for vocabulary development, Group 2 used voice alone, and Group 3 integrated voice and target language (Rosen et al., 2014).

The second experiment was designed to determine the efficacy of target or second language in supporting participants ASL vocabulary development (Rosen et al., 2014). This study was executed in a high school setting in a sample of 25 participants. The sample was recruited from the first level of the ASL L2 cohort, who spoke English as their native or first language. A list of career choice vocabulary words was extrapolated from the career curricula used in the school. One group was instructed to use voice during vocabulary instruction in the target language, and the other group was advised the lesson would be taught completely in the target language without reference to voice (Rosen et al., 2014).

The third experiment was undertaken to determine “the relationship between learners’ auditory–verbal and visual–manual language processing abilities and their learning of a visual–manual language such as ASL” (p. 158). This study utilized voice and exclusive target language

approaches to assess which approach was more efficacious to vocabulary learning capabilities and moderating effects of disabilities (Rosen et al., 2014). The sample included 10 freshmen (four females and six males) between 10 and 15 years old, who were classified as experiencing a language difficulty that manifested in hearing or visual discrimination challenges. Data were extrapolated from content analysis of participants test scores (Rosen et al., 2014).

Results of the first and second experiments confirmed the alternative hypothesis that students who were taught exclusively in the target language acquired more ASL vocabulary words than students who were exposed to an integrated instructional approach of target language and voice (Rosen et al., 2014). The exclusive target language groups mean scores were higher than the group that infused the non-native language and voice in the teaching and learning process. It was further revealed students in an exclusive second language learning environment were more disposed to develop language skills, master linguistic tests and assessments, and even demonstrate superior performance in learning situations where target and native languages were infused to mediate communication processes. These findings reinforced results of other studies that have found that vocabulary instruction in second language learning situations is more successful when the target language is used as the exclusive language of induction (Rosen et al., 2014).

These findings also have relevance for student-teacher experiences, ASL vocabulary instructional choices, and stories of hearing ASL teachers. For example, some hearing ASL teachers may choose to use an exclusive target language approach to expose their non-native students to ASL vocabulary, while others may integrate native and target language instructional approaches. These pedagogical differences in teaching ASL vocabulary to hearing ASL students have significant implications for student-teacher instructional experiences and hearing ASL

teachers' instructional choices in exposing non-native learners to sign language vocabulary. In other words, the instructional choices of hearing ASL teachers cannot be divorced from their perceptions, views, experiences, and stories of their instructional experiences with the hearing ASL students.

It is worth noting that Wilcox and Wilcox (1998) found there has been an evolution in the last two decades in how teachers approach the teaching of ASL vocabulary to hearing students. Some educators developed a preference for the translation and grammar approach, which emphasizes vocabulary development, adherence to linguistic rules, and navigation between the native and second languages. This approach derives its principles from Krashen's Monitor Model, where second language learners monitor their language progress at different stages of the continuum. Another method which has gained prominence was the audio-lingual approach, which placed greater emphasis on the target language and less focus on the native language of learners. This approach was teacher-centered and focused primarily on the memorization of rules and behavioral habituation (Wilcox & Wilcox, 1998). Other teachers preferred a cognitive instructional approach, which emphasized grammatical use and practice. This approach was disposed to a structured approach to second language learning where morphological and graphological patterns were emphasized. Correct use of grammar was central to this process, and inaccurate usage was considered a normal part of the language learning process. This instructional approach derived principles from Chomsky's Universal Grammar where the language learner was thought to possess innate language learning capabilities and these capabilities were assumed to help second language learners use and apply grammatical rules to language situations (Wilcox & Wilcox, 1998). These findings further deepened the controversy and debate about factors that intersected to shape and inform hearing ASL teachers' views and

experiences of teaching ASL vocabulary to hearing students in high school and suggested that these teachers had formed dichotomous views about teaching vocabulary to their non-native hearing ASL students because of differences in instructional outcomes, diversity in instructional choices, and diversity in how students monitored and assessed vocabulary competencies.

Similarly, the communicative language teaching methodology was embraced by some ASL teachers as the ideal approach to teach ASL vocabulary and other linguistic forms (Wilcox & Wilcox, 1998). This approach suggested learners' unique learning needs should be considered when teaching ASL to hearing students and this consideration should also incorporate learners' cultures, social experiences, educational backgrounds, language goals, and objectives. Lesson content was often seen as emergent and guided by situational learning imperatives. This approach was reflective of Vygotsky's Socio-Cultural Theory and Schumann's Acculturation Model where culture, society, and hearing and deaf group norms intersected to augment cognitive abilities of L2 learners (Wilcox & Wilcox, 1998). The communicative language teaching approach had significant implications for the views and experiences hearing ASL teachers formed about teaching ASL vocabulary to non-native learners. These experiences were undoubtedly shaped by teachers' perceptions of the utility of the communicative language teaching methodology, as well as how this approach facilitated their student-teacher instructional encounters and experiences.

However, Zdrojewski (1998) examined the effects of using a multi-sensory approach to teach ASL vocabulary in a sample of 48 participants using a quasi-experimental design. Twenty-four participants were enrolled in the treatment group and 24 were enrolled in the control group. The treatment lasted for five weeks. Participants in the control group were not exposed to ASL vocabulary instruction. Data was analyzed using independent t-tests and results revealed no

statistically significant differences in mean scores of participants in the treatment and control groups (Zdrojewski, 1998). Limitations of this study included a short treatment period of only five weeks that would not have given researchers enough time to assess the efficacy of the multi-sensory instructional approach, as well as use of only one statistical measure (t-test) to assess variables. Other techniques that would have been useful in data analysis included multiple and logical regression, discriminant analysis, and multivariate analysis of variance (Zdrojewski, 1998). These findings further solidified the argument that different instructional approaches used by hearing ASL teachers to teach vocabulary to non-native ASL produced different outcomes and these different outcomes have significant implications for the views and perceptions hearing ASL teachers form about their student-teacher instructional experiences. It can also be reasonably argued that the diversity in student-teacher instructional experiences of hearing ASL teachers shaped and informed how they approached their instructional choices. Indeed, these dissimilar outcomes also strengthened the need for this study to explore and understand the diverse stories and experiences that helped to shape these student-teacher instructional experiences of hearing ASL teachers as well as to identify points of divergence and convergence in these stories.

Staden (2013) examined effects of a multi-sensory and coding support program to support vocabulary and comprehension development in a sample of 64 hearing children diagnosed with bilateral hearing loss. Probability sampling was used to randomly recruit participants who were assigned to experimental and control groups. Results revealed statistically superior improvements in vocabulary and comprehension skills in the experimental sample exposed to the multi-sensory approach in comparison to the control group that was unexposed to this instructional strategy. The major limitation that affected this study was the small sample size

that limited findings only to the participants in this study. These findings contrasted sharply with findings reported by Zdrojewski (1998) and the difference may be related to sample size, composition of sampling units/frames, age difference, and auditory abilities. The sample in the study by Zdrojewski was composed of hearing students and in the second study the sample was composed of students who were diagnosed with bilateral hearing loss (1998). The first study only examined ASL vocabulary development. The second study examined vocabulary and comprehension development. Opinion was still divided about using the multi-sensory approach to teach vocabulary to ASL learners as Brown (2007) advised second language learners should be taught exclusively in the target language and should not navigate between L2 and L1 registers.

Different instructional media can be used to teach ASL vocabulary to hearing learners (Fourie, 2000). Some of these instructional media examples included videos designed specifically to teach sign language, compact discs-read only memory (CD-ROMs), and other software applications. These advanced instructional media allowed hearing ASL learners to engage in asynchronous learning, model ASL skills through computer-simulated learning activities, and develop cultural awareness and sensitivity for the target language through predefined mimetic activities (Fourie, 2000). Other advantages of computerized assisted learning were a high level of interaction that was facilitated between the second language user and the instructional software, which reduced teacher directed instructional time, augmented learning capabilities of struggling learners, reduced instructional planning time, and helped the second language learner control when and how he or she learned new vocabulary (Fourie, 2000).

Fourie (2000) assessed the usefulness of instructional media versus the teacher in teaching ASL vocabulary to hearing students using a single subject design in a sample of a 17-

year-old male with normal hearing and vision. He was unexposed to ASL and the deaf culture. A native ASL user was the sign language instructor. Univariate analysis (t-test) was used to analyze data (Fourie, 2000). Results revealed teacher instruction had a greater effect on ASL vocabulary learning than video, CD-ROMs, and books. These differences were attributed to directional instructional feedback and interaction that were facilitated by the teacher. Limitations of this study included a single subject design that limited the generalizability of findings to the sample in this study. It should be noted that the use of high-tech instructional media used in this study reflected principles of the multi-sensory instructional approach that required learners to use audiovisual skills in the teaching and learning process (Fourie, 2000). These principles of multi-sensory instructional media contrasted sharply with later work by Rosen et al. (2014) which revealed an exclusive target language approach is ideal to teach ASL vocabulary. These contrasting views in applied literature also strengthened the central argument of this chapter that hearing ASL teachers' experiences of using different instructional approaches to teach vocabulary to non-native learners also differed according to their student-teacher instructional experiences, which help to shape and form their instructional experiences.

Cannon, Fredrick, and Easterbrooks (2010) evaluated effects of reading books in ASL on vocabulary instruction in a sample of four English-Language learners with hearing loss. A non-probability sampling approach and a convenience sampling technique were used to recruit participants. The sample was characterized by four males, between 10 and 11 years old, diagnosed with severe hearing loss and living in the U.S. for less than six years. A multiple-baseline design was used in this study that encapsulated three vocabulary groups (Cannon et al., 2010). Participant's data were outlined on a chart and second a researcher was used to maintain inter-rater reliability by documenting the same data on a chart for comparison. Results revealed

digital versatile discs (DVDs) and preparatory introduction to targeted vocabulary were effective in enhancing the rate of vocabulary acquisition, but DVDs alone were found to be ineffective in vocabulary learning (Cannon et al., 2010). Limitations of this study included a small sample size, which limited findings to the sample of four participants, a non-probability sampling approach that limited access to diverse sampling units, and the absence of a control group, which weakened the significance of the findings of this study. It should be noted this study had implications for teaching ASL vocabulary to hearing second language learners. DVDs and ASL textbooks were used by hearing ASL teachers to encourage learners to communicate exclusively in the target language (Cannon et al., 2010). For example, ASL stories were abstracted from books and transposed on DVDs. Teachers engaged learners in viewing these stories and then retelling them exclusively in the target language. The retelling process also included students developing and signing alternative endings, substituting plots, and manipulating roles of major and minor characters. This process allowed students to generate and use ASL vocabulary, manipulate vocabulary words, and infuse their communicative nuances in the process. These nuances have different implications for the perceptions hearing ASL teachers form of their student-teaching instructional experiences. These student-teacher instructional experiences have consequences for the instructional steps they take to expose non-native learners to ASL vocabulary.

Keating and Mirus (2003) asserted computer-assisted learning revolutionized how hearing second language learners developed and utilized their ASL communicative skills. Computer software and other tools can shape how ASL vocabulary is acquired and used by helping target language users to learn the fundamentals of the language at a faster pace, alter how messages are understood, and immerse themselves in repetitive signing activities that deepen

their understanding of how ASL vocabulary is configured. Webcams and other output tools can be used to assist hearing ASL learners to develop useful communicative skills, which will enhance the quality and texture of their conversation with native and non-native ASL users (Keating & Mirus, 2003).

Pizzo (2013) examined teacher knowledge and practice in developing vocabulary in ASL learners and revealed teachers exposed learners to new vocabulary words by asking them to recall events during simulated learning sessions. This process allowed learners to infuse new words in the discourse. The teacher also modeled different aspects of the simulated activity and engaged students by asking them to use classifiers, which are synonymous to adverbial prepositional clauses in the English language (Pizzo, 2013). Teachers used this activity to teach individual vocabulary words to students by helping them to interact, discuss, and explore to understand meanings of words. This process facilitated active student engagement, meaning making through lengthy teacher to student interaction, and activation of prior knowledge to aid the communication process. The dynamic, goal-oriented, collaborative, and interactive nature of the process represented the ideals of active and participatory learning where learners were actively engaged in the process of generating new words, using these new words to advance the discourse between themselves and the teacher (Pizzo, 2013). This approach was reflective of the Communicative Language Teaching methodology described Wilcox and Wilcox (1998) and highlights theoretical orientations to Schumann's Acculturation Model and Vygotsky's Sociocultural Theory, where socially relevant experiences were used by hearing ASL teachers to engage learners in sharpening their second language skills. These socially relevant student-teacher interactions also reinforced the argument that the views and stories of hearing ASL teachers are shaped by their student-teacher instructional experiences, and in many instances

these perceptions moderate and mediate pedagogical approaches hearing ASL teachers use to expose students to ASL vocabulary. At the center of this issue was the disparity in instructional approaches used by hearing ASL teachers to teach ASL vocabulary to non-native learners in high school.

Implications for hearing second language teachers' views. As discussed above, these empirical findings have demonstrated that some hearing ASL teachers have formed strong views that a purely target language approach is very effective in exposing hearing students to ASL vocabulary, while other teachers contend that a combination of target and native language instructional approaches are more beneficial to learners. These findings revealed a significant controversy in the ASL teaching community about how ASL vocabulary should be taught to non-native learners and this disagreement had fundamental implications for the views, stories, and experiences hearing non-native ASL teachers form about teaching ASL vocabulary.

Rosen et al. (2014) revealed ASL vocabulary instructional practices were affected by different philosophical orientations. The difference in views created a division in the academic community about the role and relevance of a native language in learning the vocabulary of a second language and in this study the second language is ASL. Earlier work by Wilcox and Wilcox (1998) also revealed a high level of discordance in the world or second language teaching and learning community about instructional approaches that should be used to teach non-native hearing ASL learners. Undoubtedly, these unresolved debates affected how hearing non-native ASL teachers thought about instructional approaches. Some teachers formed positive and receptive views about exclusive target language vocabulary instructional approaches, others formed positive views about integrating speech in teaching ASL vocabulary to their second language learners, while some teachers rejected one approach to the advantage of the other. One

factor which may shape teachers' views is the efficacy and applicability of the instructional approach to vocabulary development in their second language classes. For example, an exclusive target language instructional approach may produce positive and desired outcomes for some teachers, while an integrated approach of target and native language may be more useful and effective for others. Wilcox and Wilcox (1998) noted teachers views and opinions of second language instructional approaches should be guided by a needs assessment and this needs assessment may help hearing ASL teachers to navigate instructional discrepancies encountered in literature. In the end, their views, opinions, and thoughts of ASL vocabulary instructional approaches may be determined by what meets the learning needs of their students. Another issue that affects the problem in this study and is worthy of exploration involves views hearing non-native ASL teachers have formed regarding the role of culture in teaching ASL as a second language.

Deaf and Hearing Cultures and ASL

A symbiotic link exists between language and culture. This link exists because language usage is reflective of the culture, nurtured and supported through its evolution (Everett, 2012). Knowledge of a language in most instances means an awareness and understanding of the way of life of a people and an understanding of the sociocultural idiosyncrasies that facilitated and shaped its linguistic heritage. For example, hearing teachers, understanding and awareness of ASL meant they have some knowledge of deaf cultural realities and idiosyncrasies. Language is sometimes understood as culture and culture as language because they serve a communicative and a knowledge transfer function. Acquiring a new or second language also means developing a deeper appreciation of norms, customs, and behaviors of a new culture (Everett, 2012).

Deaf and hearing cultures affect how hearing non-native ASL teachers approach the teaching of the target language to hearing students and how hearing students reciprocate instructional experiences. The intermingling of deaf and hearing cultures in world or second language classrooms has implications for how hearing ASL teachers view their instructional roles. Deaf culture in the U.S. described sociological, anthropological, historical, psychological, and geopolitical realities of a people who communicate without the advantage of voice and oral language in a culture where 360, 000, 000 people speak English as their native language. These statistics contrasted sharply with only 500, 000 Deaf users of ASL in the U.S. (The United States Census Bureau, 2014). These findings also mean the language of the deaf is in the minority in a culture where oral language has linguistic dominance.

Many people in the hearing culture viewed the deaf culture as one of silent gestures and non-manual signals. The deaf were sometimes seen as interlopers and intruders in a hearing culture designed to support voice and speech. McCaskill and O'Brian (2016) stated deaf children were sometimes seen as intruders in a hearing culture, which stigmatizes them because of their inability to hear and speak the dominant language. Deaf people were ostracized and stigmatized because they were unable to communicate in dominant language of the hearing culture, and were excluded from participating in routine hearing culture activities such as listening to the weather on the radio, ordering a pizza over telephone, demanding a refund from the telephone company, or articulating a defense in a legal matter (McCaskill & O'Brian, 2016). The inability of deaf people to hear speech, sound, and use oral language, placed them in the unenviable position of outsiders in a hearing culture. Hearing cultures are sometimes insensitive to the needs of deaf cultures because of limited communication, and this misunderstanding manifested in different ways. Deaf people may sometimes feel threatened by hearing people when they speak because

they do not have the advantage of hearing and hearing people may become suspicious of deaf people using ASL in their space because they are unable to understand and use the native language of the deaf (McCaskill & O'Brian,2016). Hearing ASL teachers are exposed to the prejudices inherent in the hearing culture. These prejudices have implications, ramifications, and consequences for their perceptions and views of their roles as teachers of a minority language in a dominant language culture that is indifferent and hostile to that language.

In the last decade, several legislative steps have been taken to bridge communication gaps between deaf and hearing cultures (McCaskill & O'Brian,2016). These steps have not fully allayed deaf people's inhibitions and fears of people in the hearing community. Deaf people were still apprehensive in interacting with members of the hearing community because of fears that they will be stigmatized, treated as socially unequal, and judged unfairly because they are unable to speak (McCaskill & O'Brian, 2016).

Hearing teachers' perception of hearing and deaf cultures also affect how ASL is taught as a world or second language to hearing high school students. For example, Horejes (2012) revealed hearing teachers should place a high premium on deaf culture in educating hearing students because it signifies anthropological and sociological realities of a people who operate in a hearing culture that is sometimes insensitive to their needs. Deaf cultural realities should be understood by hearing teachers because they will gain valuable insights about how the deaf experience the hearing world, how they cope and navigate zones of exclusion in the hearing world, and how technology has been used to narrow the communication and information sharing gaps in deaf and hearing cultures (Horejes, 2012).

Hall, Halcomb, and Elliot (2016) examined the role of the dominant and oppressive class in signing and interpreting for the deaf. Firstly, it was revealed that the deaf are a historically

oppressed linguistic minority whose language and educational rights were abrogated and infringed by the dominant hearing culture. Today, deaf people still feel alienated and disenfranchised from the hearing community because of their historical experiences of exclusion, separation, and rejection. Secondly, interpreters and teachers of signed languages have been accused by members of the deaf community as purveyors and facilitators of systematic prejudices (Holcomb et al., 2016). The language (spoken English) of hearing teachers was labeled as oppressive by the deaf community because it was sometimes used to exclude them from important linguistic discourse. Thirdly, the individualistic values of hearing ASL teachers and interpreters were sometimes unfavorable to the welfare and well-being of deaf students. These values must be thoroughly interrogated and examined by hearing ASL teachers as they educate hearing ASL students (Holcomb et al., 2016).

Hearing ASL teachers' perceptions of culture were affected by realities of the socio-cultural environment. Quinto-Pozos (2011) revealed that hearing teachers' perceptions and views of culture in teaching ASL were affected by the oppressive past of the dominant oral language culture of hearing people and these realities have shaped patterns, trends, and instructional behaviors of hearing ASL teachers. In recent years, hearing ASL teachers' perception of deaf culture have been shaped by ASL curricula standards, which mandated teaching of different aspects of deaf culture to hearing learners. Undoubtedly, hearing teachers' perceptions of deaf culture may evolve through exposure to lesson content about socialization and acculturation in deaf cultures. These curricula standards required teachers to expose ASL learners to pictorial information about Deaf culture through exclusive use of the target language. Spoken English in the ASL, L2 classroom is discouraged (Quinto-Pozos (2011). Students and teachers were further encouraged to immerse themselves in the sociological and anthropological realities of the Deaf

community by visiting deaf social spaces, cultural and community gatherings, and communicating with the deaf in their native language (Quinto-Pozos, 2011).

Cultural diversity integration in teaching ASL was reflective of Schumann's Acculturation Model, which proposed that dominance, exclusion, herding, tolerance, and culture shock were some factors which affect the acquisition of a second language (Zaker, 2016). The dominant perception of oppression by deaf people of the hearing culture may also affect how hearing teachers viewed the role of culture in planning and executing ASL instructional experiences. This process was further compounded by the safety of the herd concept where Deaf community members bond together and exclude what they perceive to be an intolerant and insensitive hearing community (Zaker, 2016). In the end, hearing ASL teachers may view their roles as mediators and moderators of two distinct and competing language cultures. The interests of hearing non-native ASL teachers who teach ASL may invariably collide with ASL curricula imperatives that demand rich and prolonged exposure to deaf cultural realities.

Implications for hearing teacher perceptions of culture. These findings have implications for hearing teachers' perceptions of the roles of deaf and hearing cultures in teaching ASL to hearing students in high school. Hearing teachers may perceive the hearing culture as oppressive, while others may internalize socialized prejudices about the deaf culture. These views and opinions may contribute to different perceptual formations about deaf cultural processes. A moderating factor in this discussion is curricula standards that define the role of deaf culture in the teaching and learning of ASL in second language classrooms. These standards may help hearing ASL teachers form culturally sensitive views about the role and relevance of different language cultures in teaching ASL to hearing non-native learners.

These findings have also demonstrated that a significant knowledge gap exists in empirical literature about hearing ASL teachers' subjective views of the roles of deaf and hearing cultures in informing their roles of teaching ASL as a second language. These knowledge gaps also strengthened the need to unmask and understand hearing ASL teachers shared and individual perceptions about the functions of deaf and hearing cultures in shaping their pedagogical practices. Views hearing non-native ASL teachers have formed about teaching signs and non-manual signals to hearing ASL students were important issues that were also worthy of review in this chapter because understanding these issues helped to extend the discussion and further clarified the research problem in the context of this study.

Teaching Signs and Non-Manual Signals

Handshapes were important in teaching sign recognition in ASL. Sign languages use cheremes, which are like phonemes used in oral languages. Cheremes described how lexical signs were sub-divided into lexical units and these units were synonymous to how units of sounds are sub-divided into phonemes in spoken languages. ASL has 150-200 cheremes and 150 hand shapes. Native users of ASL have been observed to recognize ASL words without paying keen attention to hand-shape patterns. In some cases, native ASL users have not been able to tell the difference between handshapes and articulated positions, while others have been very skilled in identifying and locating changes in sign movements and patterns. These differences in skills and competencies have implications for the design of instructional approaches, instructional experiences of students and teachers, and views hearing ASL teachers form of teaching hand-shape patterns. For example, Geitz (2013) examined hand-shape stories in a sample of four profoundly deaf participants using an exploratory research design. This study was conducted in a public educational institution over a period of five weeks using a total communication

philosophy. Results revealed hand-shape rhymes and ASL stories were effective in developing word recognition skills of participants (Geitz, 2013). However, Morford, Grieve-Smith, MacFarlene, Staley, and Waters (2008) assessed outcomes of prior language exposure on ASL perceptions in a sample of deaf native ASL users, deaf L2 users who were exposed to ASL between 10 and 18 years of age, and hearing L2 users who acquired the language between 10 and 26 years of age. The purpose of this study was to determine participants' views of handshape and place articulation. Results revealed participants were less likely to discriminate hand-shape stimuli from the region of the category prototype than stimuli peripheral to the category. Second language signers exhibited similar patterns of discrimination. "Early experience with a signed language magnifies the influence of prototypes on processing of hand-shape" (Morford et al., p.1).

Morford and Carlson (2011) investigated perceptions of signing in a sample of non-native ASL users. The aim of the study was to determine why non-native ASL users experienced greater difficulties with comprehension than native, first language users. Results revealed "deaf non-native signers are as rapid and accurate on the monitoring task as native signers, with differences in the pattern of relative performance and non-native signers differ significantly from native signers during sign recognition. "Delayed exposure to a signed language leads to an over-reliance on hand-shapes" (Mordord & Carlson, 2011, p. 2).

Hearing ASL teachers should understand how grammatical rules are encoded in the language. This process of understanding empowered teachers to guide second language learners in decoding grammatical rules by understanding the role and use of non-manual signals (Benitez-Quiroz, Gokgoz, Wilbur, & Martinez, 2014). Non-manual signals in ASL referred to linguistic manipulation of facial features, head movements, and specific areas of the body as distinct from

hand signals. Native and non-native users have been found to use different non-manual signals to represent ASL grammar. Challenges have been identified in determining which non-manual signals are linked to unique ASL grammatical forms. This problem arose because several types of articulation were used in this process such as chin, head, eyes, shoulders, nose, mouth etc. The head can be positioned in different spatial directions such as right, left, up, and down (Benitez-Quiroz et al., 2014). These disparities created several challenges for ASL teachers in determining which face and head movements should be effectively used to decode and articulate grammar to non-native ASL learners. Benitez-Quiroz et al. (2014) investigated effects of “discriminant features and temporal structure of non-manuals in American Sign Language” (p.1). Results revealed an association between the use of the head position and the mouth and established temporal non-manual features that were unidentified in previous studies.

Healey (2015) assessed how ASL users used non-manual features to express affective feelings. Results revealed respondents demonstrated frustration with raised eyebrows, slight tilt of the head, and raised upper or lower lips. In other cases, non-manuals were used to fully represent the affective response without the aid of signing. The use of the face to express affective emotions in ASL can be construed to represent an amalgamation of non-manual and manual gestures to communicate feelings in interactive processes (Healey, 2015).

Implications for teacher perceptions in teaching signs and non-manual signals.

These findings from the previous discussion about signs and non-manual signals were indicative of the common thread or theme in this chapter. This has revealed inconclusive findings about how hearing ASL teachers viewed the teaching of signs and non-manual signals in non-native educational environments. What has been made clear is that student-teacher instructional experiences of hearing ASL teachers shape and inform their instructional views and experiences

in different ways. These instructional views and experiences inevitably lead to instructional choices that produce dissimilar outcomes. Empirical findings in this review of literature suggested that further research is needed to identify symmetrical patterns in hearing ASL teachers' instructional experiences. However, we deduced some important implications from these findings for teacher perceptions in teaching signs and non-manual signals to non-native students in their high school classrooms.

Hearing teachers' perceptions of teaching signs and non-manual signals will always be affected by their perceptions and knowledge of the deaf culture. These perceptions may also be shaped by their understanding of SLA theory and how this theory informs their instructional philosophies in their second language learning communities. Teachers may also be influenced by arguments advanced by Chomsky that humans have an innate ability to learn and acquire grammar. This knowledge may inform how they approach the use of manual and non-manual signals in exposing their high school learners to ASL grammatical forms. An important consideration, which may guide their perceptions, is the postulation of Rosen et al. (2014) that ASL should be taught with deference to the linguistic and cultural realities of native users.

Knowledge Gaps and Need for This Study

This review and synthesis of literature unmasked some gaps in SLA literature. These gaps have implications for student-teacher instructional experiences of hearing ASL teachers and may also influence their instructional choices in teaching ASL vocabulary, alter their perceptions of their teaching roles in the context of deaf and hearing cultures, and shape how their experiences develop as they teach signs and non-manual signals to hearing ASL students (Rahman & Pandian, 2016). It is important to note that I was unable to determine from this review of literature if an exclusive target language approach was superior to a synthetic approach

to teach ASL vocabulary. Empirical data revealed that some teachers formed positive views about an exclusive target language approach while others formed positive views about a multi-sensory approach, which integrated native first language and second language instructional pathways. This controversy was worthy of further research to identify points of convergence and divergence in hearing ASL teachers' vocabulary instructional stories. This served to help me understand why there is such a wide pedagogical divide and to survey any significant evolutionary changes in the stories of hearing ASL teachers (Rahman & Pandian, 2016).

The literature also revealed the deaf culture has a deep level of animosity, antipathy, and distrust for the hearing culture. Limited empirical data prohibited a full explanation of how this level of animosity and cultural disposition informed the instructional roles of hearing ASL teachers who taught sign language to students at the high school. Consequently, there was a need to understand and fill this knowledge gap by capturing and investigating hearing ASL teachers' points of view of the roles of historical and contemporary antecedents of deaf and hearing cultures in informing how they understood and interpreted their positions as hearing ASL teachers who must expose their second language students to an unwelcoming and skeptical target language culture (Rahman & Pandian, 2016).

Finally, empirical findings of hearing ASL teachers' views of teaching signs and non-manual signals were inconclusive because of limited scholarship in the area, as well as limited ethnographic research exploring these stories and experiences (Rahman & Pandian, 2016). There is an urgent need to capture the views and perceptions hearing ASL teachers have formed of teaching signs and non-manual signals to high school students. An understanding of these perceptions will fill the gaps in knowledge about how hearing ASL teachers select their instructional approaches and what thought processes guide this mode of selection. A balanced

understanding of these practices and contemplations will help to augment world or second language teaching standards and narrow the levels of disparity in SLA theory and second language instructional praxis (Rahman & Pandian, 2016).

Summary

In this review of literature, I presented an evaluation of process and competence theories. The process theories I reviewed were (a) Vygotsky's Socio-cultural Theory, and (b) Schumann's Acculturation Model. I also examined competence theories (a) Chomsky's Universal Grammar, and (b) Krashen's Monitor Model. I delineated process theories and described effects of native and non-native language cultures on cognitive language processes and competence theories articulated the role of linguistic rules, grammatical forms, and processes in monitoring and evaluating ASL competencies. Applied research findings revealed an ideological divide in the academic community about the ideal instructional approach that should be used to teach ASL vocabulary. On the one hand, some linguistic experts have argued that ASL non-native learners should be exposed to ASL vocabulary exclusively in the target language, and on the other hand other experts have argued that the target and learner's native language (spoken English) should be integrated to support ASL vocabulary development. Rosen et al. (2014) found that exposure of ASL learners to target language only approach was more beneficial to vocabulary development than an integrated approach of voice and target language. Deaf and hearing cultures were two factors that affected how hearing, non-native ASL teachers navigated the deaf cultural pathway. The literature further revealed hearing teachers' degree of exposure to Schumann's taxonomic features of culture may help to determine how they perceive the role of deaf and hearing language cultures in teaching ASL to their hearing students. Finally, signs and non-manual signals were identified as two important features of acquiring and using ASL grammar

and hearing teachers' views of teaching these components to ASL students may be formed and shaped by their level of exposure to the native ASL language, as well as their knowledge of the importance of manuals and non-manuals in the ASL acquisition processes. The central argument that emerged in this chapter was that student-teacher instructional experiences of hearing ASL teachers have implications for their instructional stories, views, perspectives, and narratives.

Chapter Three: Research Methodology

Methodology

In this chapter I discuss the qualitative research approach and a bounded single case research design. I also describe the study's participants and setting by exploring population types from which I recruited teachers for this study, the non-probability sampling approaches and techniques I used to recruit the sample and explore characteristics of the sample and the settings in which the study was executed. Other components of this chapter include a description and justification of instruments that were used to explore and capture teachers' experiences, and a description of data collection procedures that were used in this study including how trustworthiness criteria described by Lincoln and Guba (1985) were maintained. Last, I describe the data analysis processes utilized including steps in data analysis and the data coding procedures proposed by Saldana (2016) that were used to code data sets and unpack themes. I also delineate steps that were taken to ensure anonymity and confidentiality of the informing teachers.

In this case study I sought to understand the perceptions of hearing non-native ASL teachers who teach ASL as a world or second language to hearing students in high school. Specifically, I investigated, recorded, and outlined viewpoints hearing non-native ASL teachers have formed of instructional approaches used to teach ASL vocabulary to second language learners. I articulated hearing ASL teachers' subjective perceptions of the roles of deaf and hearing cultures in teaching ASL to hearing high school students, and recorded and delineated

hearing ASL teachers' encounters, perceptions, and idiographic experiences of teaching signs and non-manual signals to hearing ASL students in high school. I underpinned this process of inquiry with a qualitative research approach where a bounded single-case design was used to understand the phenomenon of interest. Three teachers formed my unit of analysis.

A Qualitative Research Approach

A qualitative case study research approach guided the axiological exploration and analysis of teachers' experiences and encounters of teaching ASL to second language learners in high school. A case study approach unmask and uncovers teachers' interpretations and understandings of their lived experiences (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011). This research approach was disposed to the collection of textual and thematic data that described, explored, and explained the "how" and "why" of teachers' interaction with a phenomenon of interest in their natural environment. A qualitative research approach is a subjective or a non-positivistic research paradigm which rejects the premise that truth can only be communicated through numerical, statistical, and positivistic language (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011). Qualitative researchers assert that truth is the subjective and plural reality of teachers who experience, narrate, and interpret it. Truth is often captured using observations, structured, semi-structured, and unstructured interviews, archival records, analysis of photographs, and other types of analysis. The underlying truth about this research typology is that greater value and significance is placed on teachers' understanding of the phenomenon of interest than on the researcher's interpretation of that phenomenon (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011). This is important in my study as it provides insight into the daily experiences, perspectives, and practices of teaching ASL in a high school setting.

Rahman (2016) noted a qualitative case study research typology seeks to encapsulate how teachers experience their daily lives, the meanings they attach to these experiences, and how

their perceptions of their affective realities influence their behaviors. This approach accepts there are several dimensions to truth and these dimensions are shaped and defined by teachers' interpretations of their lived experiences in home, school, and social settings. Fundamentally, this approach sought to uncover and understand how a single case of hearing ASL teachers' perspectives interpret and process their instructional experiences in high school (Rahman, 2016). Interpretivism was a defining feature of this process which allowed me to unmask and unpack meaning attached to the participants' ASL instructional experiences.

Interpretivism. The qualitative case study research typology is linked to the interpretivist paradigm. Thanh and Thanh (2015) stated interpretivism accepts that truth has several meanings, which are often interpreted and articulated by teachers in different sociological and anthropological contexts. Truth is often seen as a product of lived experiences and often shaped by the cultural milieu of participants and researchers' understanding of a phenomenon. Undoubtedly, interpretivism places a high value on subjective understandings of participants lived experiences, rejects assertions that reality can only be objectively known, and seeks truth through the eyes and emic encounters of people who have experienced or are continuing to experience a phenomenon of interest (Thanh & Thanh, 2015). The interpretivist paradigm often uses qualitative tools to inquire into a problem or phenomenon because these tools are disposed to the collection of thick and descriptive data that give valuable insights into the contexts, circumstances, and settings. For the interpretivist, reality is an evolving process, which often intersects with cultures, values, and norms that are unique to the population being studied. These dynamic, subjective, and interpretive realities were captured and archived in this case study (Thanh & Thanh, 2015).

Case Study and Bounded Single Case Design

Baxter and Jack (2008) stated that a case study can be viewed as a qualitative approach for examining and understanding a phenomenon of interest. I used this approach in this research context because it allowed me to (a) examine the research problem, concepts, and issues in a naturalistic context, (b) interrogate the problem of interest in this study by asking how and why something occurred, and (c) unmask the unique nature of the problem by exploring how its context contributed to the perceptions of hearing ASL teachers (Baxter & Jack, 2008). I chose the case study as the most appropriate method of problem inquiry for this inquiry because it allowed me to study and understand the context in which hearing ASL teachers developed and formed their perceptions of ASL instructional practices (Baxter & Jack, 2008). Yin (2014) argued that a case study is designed to gather data about a research problem in a naturalistic setting. This process is underpinned by the triarchic pillars of reliability, dependability, and credibility.

Bounded Single Case Design

A bounded single case design is characterized by demarcations and parameters that are unique or specific to a case or unit of analysis (Merriam, 1998). Therefore, the researcher can define and set parameters around which he or she will operate during the period of the study. In other words, the researcher can articulate delimitations that guide the process of inquiry (Alpi & Evans, 2019; Merriam, 1998). This study was delimited to a unit of hearing non-native ASL teachers in a high school setting who have taught for a minimum of five years. I included teachers in this study because of the nature of their work with students who were learning ASL as a world or second language and because of their geographical proximity to the researcher.

Gustafsson (2017) defined a single case design as the study of an individual, group, or groups of individuals as a single unit. The aim of this design in a qualitative study is to understand by comparing and contrasting the contextual realities of individuals who make up this unit. The defining feature of the single case design in this study was the process of data analysis that allowed for the comparison of the experiences of teachers to identify general and specific patterns relating to the research questions. Ultimately, I chose this design because it facilitated and supported the process of data validation by identifying confirming and disconfirming information. This process of data validation was essential to establishing the truth value of this study (Gustafsson, 2017).

Table 1 Research Participants

Characteristics	Number	%
Participants	3	100%
Age		
25-35	-	
36-46		
47-57	3	100%
Sex		
Male	-	
Female	3	100%
Educational Qualification		
BA/BSc/B.Ed	3	100%
MA, M.Ed,	3	100%
ASL Certification	3	100%

Purposive sampling. I employed a purposive sampling technique to recruit a sample of hearing non-native ASL teachers who teach ASL to hearing ASL learners in high school. I chose a sample size of three teachers in order to engage teachers in in-depth interviews, develop trusting relationships with teachers through extended interaction in the field, and augment the

validity and trustworthiness of findings by collecting copious data about the research problem. A larger sample size would have compromised the validity of the study by reducing time spent in engaging and building relationships with the teachers. Alvi (2016) noted that purposive sampling is used by researchers to select a desirable sample that is of interest to the researcher. The researcher's selection is often deliberate, thoughtful, and purposeful. Inclusion criteria for this sample are predefined by researchers because they wish to recruit participants who have specialized and unique knowledge about a social, cultural, or educational phenomenon (Alvi, 2016).

To recruit teachers who matched my research criteria I wrote a letter to one district where twelve schools offered the ASL class elective. I mailed the letter to the school principals via USPS. These schools were selected through a process of purposive sampling because they were accessible and offered ASL programs to hearing ASL students. An important criterion for selection was that these schools should have hearing non-native ASL teachers who were teaching ASL to hearing students as a world language class. My informational letter stated the nature, duration, and scope of the study as well as described the type of data that will be collected. I requested a time and place to meet interested study teachers. In face-to-face meetings with potential teachers we explored components of informed consent as well as explained the low-risk nature of the study that posed little to no risk to their health or welfare. Teachers were also assured that data were managed to protect their identities. Those teachers who agreed to participate in the study were asked to sign an informed consent form. I received a signed copy from each teacher which will be stored in a locked file on the university campus for five years.

Setting. A qualitative researcher envisions the research setting as the physical space where participants interact, experience, and interpret their unique stories. Invariably, qualitative

research demands that researchers go beyond the physicality and temporality of the setting and develop a deep understanding of the research context (Snowdon et al., 2014). The research context is affected by the physical space and other factors that intersect and intermingle to characterize and define the social, psychological, educational, and academic nature of that context. Teachers were recruited from high schools that offered ASL as a world language option in one school district in the southeastern United States. Each high school was defined by unique physical and contextual realities. I recruited teachers from a total of eight schools in the school district which offered ASL as a world language option.

Hearing ASL teachers operated in multicultural and multiracial teaching and learning environments. Student populations included Whites, Latinos, Blacks, mixed races, Asians, and Indians. These schools offered career and technical education programs that prepared students for jobs in the military, education, communications industry, animal sciences, world languages, and several other areas. These programs were supported by the school's mission, which was to provide high quality high school learning experiences that prepared students for higher education.

In addition, learners had access to world language options as well as opportunities to enroll in International Baccalaureate (IB) programs that were designed to facilitate inquiry and discovery. Teaching and learning were supported by traditional and non-traditional media and students had opportunities to engage in extracurricular activities such as music and athletics. Teachers were supported in their teaching duties by vibrant school administrators who sought to empower and equip them with the tools and resources needed for teaching and learning. Learning occurred in spacious, clean, and student-friendly classrooms. Teachers had access to traditional and non-traditional media to support their preparation for teaching and learning. Some

examples of non-traditional media included laptops, desktops, tablet computers, smart boards and webcams.

The physical environments were learner friendly, clean, attractive, and ecologically pleasing. Students and teachers operated in a safe and respectful culture. Classrooms were spacious, student friendly, and inviting. The teachers' lounge was designed to support the social and academic lives of teachers where they can relax, unwind, engage in lesson planning and preparation, and interact on social and professional levels. All this was done to ensure they would feel comfortable sharing their truths about their ASL classroom experiences.

Data Collection Methods/Procedures

My data was collected through semi-structured interviews, descriptive field-notes with teacher's reflexive notes and researcher's reflexive journal. I chose these instruments to collect rich, thick, copious, and relevant data about teachers' experiences of teaching ASL to hearing students. The employment of these tools of data collection facilitated data triangulation; I collected data from three access points for comparison of the teachers' truths and value of findings of this study.

Semi-structured interview. A semi-structured interview (see Appendix A) is characterized by a series of predetermined open-ended questions that allows the researcher to initiate and accelerate the interview process (Anderson & Kirkpatrick, 2016). This interview process allowed participants to share their stories and experiences about a phenomenon or topic of interest. This interview type centralizes the emic experiences of participants by prompting them to explore and explain their subjective understandings of their lived experiences. The inquirer probes an issue by asking participants to explain the "how", "what" and "why" of their experiences (Anderson & Kirkpatrick, 2016). Deep and incisive probing of teachers' experiences

often leads teachers to explain how they encounter and process their unique experiences. Semi-structured interviews often evolve using timelines that help participants explain what occurred first, what happens in the middle, and describe how the event ends. I employed this flexible interview process to uncover meanings, which teachers attached to their life experiences and how these meanings have evolved over time (Anderson & Kirkpatrick, 2016).

In this study, I engaged in a face-to-face interview (see Appendix) with participating teachers. Each teacher was interviewed four times during the period of eight weeks for a total of 180 minutes. The duration of each interview session was approximately 45 minutes. I audio recorded each interview using a recording device. The interview protocol contained 15 open-ended questions that were divided into four sections. I focused on one section of the interview protocol in each of the four interviews for each teacher in a four-phase interview process. Phase one interviews included a discussion with teachers. I outlined the interview process, requested their permission to record their responses, I explained components of informed consent, and asked them to share their ASL instructional experiences using their words and voices. Teachers demonstrated their acceptance of components of informed consent by affixing their signature to the informed consent form. During the second phase interview, I posed exploratory questions to the teacher which opened the discussion of ASL instructional experiences. The third phase of our interview process consisted of probing questions around issues to fill gaps and extend the discussion to gain insights about areas of interest.

Active listening skills were very important at this point. I also asked participants to make closing or clarifying comments. Finally, I ended the interview by thanking the teachers for participating.

Field-notes. Field-notes are copious descriptions of the qualitative research process, research site, physicality and sociality of the research setting, context, interactions with study

participants, and any other information, occurrence, or event that may be relevant to understanding how the research process started, who was involved, how were they involved, and what the nature of their contribution to the study was (Phillipi & Lauderdale, 2017). Maharaj (2016) noted field-notes serve to clarify the researcher's role in the study and helps the researcher to reflexively define how their roles affect the research process. In this study, I recorded descriptive field-notes by stating the title of the study, the name of the principal investigator and dates when I collected data. I recorded field-notes at the beginning of the study and during prolonged engagement in the research site. Due to time constraints to collect field notes at the school sites during the final quarter of the school year I encouraged participants to submit teacher reflexive notes concerning our interview time. All participants were encouraged to and did submit reflexive notes. Afterward, I provided a comprehensive description of the setting of the study including the location, including descriptions of any special geographic formations or monuments that clarified the diverse nature of the study's locations. I recorded socio-demographic data of teachers to help the reader understand the background and profile of participants. I captured the study's context by recording field-notes of school culture, classroom set-up sensitive to the deaf culture and interactions between teachers and students in the naturalistic setting, as well as a comprehensive description of the interaction between students during the lesson. I compared my field-notes to interview data for points of divergence and convergence. In other words, I compared these field-notes and interview data to confirm and disconfirm information about the research problem (Saldana, 2016).

At the beginning of each interview, I recorded the date of the interview, the teachers code, described the setting where the interview occurred, made note of the seating position of the teacher in relation to the researcher, and stated any other information that may be relevant to

understanding the physicality of the setting. I also included a description of the teachers overall appearance and demeanor, gender, approximate age, and any other non-verbal response such as hyperhidrosis, twitching, or any unusual body movements exhibited. Teachers overall behavior in interviews were described by stating how they responded and reacted to questions and their unique processes of sharing and interpreting their ASL instructional experiences.

Reflexive journal. A reflexive journal describes how the researcher's subjective biases, experiences, thought processes, and affective responses influence processes of research design, data collection, interpretation, analysis, and presentation. This process of reflexivity allows the researcher to explore, discuss, and share how personal biases and preferences affect the research process from inception to completion (Ortlipp, 2008). The reflexive journal I kept for this study encompassed a critical appraisal of how my role as a hearing non-native ASL teacher in high school affected my mode of inquiry, as well as how I developed research questions and chose research methodology. Furthermore, I examined and reflected on the effects of my sociocultural, academic, and hearing status on the process of interacting with teachers and collecting and analyzing data sets. The aim of this process was to help the reader understand their personal biases on the research process and steps that were taken to moderate the effects of these biases on the processes of data collection and analysis (Berger, 2017). Researchers can clarify and reflect on their roles in the research process by asking what do these notes mean in the context of my system of beliefs. My journal focused on my values about teaching, my encounters with hearing and deaf cultures, and understanding of power and privilege in the context of dominant and minority language. I asked a number of reflexive questions including, (1) how do I locate my role in this study's context (Maharaj, 2016), (2) do I see myself as a participant, observer, or an outsider looking in, (3) what is the relationship between my observational recordings and my

ideological views of ASL instructional practices, (4) what areas of my notes suggest reluctance or hesitancy about what I have seen, (5) what types of words and expressions did I use to characterize and define my observations, (6) what was excluded from my field-notes and why, (7) how did my role as an observer shape or inform the experiences of the ASL teachers and, (8) how did my role as note taker inform my understanding of the study's context and would that understanding be different in my role if notes were recorded using video? (Maharaj, 2016).

The reflective journal allowed for a deeper reflection capturing thoughts about all the steps and processes that were utilized to collect, analyze, and disseminate data. The researcher's reflective journal encompassed participants reflective thoughts on instructional approaches used to teach ASL vocabulary, culture in teaching ASL to hearing students, and also their reflections on teaching signs and non-manual signals to students.

Data Collection Process

The first step in the data collection process was to gain approval for the study's protocol from the Institutional Review Board (IRB). After IRB approval was granted, I scheduled interviews with teachers, recorded descriptive field-notes and conducted interviews over a period of 8 weeks beginning in March 2019.

Prior to week one, I engaged with building principals of the research sites by writing and submitting a letter (see Appendix B) explaining the purpose of the study and requesting permission to observe the research site and engage hearing non-native ASL teachers in a narrative interview. I received favorable responses from principals and teachers via email confirmation by the second week of February 2019. In weeks one to three, I observed the research site, recorded field-notes, and met with prospective teachers. I recruited a sample of three hearing non-native ASL teachers who taught ASL to hearing students in high school for

this case study through a non-probability process called purposive sampling. A purposive sampling technique is a non-randomized approach used to engage teachers in the study because they possessed rich and unique knowledge about the phenomenon of interest. Inclusion criteria included hearing teachers who had been teaching ASL to hearing students in high school for at least five years, were non-native ASL users, held a state or national ASL teacher certification, and resided in one district in a southeastern state.

The exclusionary criteria included any teacher who was deaf or a hearing native signer, not certified to teach ASL or who had been teaching less than five years.

Informed consent. During the sample recruitment process the purpose, nature, and duration of the study were explained to prospective teachers. All components of informed consent (see Appendix C) were explained to teachers once they agreed to participate in the study. Components of informed consent that were explained to teachers included, a declaration that they were participating in a research, explanation of the purpose, duration and conclusion of the study, outline of processes that were followed in conducting interviews, and a statement explaining the level of risk associated with participating in this study. Other components of informed consent I explained to the teachers included, a statement of possible benefits that may be derived from this study, an explanation of how anonymity and confidentiality of hard and soft data files were maintained in the study, a statement explaining that teachers were not compensated for their participation in the study, a statement explaining they were able to contact the IRB of record at the large university from a southeastern state if they had questions or complaints, and a declaration assuring teachers that they were free to withdraw their consent to participate in the study at any time without any negative consequences. I ensured each teacher understood each component of informed consent by asking them to explain how they interpreted

each component. Then, teachers and I affixed their signatures at the end of the document. Each teacher was given a signed copy of the informed consent form. To ensure the anonymity of teachers in this study, an English alphabet coding system was used to code participants. For example, the three teachers were coded as, Teacher A, Teacher B, and Teacher C.

After the consent process, I began the data collection process. In weeks one to three, I visited the three research sites, observed teachers in their naturalistic settings and recorded field-notes. This process deepened my understanding of the different study settings and how they affected the data collection process. Prolonged engagement was also vital in the qualitative case study. This helped to develop an audit trail of the research process to keep me organized during a busy data collection time, compensating for the fourth quarter rush at the high school level with state testing, and teacher year-end demands.

Case study interview process. In weeks four to seven, I interviewed each teacher using a 15-item semi-structured interview. This interview was conducted with each teacher over the period of a week. I organized the interview instrument into sections. Section A was designed to capture teacher's socio-demographic data. Section B explored their stories of teaching ASL vocabulary to non-native learners. Section C explored their perceptions of the role of hearing and deaf cultures in teaching ASL. Section D examined their perceptions and interpretations of teaching signs and non-manual signals to hearing ASL learners at the high school level. Approximately 45 minutes were allotted each for each section of the interview. For example, 45 minutes were allotted on day one for Section B, 45 minutes on day two for section C, 45 minutes on day three for section D, and 45 minutes on day four for section A. This means that each teacher was interviewed for a total of 180 minutes.

I conducted each interview in the teachers' classroom or teacher's lounge where the researcher and teacher faced each other to assure a relaxed, comfortable atmosphere for dialogue. I explained the purpose of the interview to each teacher and the total interview period for each section of interview questions. Teachers were also told that I would audio record their stories during their scheduled interview as they shared their experiences. They were also reassured that all information shared would be kept in the strictest confidence and would not be disclosed to anyone outside of this study, except with their written approval. Participants also gave their verbal consent to record their experiences before I initiated the process. Then, I asked teachers open-ended questions about their perceptions and experiences of teaching ASL vocabulary, their perceptions about the role of hearing and deaf culture in teaching ASL, and their views of teaching signs and non-manual signals to hearing students in high school. I listened actively, recorded shared experiences, and allowed teachers to speak freely without interruptions. I offered only non-verbal cues such as nodding, and a smile to prompt teachers to share their experiences. Once they ended the process of sharing, I asked teachers to tell what happened next, describe how that event developed, and asked to explain why. The interview process was concluded by thanking the teachers for participating in the interview process. Teachers were also asked if they had any further comments to add to the interview. Descriptive field notes included what I saw, heard, and experienced while in the teacher's classroom. It also included verbatim quotations and drawings of the classroom layout. During these interviews weeks I began to code data both during and after collection (Saldana, 2016).

By the final week, I continued the process of data analysis by reviewing field-notes, teacher reflexive notes and interview transcripts and my researcher's journal. I checked for missing data, cleaned data sets where necessary, and ensured that enough data were collected to

respond to research questions. I also redacted all identifying information to ensure anonymity and confidentiality of participants. During the preliminary review I explored coding techniques and ways of disaggregating data sets, generating themes, and developing cogent findings.

Table 2 Summary of Data Collection Procedures and Timelines

Timelines (Months/Weeks)	Activities and Implementation
December 7, 2018	Defend Proposal
January 27, 2019	Submit IRB Application
March, 2019	Written Approval from IRB
February 1, 2019	Submit Written Request to access Study Sites
March 29, 2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Enter research sites, recruit sample, explain informed consent, sign, and distribute informed consent to teachers ● Code Teachers ● Record Field-notes
March 29, 2019 to May 17, 2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Prolonged Immersion in Study Sites ● Continue to Develop Audit Trail <p>Interview Process</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Overview of Interview Process ● Sharing of Stories ● Questioning and Active Listening ● Closure ● Recording field-notes/Researcher’s Reflections
March 29, 2019 to June 17, 2020	<p>Data Management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Checking for Missing Data ● Cleaning Data ● Organizing Interview Transcripts for Analysis ● Generating Initial Codes ● Comparing field-notes and interview transcripts
December 30, 2020	Submission of Chapter 4 for Review
February 26, 2021	Submission of Chapter 5 for Review
March 1, 2021	Submission of 1 st Draft Dissertation (Ch 1-5)
March 11, 2021	Submission of Final Draft
March 1, 2021	Submission of Application for Dissertation Defense

Trustworthiness criteria. Trustworthiness criteria are used in qualitative research as quality assurance measures (Cope, 2014). These criteria define steps and processes that should

be followed in naturalistic and ethnographic studies to ensure findings are valid, authentic, and credible. Credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability were four trustworthiness criteria that were observed in this case study to maintain the authenticity, solidity, and reliability of findings that emerged from the interview process and field-notes (Cope, 2014).

Credibility. Credibility refers to the level of believability and truthfulness that can be applied to findings in a qualitative study. A credible study should reflect the authentic views of study participants (Loh, 2013). I maintained this criterion in my study through my extended engagement at the research sites. This was supported by a process of observation where I was immersed in the naturalistic setting of teachers where I recorded copious field-notes of what was observed on each visit. I used data triangulation to ensure the credibility of findings by using three data collection tools, semi-structured interviews, and field-notes with reflexive teacher notes and researcher journal to collect data of teachers' ASL instructional stories and experiences. The data I collected with these tools was used to confirm and disconfirm information. I also read transcripts to the teachers and asked if the excerpts read reflected their interpretations and understandings of their experiences. Member checking further ensured credibility of the data. I asked a peer who is familiar with qualitative research to review the data I shared and challenge my thinking if needed. I also used peer reviews of my coding and story development process to maintain the credibility of findings.

Transferability. Transferability refers to the applicability and relevance of research findings to other teaching and learning situations and study populations. The research design and sample size that was used in this case study limited findings only to the sample that was recruited for the study (Loh, 2013). Findings may not be readily transferable to other settings and situations. Transferability of the findings was maintained by providing rich, thick, detailed, and

copious descriptions of the research process in field-notes. For example, I described all steps in the data collection process and explained the study's design to ensure the methods used can be replicated by another researcher. I also described any adjustments made to the data collection process and explained why these changes were made.

Dependability. Dependability describes the degree to which the research process used in this study can be replicated to produce similar results. This process is determined by exploring data collection, storage, and analysis processes (Loh, 2013). I maintained the dependability criterion in this study by providing a clear and detailed description of the data collection, management, and analysis processes. Copious and descriptive field-notes that I recorded in this study can also be used to support this criterion.

Confirmability. The final criterion was confirmability. This criterion describes the authentic nature of findings in a qualitative study. Do the findings represent the views of the researcher or do they truthfully reflect the thoughts, views, and experiences of teachers? (Loh, 2013). Confirmability was maintained in this study by weaving and interspersing classroom vignettes and verbatim quotes of stories shared by participants in the interviews. Data triangulation was another strategy I used to maintain confirmability of findings in this study. I also used the data triangulation strategy to augment the truth of emergent themes and conclusions.

Data Analysis (Interviews)

A thematic approach was used to analyze interview transcripts. Vaismoradi, Turunen, and Bondas (2013) stated thematic analysis is a data analysis approach that allows the researcher to detect, examine, and articulate common threads or themes identified in data sets. Thematic analysis allowed for the integration of a paradigmatic approach to data analysis by unpacking

general themes and patterns embedded in data and reporting findings in a well-organized and cogent manner (Vaismoradi et al., 2013). This process of data reduction and analysis also allowed me to disaggregate data into data sets to identify common threads in teachers' experiences, respond effectively to research questions that inquire into major preoccupations or concerns of teachers, and explain why they prefer one set of approaches and not others. The overall aim of the thematic analysis was to locate, isolate, and report common experiences in hearing non-native teachers ASL instructional experiences (Vaismoradi et al., 2013).

A six-stage process of thematic analysis of data was used in this study. Firstly, I reviewed interview transcripts by reading them multiple times for missing data, identifying areas where personal information should be redacted, and made notes about general patterns or common threads in teachers' experiences. The second phase involved disaggregating data into data sets or coding units. During this phase, I placed interview transcripts of each teacher in folders labeled Teacher A, Teacher B, and Teacher C. I used an *a priori* coding approach as described by (Saldana, 2016). The first cycle of the coding method consisted of reading data categories and using participants' words or phrases to summarize or capture the meaning of each category. I settled on these *a priori* categories because they emerged as dominant experiences of participants. The experiences were identified in all the interview transcripts of teachers in the study. The aim of this type of coding was to highlight teachers' voices as exemplified in their experiences and to generate a deep understanding of meanings and interpretations of teachers attached to their ASL instructional experience (Saldana, 2016). I highlighted idioms, verbs, nouns, clauses, and phrases that were repeated by teachers. Teachers repeated use of words or phrases were then applied as an *in vivo* code in quotation marks beside the data category it summarizes or represents (Saldana, 2016).

Later, I applied pattern coding as a second cycle coding method. This coding technique was used to unmask themes, develop explanations, and draw inferences from data categories. The aim was to collate and identify common features or patterns of the teachers ASL instructional experiences and refine the process of summarizing (Saldana, 2016). The process of pattern coding involved comparing first cycle coded data sets for Teacher A, Teacher B, and Teacher C for common codes. During the process of review, I grouped and reviewed common or similar data categories and I used a metaphor to label data categories with a similar pattern. The next step involved a process of merging minor themes to develop overarching or major themes. This process involved clustering minor themes into patterns or categories that reflected overarching or major themes, developing a definition for themes, and identifying data sets or verbatim quotes that correspond to identified themes. I reviewed themes and verbatim quotes to ensure they provided adequate exploratory and explanatory responses to my research questions. The final step was developing and reporting thematic findings that were organized according to research questions and major themes. Themes were extrapolated from the data using a paradigmatic approach where shared experiences that were common were disaggregated into thematic data sets. I identified themes that corresponded to each research question by reviewing disaggregated data sets and extrapolating excerpts to develop cogent findings. For example, I identified major themes that corresponded or provided answers to research question one and these themes were used to guide the development of the response to this question. Using this approach, I was able to integrate themes uncovered during the process of data analysis to develop a unified, context specific, and persuasive body of data that revolved around major themes.

Analysis of my reflexive journal

I analyzed data from my reflexive journal to deepen and enrich the findings in this study as well as to situate the interview data in its proper context. This process of analysis and inclusion of the reflexive journal underpinned the data triangulation process in this study. My observations were interwoven in the reflexive journal which allowed for the inclusion of three data sources in this study. These triangulated data sources added to the credibility and validity of this study allowing me to compare data sources for confirmability and to identify disconfirming information. My process of data analysis involved *a priori* coding where I (1) reviewed the observations and notations in the journal, and (2) identified confirming findings that corresponded with themes in the interviews. These confirming findings were color coded in pink and disconfirming findings were coded in yellow. I also used descriptive codes to summarize the confirming and disconfirming findings related to each theme. These were findings that departed from or were dissimilar to the major themes identified in the interviews. Confirming and disconfirming findings enriched the nature of this study by helping to clarify major themes and broaden the breadth of understanding of the study's context.

Summary

In this chapter I discussed my qualitative research approach and the case study research design. I described the research participants and setting by exploring the physicality and contextuality of research sites. I also defined the population types that were of interest to this study and explained how non-probability sampling approaches and techniques were implemented to recruit a desirable sample. Furthermore, I described and justified the data collection instruments used in this study and strategies that were used to ensure the validity and reliability of the semi-structured interview outlined. Other major features of this chapter included a detailed description of data collection procedures such as informed consent and the interview processes

as well as steps that were taken to maintain trustworthiness. Importantly, I outlined the thematic data analysis strategy, I delineated and defined first and second cycle coding strategies, and I described measures to protect the anonymity and confidentiality of the teachers I interviewed.

Chapter Four: Findings

Overview of Findings

Making deaf culture and hearing cultural connections, the importance of diversifying vocabulary instruction, and the instructional challenges of teaching signs and non-manual signals emerged as themes in this study. One of the major findings of this study revealed teachers' experiences of the deaf and hearing cultural connections and etiquette. Etiquette in the deaf community means being sensitive to eye contact, touch, and clear communication. Another finding revealed a variety of experiences and beliefs related to diversifying vocabulary instruction in the ASL classroom. The third finding was the challenges ASL non-native teachers faced when teaching signs and non-manual signals beyond the current curriculum. These findings taken together reveal non-native ASL teachers' views of teaching ASL and the focus on the learning needs of their students. There is a need for a curriculum that is flexible and sensitive to deaf and hearing cultures of a second language learning classroom at the high school level. Teachers must use the background knowledge of their students to modify lessons and mediate the cultural gap. Supports for professional development are needed to help teachers develop their toolbox of appropriate strategies. Data I extrapolated from the interviews, descriptive field notes with teacher reflexive notes, and my researcher's reflexive journal are presented below in a thematic form. A summary of major themes and findings are outlined on table 2.

Table 3 Research Questions and Data

Research Questions	Data Sources	Heuristics/In vivo codes	Major Themes
<p>What views have hearing ASL teachers formed of instructional approaches used to teach ASL vocabulary to non-native learners in high school?</p>	<p>Interview Reflexive Journals/Observation</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Visual strategy ● Voice and instruction, ● Total language immersion ● Expository teaching ● Technology in instruction ● Model aspects of lesson 	<p>Diversifying vocabulary instruction</p>
<p>How do hearing ASL teachers perceive culture in teaching ASL as a second language in high school?</p>	<p>Interview Reflexive Journals/Observation</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Change learning environment ● Oppressive hearing culture ● Total language immersion ● Outside of the box experiences ● Cultural immersion ● Minority voices ● Dichotomy in deaf and hearing culture 	<p>Multicultural connections and etiquette</p>

Table 3 (Continued)

What are the perceptions of hearing ASL teachers of teaching signs and non-manual signals to their hearing students?	Interview Reflexive Journals/Observation	Variations in signs <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Outdated instructional strategy● Deaf advocacy and militancy● Curriculum implementation challenges	Instructional challenges of teaching signs and non-manual signals
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------

Making Deaf and Hearing Culture Connections

The teachers in this study emphasized the importance of making connections between the deaf and hearing cultures, both for their students and for themselves as hearing non-native ASL teachers who advocate for deaf culture. Indeed, supporting students to make connections between deaf and hearing cultures was an important goal for these teachers.

Establishing learning environments that support students' abilities to make deaf and hearing culture connections was important for these teachers and they spoke of doing this in a variety of ways. I found in my field-notes Teacher A encouraged students in their learning environment as a safe place for learning where ASL was transferred via culture. Deaf cultural transmission was a major concern of this hearing ASL teacher who felt these experiences should be acquired through classroom visitations or field trips to a local residential school for deaf and hard of hearing children. Teacher B described how inviting deaf speakers to visit the classroom helped her students make connections between hearing and deaf cultures stating, "the deaf person knows what is culturally acceptable and what is not and that helps my students make connections into their real-world situations like explaining to the speaker why they were late to class." Teacher

C stated awareness to those connections by organizing her class with visual supports like “my deaf teachers did for me.”

Teachers discussed how providing students with opportunities to engage in total language immersion in deaf cultural experiences and situations was important in supporting their students’ understanding of the deaf culture. For example, Teacher B spoke of her students attending a silent dinner. “They have come back really energized and so when we talk about that in the classroom, we bring back those experiences to the classroom for students to share with each other and that’s where it’s going to come across louder and stronger, is when it comes from students. We make correlations to expectations in the culture.” Teacher A went on to say, “You want them to understand as much as possible as the culture they come from. Trying to get them to live deaf culture for one hour a day... is hard.” Teacher B also commented on the importance of immersive experiences for her ASL students, “I use ASL as a tool to get them outside of their box, outside of their comfort zone, and teach them a little bit more.” Teacher B described the importance of envisioning the ASL classroom environment as a space to support her students’ thinking outside of their hearing only culture box, how the ASL learning environment is the vehicle to broadening students’ notions of the world in which they live. Teacher C supported her colleagues by highlighting the value of her students understanding HOLME and regional sign variations in respect to learning a second language.

A discussion of cultural experiences continued as Teacher B says, “I had never been taught non-manual signals. I just think it’s the funniest thing like the ‘nose twitch’ non-manual signal. It means ‘I got you, I’m with you’ in the deaf culture. It lets one know you are following along with whatever you’re saying... it’s not in the ASL curriculum books... I teach them from day one about the sign, ‘What’, to add a head tilt forward, and eyebrows furrowed to complete how we use that

word.” Teacher A continues, “...taking ASL with a deaf teacher they could never explain why we did what we did. I just saw modeling of the signs in context, but I had to study on my own... to understand the depth of the language.” It is important to understand these concepts about deaf culture are missing in school curriculum.

I contend there are gaps in the curriculum that leave out important dynamics of the language like the ‘nose twitch’. I pondered the question, “What can be done to improve a non-native teacher’s practice so they can successfully implement these skills at the high school level for language acquisition success?” Facial expressions, head tilts, and holding the last sign in a question for turn taking are very necessary parts of a second language learning process, yet depending on the curriculum a school district approves, a teacher can find themselves struggling to add more in-depth cultural knowledge which is needed in the language learning process.

Teacher C supports this same perspective. “For hearing students it’s a big deal to them because they are not used to figuring out where their eyebrows are (located). ‘I don’t know how to move my eyebrows, Miss’. So, I model the facials for the WHAT sign... I have to tell them verbally to furrow their eyebrows... I continue to model my facial expressions and use the whiteboard to communicate back and forth.”

These teachers also spoke about how the connections they make personally between the deaf and hearing cultures were important to their own development and identity as hearing ASL teachers. They noted how minority voices in the deaf culture are important for hearing ASL teachers because these voices help hearing non-native ASL teachers develop their own instructional experiences related to the deaf culture. Teacher A states, “kids get different things from deaf teachers than they do hearing teachers. More of the etiquette... rules of the culture to

interact with them in the classroom. Deaf people have a natural ability for use of body language and facial expression and not all hearing people have it...For me as an adult and being a part of the field and deaf culture so long it was just the norm.”

Participating teachers underscored the importance of making personal connections between the deaf and hearing cultures. Deaf and hearing culture experiences have shaped them as advocates for the deaf culture. For example, Teacher B revealed: “I tell the story of how I got invited to the Super Bowl party that was a deaf party. It took me a whole evening to figure out the difference in a hearing party. You can eat throughout the whole thing because you are not missing anything, you can multi-task, but deaf people in this scenario had their food and then put their food away and now it’s time to watch the game.” Teacher B postulated that: “I have become more of an advocate for deaf culture instead of just giving them information about deaf culture...how much deaf people have struggled.” Teacher C continued with how she sees the hearing culture as being oppressive in nature and that this perception was shared by many in the deaf community “who groaned at the placement of the ASL in the hands of the oppressor, the non-native, hearing signer.” Hearing teachers express their awareness and sensitivity to relating and advocating deaf culture to their students in the ASL classroom.

My reflexive journal further identified deaf advocacy as important as understanding hearing and deaf cultural connections. My reflexive views about deaf advocacy were in alignment with Teacher C in the comments, “I learned from militant ASL teachers who were part of the Deaf Way movement after the Deaf President Now (DPN) experience...There was a strong respect for teaching ASL and a hearing person learning the language should respect the rules of learning about the deaf culture and the language of ASL.”

Theme 1 Summary and Researcher Reflection

Different changes in the learning environment need to be taken into account. Teachers need a variety of experiences, willingness to change and the resources to change because each classroom situation is unique and different. Best practices are needed but unconventional, “outside the box” experiences also have a place in the second language learning process. Teachers need to consider a toolbox of strategies to meet the needs of different learners in different situations.

Learning about the deaf culture is a dynamic experience and I wonder if creating a curriculum that focuses on the similarities and differences would enhance this second language experience. This question is posed in light of the postulations of Lopez-Class et al., (2011) who argued that the two-factor acculturation paradigm proposes two separate forms for cultural identity. These are (a) associating with the minority ethnic culture and (b) relating to majority or popular culture. This two-factor framework is also supported by a quadratic structure with different acculturation outputs. These outputs are marginal or have limited participation with first and second language cultures, high participation in the first language culture and limited participation in new second language culture, high participation in second language culture and low or restricted participation in native language culture, and intense assimilation and association with native and non-native language cultures.

I raised this question because of the absence of any curriculum that addresses the cultural needs of hearing students who are learning ASL. A dynamic and flexible curriculum is needed because of the different cultural backgrounds of participants and socioeconomic differences. Consider this example where the hearing cultural dynamics are different from expectations in the

deaf culture. The hearing students did not arrive to class on time when a deaf person was in the classroom. The deaf person considered this inappropriate because communication broke down between the deaf and hearing culture. This situation underscores the need for a multicultural education, and I believe a dynamic curriculum can bridge the gap between the hearing and deaf cultures as supported by Wilcox and Wilcox (1998) who reasoned that this approach is reflective of Vygotsky's Sociocultural Theory and Schumann's Acculturation Model where culture, society, and hearing and deaf group norms intersect to augment cognitive abilities of second language learners.

The dichotomy in cultures could be driven by the age of the learners as well as the sociocultural differences between deaf and hearing people. Arising is the issue of curriculum support for teachers at the high school level to bridge this gap within the hearing and deaf populations. Curriculum is necessary to support teachers and students in the world language setting who face these situations and who sometimes use "outside of the box" approaches in their ASL classes. This postulation was supported by Horejes (2012) who asserted hearing teachers should place a high premium on deaf culture in educating hearing students because it signifies anthropological and sociological realities of a people who operate in a hearing culture that is sometimes insensitive to their needs. Deaf cultural realities should be understood by hearing teachers because they will gain valuable insights about how the deaf experience the hearing world, how they cope and navigate zones of exclusion in the hearing world, and how technology has been used to narrow the communication and information sharing gaps in deaf and hearing cultures (Horejes, 2012).

It is important to make a distinction between "outside of the box experiences" and traditional instructional approaches. My understanding is that "outside of the box experiences" are

non-traditional, teacher driven approaches used by experienced educators to engage students in educational settings such as an inner-city or rural school where hearing students are taking ASL as an elective. Teacher A felt this approach was useful because it catered to the whole child by making them aware of different language cultures. This awareness allowed the teacher to engage her students using a multicultural approach where culture was seen as an important part of the language acquisition process. It is important to remember that the literature also revealed that the deaf culture has a deep level of animosity, antipathy, and distrust for the hearing culture. Limited empirical data was available to fully explain how this level of animosity and cultural animus informs the instructional roles of hearing ASL teachers who teach sign language to students at the high school level.

I am not a traditional teacher because I strongly believe in using outside of the box experiences as an effective tool in teaching ASL students at the high school level. For example, I developed a friendship with a teacher who worked at the state's deaf residential school. We connected on Zoom and engaged in an ASL dialogue which led to sharing rich, relevant curriculum classroom experiences with my students who were hearing and her students who were deaf. My advice was teachers must be very selective in how they approach "outside of the box" experiences because of safety issues for students as well as other issues relating to the logistics of time and expectations of deaf participants and teachers. I said this because novice teachers may have to invest extra time in planning and coordinating with the school, deaf community, parents, and other community dynamics for a successful classroom experience. Invariably, unforeseen things do develop, and those developments can create implementation and engagement challenges for hearing and deaf students. An example of this is the current world pandemic where social interaction is inhibited, and internet connections have now become normal. It is important to

ponder the questions raised by Schumann's Acculturation Model when postulated that acculturation is mediated by context, which essentially describes factors that regulate and govern how this phenomenon occurs. Context is often affected by environmental situations such as second language learner's initial exposure to ASL, the existing second language culture, the size of the population of non-native learners, and unique cultural characteristics of the group of learners. Other influences on acculturation include cohesiveness of social groups, cultural sphere, and parochial factors such as population size (Lopez-Class et al., 2011; Schumann, 1985). Teachers can use both cultures to mediate ASL acquisition. I think the answer is found in the voices of teachers in this study who revealed that changes in the learning environment need a sensitive mix of total language immersion in deaf cultural attitudes and practices throughout the second acquisition process with those of the minority voices.

Importance of Diversifying Vocabulary Instruction

Diversifying vocabulary instruction was a second theme which emerged from this study. All three teachers shared a variety of experiences and beliefs related to the important role that diversifying vocabulary instruction played in ASL. The teachers spoke of how they diversified vocabulary instruction through visual strategies, voice instruction and total language immersion, HOLME understanding, expository teaching and modeling aspects of the lesson, and technology in instruction.

Teacher C stated, "I use a lot of visuals... I try to add a lot of gloss (written English) around the room to support learning... I also spend a lot of time reviewing vocabulary and cleaning up sign errors." My observation and reflexive journal revealed that Teacher A described how she diversified her ASL vocabulary instruction through the use of visual strategies. "The teacher went

into a deeper discussion in the students' native language. She used a visual strategy and goes deeper in the native language to explain the types of iconic signs. She writes the words on the board visually for a better understanding and setting vocabulary in context." Teacher A felt it is a benefit being a hearing non-native teacher who is teaching hearing ASL students. She connected the visual sign for soap to the sign's meaning through classification and an explanation of the soap making process, "Teens tend to hold on to the sign and remember it longer." I could tell from her body language and facial expressions that she (Teacher A) knew if she turned her voice off, she would lose her students even though a visual sign was modeled. Teacher C stated: "...once they create a HOLME (Handshape, Orientation, Location, Movement & Expression) hand they keep it all four years in their folder." Teacher C's statement indicated she uses specific teaching strategies to teach the important pieces of ASL vocabulary to her hearing students. Non-native hearing teachers have found that diversifying instructional approaches and practices is useful in helping hearing students acquire the skills needed to learn and use ASL vocabulary in appropriate contexts.

Diversifying ASL vocabulary instruction is also accompanied by challenges. Teacher C revealed, "The only challenge...the students learning bad habits during ASL 1...they learned their ASL 1 vocabulary off of Quizlet and not videos...by a novice ASL 1 teacher. I spend the first two months modeling vocabulary, going back to show students all the variations they are going to see." Teacher A also believed stepping outside the book and using videos or modeling to support ASL learning in the classroom helps students make connections to their signed vocabulary. The continued modeling and practice of signs can eliminate signing errors in the early stages of second language acquisition.

ASL vocabulary instruction involves diversifying teaching processes by changing how lesson content and concepts are presented to students. Teacher A's experiences revealed an emergent

instructional process where she diversified according to the needs and initial competencies of her students. She revealed, "...if you attempt to voice off completely you lose some of the kids that are not very visual... I try to give them a way to remember the sign...we have been talking about how technology has changed signs. Teacher C supports this perspective, "I typically use Power Points that have pictures followed by a glossed word...I model classifiers and use vocabulary sheets...I also use technology like Lifeprint as an online resource." Voice off, voice on, visual supports, and sign historicity are just a sample of the teaching processes that help ASL students learn and hold on to their new language learning experience.

Theme 2 Summary and Researcher Reflection

The findings of this study also revealed that vocabulary instruction can be diversified in different ways such as through visual strategies, voice instruction and total language immersion, HOLME understanding, and expository teaching and the use of technology. I felt it was important to reflect on these findings in two ways. First, I desired to unpack and explore them through the lens of a reflective practitioner and the second goal was to view them in the context of the findings of the review of literature in Chapter 2.

I always believed visual strategies were important in teaching ASL vocabulary to hearing students. This is because ASL is a visual, 3-D language that involves getting the students' attention and focus. I have learned over two decades of teaching ASL that visualization helps students make connections and think about the use of signs in context. The efficacy of visualization was underscored by Teachers A, B, and C who noted it was a process of change and real-life application, and I would add, I feel it is an ongoing and emerging process (Staden, 2013). This process becomes even more important during expository teaching. The success of expository

teaching is tied to the process of visualization where the teachers use different strategies to help students understand how they should sign and use ASL vocabulary in context. Teacher C focused her expository instruction on helping students understand and see connections between the teacher's instruction and how that is applied in handshapes and orientation (Cannon et al., 2010).

The sub-themes "voice instruction and total language immersion" and "HOLME Understanding" are also linked to the idea hearing ASL students need to visualize in order to understand the mechanics of ASL vocabulary. This process of visualizing is developed and articulated through expository teaching. The hearing ASL teacher uses his or her voice to gain students' attention and this helps to guide the instructional process as the teacher explains HOLME to students (Zdrojewski, 1998). Through my experiences, I have learned that HOLME cannot be thoroughly explained by the teacher without the use of the native language, whether spoken or written English. Teacher C argued that HOLME understanding is an emergent process that uses visual signs to expose students to ASL vocabulary but is not the only process. This learning process has to be diversified, which can be achieved during the expository teaching phase of the lesson where the teachers model aspects of the lesson and help students visualize correct handshape, orientation, location, movement and expressions for the sign. As I reflected on these findings, I felt that total language immersion was difficult to achieve because of what was voiced by the teachers in this study. This is in agreement with Teachers A, B and C who contend using the voice helps the hearing ASL teachers to engage students, hold their attention, and diversifies the instructional process. Total language immersion is perhaps a struggle in the current circumstance because hearing ASL learners require the use of voice in the instructional process (Brown, 2017).

I also supported how the teachers in this study used technology to diversify instruction. This helped learners to visualize what they were learning and sharpened their use of the HOLME

components in their everyday use of clear communication with ASL vocabulary. Diversifying ASL instruction with technology was found by teachers to be useful when they were tailored or designed to meet the needs of students (Keating & Mirus, 2003). This point is very important because not all technology is applicable and useful in teaching ASL vocabulary to hearing students. It can be understood why the teachers in this study used technologies that were aligned to instructional needs of students (Fourie, 2000). The basic issue here is that teachers should analyze the learning needs of students, components of the curriculum that should be taught, and the teachers comfort level in using that type of technology. The main point emerging from this theme is that ASL vocabulary instruction can be diversified using technological instructional tools, but these tools and approaches should be tailored to meet the needs of students and should be aligned to existing learning contexts. Total language immersion without the use of voice is a challenge that is difficult to achieve in the existing context where students require voice to understand how they should use HOLME understanding and other aspects of ASL vocabulary (Rosen et al, 2014).

Instructional Challenges in Signs and Non-Manuals

Variations in signs, outdated instructional strategies, deaf advocacy, and curriculum implementation challenges were instructional challenges in teaching signs and non-manual signals that were identified by teachers in this study.

Teacher B's experiences of teaching signs and non-manual signals to hearing students revealed, "We need to be sending out our students with a language that is full and clear. I teach them from day one about the sign, to add the head tilt forward, eyebrows changing the form of the words." Teacher C also shared, "I use a lot of visuals...they are followed by a GLOSS term...the pictures are not of just an apple, but a basket of apples so later I can show

classifiers...I use a lot of role play to demonstrate various signs” Teacher C confronts the challenge by showing, “my students all the variations they are going to see...but it’s not in the book”.

My researcher’s reflexive journal revealed outdated instructional strategies were viewed by teachers as a challenge in teaching signs and non-manual signals. For example, I noted the following after observing Teacher A using books to support signs and non-manual signals. Based on my experience of teaching ASL to hearing students, interviews with the teachers in this study, and reflection on ASL instructional best practices, I can conclude that, “presenting ASL vocabulary from a book does not work! ASL is a 3-D language and requires human modeling, facials, and body language...some novice ASL teachers may still be using a book or technology like Quizlet to teach and not have needed tools to diversify their teaching.” Teacher C shares her frustration teaching ASL students at level 2, “Students learn bad habits off of Quizlet and not videos.” The use of outdated strategies can be frustrating and a waste of time for those teachers who are doing a good job in the field.

Teacher B postulated deaf advocacy was important to the process of understanding deaf culture. She revealed, “I have become more of an advocate for deaf culture... I’ll say this is what it’s like in deaf culture because these are the things they have to struggle with just like you... I have become a much stronger advocate for deaf culture and how much deaf culture has struggled to create a voice for themselves, an identity, a place where they can have equality”. Teacher A shared, “My students will start asking, ‘Are they (Deaf) able to drive?’ Well, Yeah, why not? You get to prove to them they are people just like us.” Teacher C continues to respect and support deaf advocacy in the classroom with “the use of online materials like Lifefprint and Signingsavvy where signing models are deaf”.

Hearing ASL teachers' experiences revealed that teaching signs and non-manual signals to hearing students was a challenging process. For example, Teacher A stated, "for students to actually produce it (signs), I think they have the hardest time with that... I don't even try to do without voice and if I do, I will see all of these "deer-in-the-headlight" (blank facial expressions) looks...I actually write words on the board and sign each one and they get it, but for them to go back and apply it to the entire language, they still want to use words... We have different kinds of learning styles but it's still based on listening to someone explain it." Teacher C also added in, "I encourage my students to use online dictionaries or any of the dictionaries in the room when struggling with signs." Teacher B remembers, "the nose twitch, which means "I got you," is not taught in a textbook but a lot of deaf use it."

Data from my reflexive journal and observations further revealed and confirmed instructional challenges experienced by Teachers A, B, & C. These challenges were related to curriculum implementation. For example, after reflecting on observational data, I discovered that curriculum implementation was a challenge experienced by all teachers in this study because of how they explored and critically reviewed signs in the teaching and learning context. Teachers had to create supports to bridge the gap of two cultures while teaching a second language. My concerns were heightened when I observed, "getting feedback on a sign sometimes involved students raising their hands to confer with the teacher...the teacher added the historicity of the sign to connect to its iconicity or movement but that is not always applicable in every situation. Some students were observed using wrong movements with the dominant hand. The teachers were often heard calling their large class to attention with the use of voice and modeling signing expectations to fix signing errors. Video demonstration in the classroom could not ensure correct signing production and time constraints limited implementing necessary district curriculum expectations."

Theme 3 Summary and Researcher Reflection

Teachers reported four major challenges in teaching signs and non-manual signals and these challenges also have implications for themes two and three. Theme three was broken into four sub-themes. I reflected on these sub-themes in the context of my experiences teaching ASL for over two decades and in the context of the findings of the literature reviewed in Chapter 2. I asked teachers to share the challenges they experienced in teaching signs and non-manual signals and Teacher B reported that her main challenge was the variations of how students signed and what was signed by the deaf community. She opined and lamented that even though she taught students the correct signing techniques, there were instances where students did not follow those steps. Her major concern was that students would graduate from the program with a limited understanding of ASL signing techniques. She also shared her fear and concern as her experience had been similar to Teacher C's with trying to expose students to sign variations or non-manual signals they may see out in the real world. One factor that can be blamed for the challenges in teaching signs of non-manual signals is outdated instructional materials or the strategies used by novice ASL teachers. The case in point is Teacher C whose team member teacher used Quizlet to engage ASL 1 students in vocabulary learning. I felt strategies like that were outdated and inappropriate for a 3-D language like ASL. Approaches like that did not give students the opportunities they needed to practice standard signing techniques and self-correct production errors and applications.

Over the years, I have encountered students who have not developed an understanding of appropriate signing techniques and this becomes a serious problem when they attempt to interact with people in the deaf community. The deaf community expresses the point that hearing people

are oppressive and often disrespectful of their language culture when it could truly be a lack of understanding and awareness of sign specificity in student output.

Deaf advocacy and culture have been themes that have resonated throughout this study in the review of literature and interspersed throughout the findings of all three major themes. A dichotomous relationship exists between hearing and deaf language cultures and this dichotomy is a major challenge in students learning how to sign and engage people in the culture who can mentor and nurture this behavior (Holcomb et al., 2016). Teacher B accurately observed that deaf people experience challenges that are not well understood by hearing people. Likewise, my experience has been that deaf people feel hearing people do not respect and understand their language culture. This perceived level of disrespect and misunderstanding is a major obstacle in bridging the cultural differences in the deaf and hearing populations (Quinto-Pozos, 2011). It is simply an issue of trust. The deaf do not trust the hearing population and the hearing population has not bothered to understand the causes of this level of distrust (Horejes, 2012).

The challenges identified in teaching signs and non-manual signals have implications for curriculum implementation. Teacher A noted that these challenges are manifested in how the teacher uses voices this brings us back to that very debate about total immersion in the target language. Teacher A found it difficult to teach her ASL students without the use of her native language because voice is used as a tool to bridge the instructional gaps in her classroom. She further noted that deaf teachers experienced classroom engagement challenges and she reasoned that these challenges were due to those teachers' inability to use voice to prompt and engage their learners (Holcomb et al., 2016). I also found voice to be an effective tool in engaging hearing ASL students and deaf teachers teaching ASL can be at a disadvantage in that regard. This brings us back to that very issue of the dichotomy in deaf and hearing cultures. Total language immersion is

particularly difficult in the context where hearing teachers are using voice to bridge the communication gap in their ASL classes (McCaskill and O'Brian, 2016).

Summary of Findings

Hearing non-native ASL teachers who participated in the study shared rich and meaningful encounters which mirrored their experiences in teaching hearing students. These experiences can be summarized in three major paradigmatic themes of (1) Hearing and deaf cultural connections and etiquette, (2) diversifying vocabulary instruction, and (3) the instructional challenges of teaching signs and non-manual signals. The first theme revealed teachers' experiences of hearing and deaf cultural connections and etiquette and these were reported as changes in the learning environment, total language and cultural immersion, outside of the box experiences, and a dichotomy in deaf-hearing cultures. Changes in the learning environment were seen by ASL teachers as important to hearing and deaf cultural connections. Teachers further revealed that total language immersion supported and enabled deaf cultural connections by exposing students to deaf cultural experiences. In addition, outside of the box experiences were seen as useful in developing cultural connections and etiquette in ASL classrooms. Teachers also reported that minority voices in the deaf culture were important to the ASL instructional process and that an understanding of the dichotomous relationship in deaf and hearing cultures were important to teaching ASL to hearing students.

Diversifying vocabulary was the second theme. Teachers reported they diversified vocabulary instruction through visual strategies, voice and total language immersion, HOLME understanding, expository teaching and modeling aspects of the lesson, and technology in instruction. Visual strategies and signs were used as tools to diversify vocabulary instruction. Voice instruction, and

total language immersion were also used to diversify vocabulary instruction because participants felt hearing ASL students would learn more about ASL vocabulary if they connected this process to real life situations. HOLME understanding exposed students to handshapes, orientation, location, movement, and expression. Expository teaching allowed teacher participants in this study to model different aspects of their lessons which were accompanied by some challenges. Technology was also used by participants to diversify vocabulary instruction by changing the methods and media they used to introduce lesson content and concepts to their students.

Instructional challenges of teaching signs and non-manual signals was the third theme. Variations in signs, outdated instructional strategies, deaf advocacy, and curriculum implementation were challenges participants experienced in teaching signs and non-manual signals. Teachers reported variations in signs was challenging because hearing students had problems figuring out which signs were used in specific contexts and when to use needed non-manual signals. Outdated instructional strategies such as using a book or Quizlet to teach signs and non-manual signs were identified as instructional challenges because ASL is a language that is adaptable to 3-D instructional approaches. Furthermore, deaf advocacy was identified as important to exposing students to the importance of deaf cultural experiences in learning signs and non-manual signs and this process of learning was sometimes undercut by curriculum implementation challenges experienced by hearing ASL teachers. These challenges affected how teachers taught signs and non-manual signals by implementing their own supports to encourage students apply and successfully produce those language acquisition skills.

Overall teachers in this study spoke of how they diversified their instructional approaches to teaching ASL vocabulary. The process of diversification infused traditional and non-traditional instructional approaches. Hearing non-native ASL teachers' instructional experiences revealed

they viewed hearing and deaf cultures as important factors in teaching ASL to hearing students. Their realities revealed that it was important for students to understand and participate in deaf cultural experiences, understand deaf and hearing culture differences, appreciate deaf culture expectations through outside of the box cultural experiences, and develop an awareness of deaf culture etiquette. Hearing non-native ASL teachers' experiences further illuminated that teaching signs and non-manual signals to hearing students was a challenging process, which required teachers to use creative instructional approaches to engage their hearing students.

The findings shed light on hearing and deaf cultural connections in the ASL classroom and new knowledge about some of the challenges that teachers and students encountered in this context. However, this knowledge raised the question, "How does the dichotomous relationship in the deaf and hearing cultures affect learning outcomes in the ASL classroom?" This question was never raised at the beginning of this study because it was never designed to measure cause and effect relationships. However, in looking at the bigger picture and the implications of the findings of this study for the discipline, it is important that the question be contemplated in future studies that will be designed to measure cause and effect relationships. The issue of hearing and deaf cultures was a recurring theme that resonated from all three major themes in this study, therefore, further scholarship is required to understand this emerging phenomenon.

The findings about teaching ASL vocabulary to hearing students using only the target language approach was impractical and ineffective. Second language students need voice or their native spoken language to understand the mechanics of ASL. The 'voice off' approach was not preferred by the teachers in this study. Teachers who are deaf utilized this approach and have encountered difficulties and challenges in student engagement at the high school level. This means there is a discrepancy in classroom practice and applied research findings of scholars. Quinto-

Pozos and others argue and postulate an exclusive target language approach as the ideal method to educate students. These considerations about voice on and voice off can only be resolved by further research which will gather empirical data about best practices in ASL classrooms.

Researcher's Reflexivity

Teaching ASL to hearing students is a very complex process. This process becomes even more complex because as a hearing teacher I am seen as an interloper in the deaf community. Consequently, many hearing non-native ASL teachers start out with this negative label as trespassers on sacred ground and trust has to be ultimately earned by hearing teachers to be considered part of the deaf language community.

As a hearing ASL teacher I must remember that I entered the teaching and learning environment with my own biases and preconceptions about how the language should be taught. These biases affected the outcomes in my ASL classroom and were very different from my experiences in the classroom with a deaf professor. My experiences teaching ASL to hearing students were no different than the experiences of the teachers in this study. I shared the same bias and fears. Some of their concerns were similar to challenges I had when I began to teach ASL at the high school level. I found myself bridging the gap of hearing and deaf cultures with no solid curriculum to support my journey through an exploding educational ASL field.

My place in this study is I understand why teachers diversified their instructional strategies. I often diversified as well to meet the varying needs of my students. Technology incorporation was the main tool I used to diversify instruction in my classroom. This tool allowed me to engage learners and introduce content about ASL vocabulary, culture, and signs and non-manual signals beyond the basic ASL curriculum. Teachers in this study also found

technology to be an effective tool in teaching ASL vocabulary. However, in one instance a novice team teacher used Quizlet in the instructional process. I felt this tool was not appropriate because ASL is a language that is disposed to three dimensional approaches and Quizlet had no instructional value in that context. The criticism was not of the use of technology in general but of the specific technological tool that was utilized by this teacher to engage students which impeded ASL development.

The most significant finding that emerged from this study was that deaf culture is considered indispensable and yet the needs of hearing students need to be considered in learning a second language. The literature reviewed and the findings generated from interviews, field-notes with reflexive teacher notes and a reflexive journal revealed a dichotomous relationship in deaf and hearing cultures. The deaf community views the hearing culture as unable to handle their language and respect their culture. This view often results in a deep-seated level of fear, distrust, and antipathy in both cultures. I have formed this view over my time of teaching ASL at the high school level as well as from the seminal work of Quinto-Pozos (2011). There is a sense that hearing ASL teachers are not welcome to teach ASL in the classroom. Teachers in my study share my awareness of this cultural disconnect that exists and are sensitive to bridge the gap between their hearing students and their deaf counterparts.

As I reviewed the findings in this study, I asked myself, “How can other hearing non-native ASL teachers who teach ASL improve their practice at the high school level based on the findings of this study?” First, it must be stated that the aim and objective of this study was not to assess the effects of the participants' classroom practices, but to understand perspectives of how these teachers taught ASL. However, based on the findings in this study it can be said that hearing ASL teachers can improve their practice by diversifying their instructional strategies to

meet the needs of the students. The process of diversifying instructional practice involves understanding the instructional needs of learners and designing an instructional program to meet their needs. The most significant lesson that can be drawn from the “voice on” and ‘voice off’ approach is in the teaching process. Teachers have to decide when it is appropriate to use voice and when that scaffold should be faded and eliminated. Ultimately, students should learn ASL without the use of voice but as the teachers stated, the use of voice has its place in bridging the communication gap in the instructional process.

I believe non-native ASL teachers can teach ASL and do a good job introducing vocabulary, non-manual signals and culture in the ASL high school classroom. In order to improve their practice, ASL teachers need appropriate professional development supports that can be available for them to take on a regular basis. This does not mean taking a world language workshop and adapting it for our ASL classrooms but the use of qualified ASL teachers demonstrating best practices to implement vocabulary, non-manual signals and culture. I am a member of the state and national organizations for ASL and attend the conferences to improve my craft. However, this does not mean that funds and timetables meet all teachers’ needs in the district, state or nation. What can be done to make professional development trainings more applicable for teachers in the ASL classroom? This question may even go beyond the scope of whether the teacher is a native or non-native ASL teacher.

Chapter Five: Discussion and Recommendations

Discussion of Findings by Research Question

Research question 1

Teachers' stories in this study revealed they diversified the instructional approaches they used to teach ASL vocabulary to non-native learners in high school. This process of diversifying vocabulary involved modifying instructional processes by changing how lesson content was introduced to students, diversifying according to initial academic competence, and integrating technology in the teaching and learning process. These findings are important in the context of ASL research because diversification in instructional strategies suggests hearing non-native ASL teachers are mediating the language and communication gap in the classroom by using strategies that meet the needs of learners in their unique contexts. Content modification meant that teachers were not using a one size fits all approach but were tailoring their instructional agenda to engage learners. This process involved the use of available technology, which was significant because these teachers used many approaches to overcome the challenges encountered in teaching vocabulary to hearing students. Diversification of instruction offered students opportunities to learn using a mode that was compatible with each of their learning styles.

I wasn't surprised by this approach because I am an ASL teacher who has had to diversify my instructional approaches to teaching ASL vocabulary. This often involved using

available resources to meet the needs of the students. These approaches are not always acceptable to deaf culture. These teachers confronted a problem in their teacher context and utilized available technology such as computers and PowerPoints to engage students in the learning process. In other words, teachers changed their instructional method and approaches according to how their students responded to their instructional and cultural approaches. In many ways this is typical of most teachers who find ways to enhance learning, increase levels of success in the classroom, and empower students learning a new language and culture.

The combination of strategies that I found to be significant in this research context were technology integration and content modification. This was significant because the content modification often supported the technology used to present the content in the lesson. Teachers were often very strategic and deliberate in their planning and teaching. These modifications were designed to enhance student participation, reduce boredom, expose students to the foundational principles of ASL vocabulary and respect the deaf community.

Teachers in my study noted Quizlet and simple computer applications were used to support students in vocabulary development. The use of Quizlet was not appropriate because it did not support the 3-dimensional orientation of ASL. However, PowerPoint slides and computer education applications were used effectively to engage students and present lesson content. This diversified instruction from a passive learning process to an interactive and student-centered reality. The barriers to the use of technology in the sample of teachers in this study were never identified in interviews or observed during the observation process nor did this study seek to capture data about barriers. Instead, the researcher captured data about the views hearing non-native ASL teachers have formed of instructional approaches. A major finding was the use of technology to diversify this process of teaching vocabulary to hearing students. These findings

are supported by Keating and Mirus (2003) who asserted computer-assisted learning has revolutionized how hearing second language learners develop and utilize their ASL communicative skills. Computer software and other tools can shape how ASL vocabulary is acquired and used by helping target language users to learn the fundamentals of the language at a faster pace, alter how messages are understood, and immerse themselves in repetitive signing activities that deepen their understanding of how ASL vocabulary is configured. Webcams and other output tools can be used to assist hearing ASL learners to develop useful communicative skills that will enhance the quality and texture of their conversation with native and non-native ASL users (Keating & Mirus, 2003). Further findings in the review of the literature revealed digital versatile discs (DVDs) and preparatory introduction to targeted vocabulary were effective in enhancing the rate of vocabulary acquisition, but DVDs alone were found to be ineffective in vocabulary learning (Cannon et al., 2010). While this type of technology may seem outdated, it does support the cultural model of using native signers in 3-D demonstration situations for vocabulary acquisition in the classroom.

Furthermore, the process of diversifying instruction to support the needs of students was corroborated by Wilcox and Wilcox (2008) in communicative language teaching methodology. This approach suggests that unique learning needs of learners should be considered when teaching ASL to hearing students and this consideration should also incorporate learners' cultures, social experiences, educational backgrounds, language goals, and objectives. Lesson content is often seen as emergent and guided by situational learning imperatives. This approach is reflective of Vygotsky's Socio-Cultural Theory and Schumann's Acculturation Model where culture, society, and hearing and deaf group norms intersect to augment cognitive abilities of second language learners (Wilcox & Wilcox, 1998).

My observations of teachers' instructional process raised several questions that were not answered because of the qualitative nature of this study. How did students respond to the diversification in instruction? How did teachers manage the scope and sequence of learning in the context of these modifications? How did teachers align their innovations with state and national instructional standards? How did teachers modify their assessment practices to support a diversified instructional context? These questions were not answered in this study because of the nature of qualitative research design and the limitations of a case study. These questions could be part of future research inquiries.

Implications of these findings for hearing ASL teachers, ASL curriculum/instructional designers, and school administrators

Hearing ASL teachers. These findings mean that hearing non-native ASL teachers can successfully diversify their instructional strategies to meet the diverse needs of their learners. In other words, they can differentiate learning by modifying instructional content to meet the needs of learners as well as integrate available technology to support and engage learners. Teachers in this study did not use a homogenous set of instructional approaches to teach ASL vocabulary. Instead they modified and diversified their instructional pathways by using different methods and media such as laptops, PowerPoints, and online educational applications. Their diversification of instruction means that other hearing non-native ASL teachers can also diversify how they teach ASL vocabulary by identifying the unique learning styles of their learners, adapting available technology to the instructional process, and using assessment data to guide the pace at which diversification occurs. Fundamentally, each teacher should assess the unique needs of his or her learners as well as the students' access to technology to ensure the success in teaching ASL vocabulary. The important takeaway from these findings is that one set of instructional strategies

may not be suitable for all hearing ASL learners. Diversification allows the teacher to differentiate her instruction and be sensitive to the deaf-hearing cultural connections.

Curriculum/Instructional designers. What are the implications of these findings for curriculum planners/instructional designers? Curriculum planners are in a unique position to adapt the findings of this study in the curriculum design process. This is especially useful when curricula are designed to give ASL teachers support to integrate and infuse strategies that encourage student engagement and accelerate the learning of ASL in the classroom. These findings have implications for the scope and sequence of ASL curriculum where teachers can integrate these strategies to accelerate the breadth and depth of coverage of culture and language in the ASL curriculum. There is room for real and relevant curriculum that builds on both recognition of a native language and culture, which in turn respects the deaf culture and their beautiful ASL language.

School administrators. These findings also have implications for ASL school administrators who manage and supervise the implementation of the ASL curriculum. School administrators supervise hearing ASL teachers on a daily basis. The findings from this study have implications for the level of flexibility they give to teachers in modifying curriculum content and designing instruction to meet the needs of their hearing ASL students. This study has demonstrated that ASL can be taught using different strategies with the spoken native language, which means that school administrators should also develop a level of openness and flexibility to this reality. Hearing non-native teachers can successfully teach ASL with appropriate classroom curriculum and flexibility from their supportive school leadership.

Research question 2

Hearing non-native ASL teachers' stories revealed they saw deaf and hearing cultural connections and etiquette as very important to teaching ASL as a second language to hearing students in high school. Their stories revealed it was important for students to understand and participate in deaf cultural experiences, understand deaf and hearing culture differences, appreciate deaf culture expectations through 'outside of the box' cultural experiences, and develop an awareness of deaf culture etiquette. Teachers underscored that an important connection exists between deaf and hearing cultural connections and deaf etiquette. These experiences were important to the advocacy process happening between two different cultures in and outside the classroom walls.

These findings are important because they indicate that hearing non-native ASL teachers think deaf culture has an indispensable role in teaching ASL as a second language. This level of importance is revealed in the findings, which indicate the importance of encouraging hearing ASL students to participate in deaf cultural experiences, appreciating the differences in deaf and hearing cultures, understanding "outside of the box" deaf cultural experiences, and understanding deaf etiquette. These findings have one thing in common all hearing non-native ASL teachers interviewed believed that language acquisition cannot be divorced from the culture that nurtured it. I was not surprised by these findings as the importance of culture in language acquisition was established in this study by Schumann (1985) who reasoned that SLA must be viewed and studied in the context of existing culture. Language acquisition in bicultural populations is often affected by internalizing and externalizing variables (Lopez-Class et al., 2011). For example, ASL second language learners sometimes seek to immerse themselves in the culture of the language and become strong allies of the deaf community.

Hearing ASL teachers attempt to expose their students to different aspects of deaf culture but that was not always successful because of the deep level of distrust that exists in the deaf community for their hearing counterparts. The deaf culture perceives the hearing culture as foreign and oppressive because of the dominance of the hearing spoken language. In general, the deaf culture is seen as a minority culture that is often oppressed and this level of distrust makes it difficult for hearing ASL students and teachers to fully participate and immerse themselves in deaf cultural experiences. The consequence of this dichotomous relationship is that hearing ASL students can learn the basics of the ASL language without a full understanding of deaf cultural experiences and participation.

The literature supports the notions expressed by my fellow teachers. For example, Everett (2012) found that a symbiotic link exists between language and culture. This link exists because language usage is reflective of the culture that nurtured and supported its evolution (Everett, 2012). Knowledge of a language in most instances means awareness and understanding of the way of life of a people and an understanding of the sociocultural idiosyncrasies, which facilitated and shaped its linguistic heritage. For example, hearing non-native ASL teachers' understanding and awareness of ASL means they have some knowledge of deaf cultural realities and idiosyncrasies. Language is sometimes understood as culture and culture as language because they serve a communicative and a knowledge transfer function. Acquiring a new or second language also means developing a deeper appreciation of norms, customs, and behaviors of a new culture (Everett, 2012). McCaskill and O'Brian (2016) stated deaf children are sometimes seen as intruders in a hearing culture that stigmatizes them because of their inability to hear and speak the dominant language. Deaf people are ostracized and stigmatized because they are unable to communicate using the dominant language of the hearing culture and are excluded

from participating in routine hearing culture activities such as listening to the weather on the radio, ordering a pizza over telephone, demanding a refund from the telephone company, or articulating a defense in a legal matter (McCaskill and O'Brian, 2016). Hearing cultures are sometimes insensitive to the needs of deaf cultures because of limited communication and this misunderstanding manifests in different ways. Deaf people may sometimes feel threatened by hearing people when they speak because they do not have the advantage of hearing and hearing people may become suspicious of deaf people using ASL in their space because they are unable to understand and use the native language of the deaf (McCaskill and O'Brian, 2016).

Furthermore, hearing ASL teachers' perceptions of culture are affected by the realities of the socio-cultural environment. Quinto-Pozos (2011) revealed that hearing teachers' perceptions and views of culture in teaching ASL is affected by the oppressive past of the dominant oral language culture of hearing people and these realities have shaped patterns, trends, and instructional behaviors of hearing ASL teachers. In recent years, hearing ASL teachers' perceptions of deaf culture has been shaped by ASL curriculum standards that mandate teaching of different aspects of deaf culture to hearing learners (Iasevoli, 2018). Undoubtedly, hearing teachers' perceptions of deaf culture may evolve through exposure to lesson content about socialization and acculturation in deaf cultures. These curricula standards require teachers to expose second language learners to pictorial information about deaf culture through exclusive use of the target language (Iasevoli, 2018).

The fact that teachers communicated the importance of integrating deaf cultural etiquette in teaching hearing ASL students is especially important within the context of Schumann's Acculturation Model. Cultural diversity integration in teaching ASL is reflective of Schumann's Acculturation Model that proposed that dominance, exclusion, herding, tolerance and culture

shock were some factors that affect the acquisition of a second language (Zaker, 2016). The dominant perception of oppression by deaf people of the hearing culture may also affect how hearing teachers view the role of culture in planning and executing ASL instructional experiences. This process is further compounded by the safety of the herd concept where deaf community members bond together and exclude what they perceive to be intolerant and insensitive hearing communities (Zaker, 2016).

The level of distrust and antipathy that exists in the deaf community for the hearing culture raises several questions that were not answered in this research. For example, How can the barriers in the hearing and deaf culture be bridged or moderated to support cultural diversity integration? What are some strategies that can be used by the hearing community to engage the deaf community? How can technology bridge the communication in deaf and hearing cultures? What can ASL teachers at the high school level do to engage and expose their hearing ASL students to deaf cultural experiences?

Implications of these findings for hearing ASL students and hearing non-native ASL teachers

Hearing ASL students. These findings about integrating deaf culture while acquiring ASL have implications for hearing ASL students. Teachers revealed that they believed deaf cultural integration is important to hearing ASL students learning the fundamentals of the language. This has implications for student development activities such as field trips, tours, and other activities that involve students interacting with the deaf community. Implicit in this process of engaging the deaf community is hearing ASL students developing a level of sensitivity and

respect for deaf cultural identity and this can be facilitated through a phenomenological approach to cultural diversity integration.

Hearing non-native ASL teachers. What are the implications of these findings for hearing non-native ASL teachers? These findings have implications for how ASL teachers plan teaching and learning experiences as well as how deliberate they are in exposing their students to deaf cultural realities. Hearing ASL teachers will have to be strategic in how they engage the deaf community, and this strategic alliance has implications for building meaningful relationships with deaf community advocates. Ultimately, these teachers will also have to build and nurture a culture of sensitivity and understanding for the deaf culture in the classroom environment. This has implications for curriculum enrichment and delivery at the high school level.

Research question 3

Hearing ASL teachers in this study viewed the teaching of signs and non-manual signals as challenging. For example, Teacher A stated, “I think that is probably one of the things that they get, but for them to actually produce it, I think they have the hardest time with that. Some of it is not hard because you can actually write words on the board and sign each one and they get it, but for them to go back and apply it to the entire language, they still want to use words.” The literature supports the views of my fellow hearing teachers in this study.

These findings are significant because they help to unmask the challenges faced by hearing non-native ASL teachers as well as to specify the areas in which these challenges are more prevalent. This finding is useful as the first step to solve this problem. The findings related to these questions achieved two objectives where teachers identified several problems that they

encountered in teaching ASL to hearing students at the high school level. These problems were further compounded and frustrated by the differences in regional signs and non-manual signals learned by the hearing community and regional signs and non-manual signals used in the deaf community.

The challenges encountered by teachers in teaching ASL vocabulary were unique to this language context. They were unique because of the nature of the language and the nature of the deaf culture described in Chapter 2. The challenge of mediating cultures in research question #2 affected how students successfully acquired ASL skills. This was evident in this context as well. Hearing ASL students made several errors in signs and non-manual signals because of the confusion about what signs and non-manual signals meant in specific encounters with the deaf culture.

For example, Healey (2015) assessed how ASL users used non-manual features to express affective feelings. Results revealed respondents demonstrated frustration with a raised eyebrow, slight tilting of the head, and raising of upper or lower lips. In other cases, non-manuals were used to fully represent the effective response without the aid of signing. The use of the face to express affective emotions in ASL can be construed to represent an amalgamation of non-manual and manual gestures to communicate feelings in interactive processes (Healey, 2015). Furthermore, challenges have been identified in determining which non-manual signals are linked to unique ASL grammatical forms. This problem arises because several types of articulation are used in this process such as chin, heads, eyes, shoulders, nose, mouth etc. The head can be positioned in different spatial directions such as right, left, up, and down (Benitez-Quiroz et al., 2014). For ASL teachers at the high school level, encouraging teen-agers to use appropriate facials and non-manual signals can be frustrating.

These findings raised several questions such as what strategies can hearing non-native ASL teachers use to moderate challenges in teaching signs and non-manual signals? What is the best approach to help hearing ASL students understand the appropriate language context of signs and non-manual signals? How can teachers help students decide when and how they should use head signals and facial expressions when signing in ASL? These are questions that were not answered in this study and will require further investigation in future research.

Implications for Policy, Praxis, and Future Research

The findings of this study have different implications for deaf educational policy, classroom praxis in second language classrooms, and future research in ASL education for hearing students and their teachers. Consequently, this section explores the inferences that can be drawn from the findings in Chapter 4 for policy imperatives, classroom practice, and future research.

Policy implications. A critical reading of the findings of this study reveals different implications for educating hearing students in a minority language primarily used by the deaf community. First, a multicultural approach needs to be taken in educating hearing students. This involves designing policy initiatives at the state and federal levels that speak directly to integrating deaf minority voices in ASL educational policy (Seaver & Desgeorges, 2001). These policy initiatives should involve broad guidelines about exposing hearing ASL students to deaf cultural experiences. This will also help them to understand how deaf minority voices inform their educational experiences. These policy implications are relevant because they seek to accelerate and augment the process of educating hearing ASL students using tools and approaches that support a language experience approach (LEA) to teaching ASL as a second

language to hearing students (Seaver & Desgeorges, 2001). Other policy implications to be considered are instructional in nature and are tied to how deaf culture is understood. For example, policy guidelines developed by state and federal governments should consider integrating technology in ASL instruction and this type of technology should be guided by principles of multicultural education (Seaver & Desgeorges, 2001).

These policy implications are significant in the context of the literature and can be implemented in different ways. For example, Horejes (2012) revealed hearing ASL teachers should place a high premium on deaf culture in educating hearing students because it signifies anthropological and sociological realities of a people who operate in a hearing culture that is sometimes insensitive to their needs. Deaf cultural realities should be understood by hearing teachers because they will gain valuable insights about how the deaf experiences the hearing world, how they cope and navigate zones of exclusion in the hearing world (Horejes, 2012). The postulations of Horejes (2012) were supported by Zaker (2016) who argued cultural diversity integration in teaching ASL was reflective of Schumann's Acculturation Model that proposed that dominance, exclusion, herding, tolerance and culture shock were some factors that affect the acquisition of a second language (Zaker, 2016). The dominant perception of oppression by deaf people of the hearing culture may also affect how hearing teachers viewed the role of culture in planning and executing ASL instructional experiences. This process was further confounded by the safety of the herd concept where deaf community members bond together and exclude what they perceive to be an intolerant and insensitive hearing community (Zaker, 2016). In the end, hearing ASL teachers may view their roles as mediators and moderators of two distinct and competing language cultures. The interests of hearing ASL teachers who teach ASL may

invariably collide with ASL curricula imperatives that demand rich and prolonged exposure to deaf cultural realities (Swaney, 2015).

The policy implications which have emerged from the literature and the findings of this study point boldly to the issue of the dominance of the hearing culture and the perceived exclusion of the deaf culture where Quinto-Pozos (2011) revealed that hearing teachers' perceptions and views of culture in teaching ASL were affected by the oppressive past of the dominant oral language culture of hearing people. These realities have shaped patterns, trends, and instructional behaviors of hearing ASL teachers. In recent years, hearing ASL teachers' perception of deaf culture have been shaped by ASL curricula standards that mandated teaching of different aspects of deaf culture to hearing learners (Swaney, 2015). Undoubtedly, hearing teachers' perceptions of deaf culture may evolve through exposure to lesson content about socialization and acculturation in deaf cultures. These curricula standards required teachers to expose second language learners to pictorial information about deaf culture through exclusive use of the target language. Spoken English in the ASL, second language classroom is discouraged (Quinto-Pozos, 2011). The most significant policy imperative of these findings is to mediate the competing interests in the deaf and hearing cultures by giving greater prominence and exposure to deaf minority voices. McCaskill and O'Brian (2016) noted in the last decade that several legislative steps have been taken to bridge communication gaps between deaf and hearing cultures, but this suggests that these legislative changes should be guided by evidence-based policy directions. Some of these legislative steps include the Civil Rights Act that allow federal agencies working with the deaf to develop policies and practices as well as to help these agencies shape policies that define the roles of sign language interpreters. Policy implications from this study should be viewed in the context of the limitations in the sampling size and

selection. More robust and representative policy implications can be extrapolated from future studies with larger samples and a quasi-experimental design.

Praxis implications. The implications for praxis are similar to the implications for policy because this study envisions that policy will guide classroom practice where teachers are equipped with technological tools and skills that support deaf cultural integration in teaching ASL to hearing students. In addition, the necessary technological tools (computers, smartboards, CD-ROMS) are needed to augment the learning experiences of hearing students. Teachers can use these different technological tools to design and support students' learning. For example, the literature suggests that the use of a variety of instructional media/technology can be used to teach ASL vocabulary to hearing learners (Fourie, 2000). Some of these instructional media included videos designed specifically to teach sign language, compact discs-read only memory (CD-ROMs), and other software applications. These advanced instructional media tools allowed hearing ASL learners to engage in asynchronous learning, model ASL skills through computer-simulated learning activities, and develop cultural awareness and sensitivity for the target language through predefined mimetic activities (Fourie, 2000). Other advantages of computerized assisted learning were a high level of interaction that was facilitated between the second language user and the instructional software which reduced teacher directed instructional time, augmented learning capabilities of struggling learners, and reduced instructional planning time, and helped the second language learner control when and how he or she learned new vocabulary (Fourie, 2000). These findings were supported by Cannon et al., (2010) who revealed digital versatile discs (DVDs) and preparatory introduction to targeted vocabulary were effective in enhancing the rate of vocabulary acquisition, but DVDs alone were found to be ineffective in vocabulary learning. Furthermore, Keating and Mirus (2003) asserted computer-assisted learning

revolutionized how hearing second language learners developed and utilized their ASL communicative skills. Computer software and other tools can shape how ASL vocabulary is acquired and used by helping target language users to learn the fundamentals of the language at a faster pace, alter how messages are understood, and immerse themselves in repetitive signing activities that deepen their understanding of how ASL vocabulary is configured. Webcams and other output tools can be used to assist hearing ASL learners to develop useful communicative skills that will enhance the quality and texture of their conversation with native and non-native ASL users (Keating & Mirus, 2003). Marschark and Spencer (2012) revealed that technologies such as “television and in-class captioning, interactive whiteboards, tablet PCs, and handheld technologies” also play a significant role in educating deaf and hearing students.

The use of technology choices to enhance the learning experiences of hearing students taking ASL was a point of disagreement among hearing non-native ASL teachers in this study. This disagreement in pedagogical approach and design has affected instructional practices and teaching and learning outcomes. For example, I observed that some hearing teachers of ASL have integrated socio-cultural and socio-linguistic philosophies in choosing instructional approaches, techniques, and strategies to engage their students in the use of a second language. These observations that were identified in the statement of the problem can be remedied by policy and praxis guidelines that speak directly to the development of instructional approaches, techniques, and strategies for ASL teachers in the classroom like voice on and voice off supports. The most significant praxis implication that emerged from the literature was articulated by Rosen et al., (2014) who revealed that students in an exclusive second language learning environment were more disposed to develop language skills and master linguistic tests and assessments, and even demonstrate superior performance in learning situations where target and native languages

were infused to mediate communication processes. These findings reinforced results of other studies that have found that vocabulary instruction in second language learning situations is more successful when the target language is used as the exclusive language of induction (e.g. Rosen et al., 2014).

Future research implications

The findings of this study have several implications for ASL educational research including sampling guidelines and type of research design approaches. I used a qualitative approach to examine the research problem stated in Chapter 1 and the related research questions. Additional research designs could support examinations of factors that teachers in this study referenced as important including cultural diversity, vocabulary instruction, and signs and non-manual signals. For example, using experimental and a quasi-experimental design would allow researchers to measure cause and effect, manipulate independent and dependent variables, and test directional and nondirectional hypotheses to examine findings such as those postulated in the literature. For example, Rosen et al (2015) found that hearing ASL instructors who used technological instructional methods and media were more excited and enthused to learn about iconic signs and phonological patterns. Further examination of the relationship between use of technology and ASL teacher outcomes is warranted.

The most significant implication that emerged from this study for future research is to understand what Holcomb et al., (2016) described as the oppressive nature of the hearing culture and the perceived level of alienation in the deaf community. Today, deaf people still feel alienated and disenfranchised from the hearing community because of their historical experiences of exclusion, separation, and rejection. Secondly, interpreters and teachers of signed

languages have been accused by members of the deaf community as purveyors and facilitators of systematic prejudices and future research should seek to understand these dichotomous variables of disenfranchisement, alienation, and articulate how they can be mediated in the teaching and learning context.

As the researcher, I would like to recommend that educational policy governing ASL education include guidelines on integrating deaf cultural experiences in teaching ASL to hearing students. These guidelines should include a component that will allow hearing ASL students to observe and learn and gain phenomenological insights about the deaf culture through a deaf culture curriculum or class solely focused on nuances of the deaf community. For future research, I would like to recommend that a cross-sectional research design and a randomized sampling approach be used to explore the effects on the implementation of a deaf culture and/or instructional technology enhancements on hearing student's achievement in high school level ASL classrooms.

Researcher Reflexivity

I am aware that a qualitative study means the researcher is the instrument in the study and I began this process by deeply reflecting on how I would be able to maintain rigor and validity in the research process. From the outset, I knew that I had to collect copious data in order to validate the findings from the interview process. My process of validating the findings of this study involved triangulating data sources through interviews, fieldnotes with teacher reflexive notes and a researcher's reflexive journal. Importantly, my observations formed the basis of the field notes I recorded in this study. As the study developed, I continued to reflect on the process of quality assurance, rigor, and validity. The process of reflection culminated with these

important ideas which were to (a) organize my data sets (b) code my data sets (c) compare my coding categories and (d) compare my data from different data sources. This process allowed me to clean the data through member checks as well as to identify major themes and findings in this study. This process allowed me to reduce researcher bias and maintain the trustworthiness criteria articulated in Chapter 3 of this case study.

The research process was challenging and rewarding. I began this study with an idea in my head about how my fellow hearing teachers taught ASL to hearing students at the high school level. I wanted to explore this in my dissertation because I also taught ASL to hearing students for almost two decades and I had questions about instructional practices and deaf cultural experiences in teaching ASL as a second language. I found the research process challenging because of the nature of a qualitative design that required collection of copious data that had to be analyzed, coded, and organized into meaningful data sets. My purpose statement began as an assessment and evaluation of hearing ASL teachers' perceptions and through the data collection process I began to see the change in my purpose statement. I began to understand ASL teachers' perceptions and views of teaching ASL. I realize my statements served a different purpose. As I gained a better understanding the iterations of the purpose statement also improved. I also began to understand the teachers' perceptions and views as my purpose changed within the process.

This takes me to my initial postulation about the rewarding nature of this study. I discovered that most teachers who were interviewed in this study identified deaf-hearing cultural connections and etiquette as important paradigmatic experiences. These experiences were similar to my own because I saw deaf culture as important to hearing students acquiring ASL as a second language. I felt as these teachers did, that the minority voices in deaf culture were unique and essential to students' understanding of the nature and functions of the language. I was also

acutely aware of the dichotomous phenomenon in deaf and hearing cultures where the deaf population saw the hearing culture as oppressive. My experiences were corroborated by the teachers in this study who felt deaf minority voices were important to the instructional process because these voices were useful to teachers developing their instructional etiquette. Expansion in this area of curriculum needs is necessary for the future growth and expansion of the ASL field.

I found my voice and place in this study as a hearing researcher and ASL teacher. As this study evolved, I began to code teachers' transcripts at the level 1 coding process (Saldana, 2016). During the coding process, I realized that I identified with their shared experiences of becoming ASL teachers and the journey of teaching ASL to high school students. The identities of these teachers were also intertwined with my own as I struggled to teach sign and non-manual signals. I also struggled to find my place in that unique chasm that separates the hearing and deaf cultures. I am aware that as a hearing person, I am part of a dominant language culture that put me in a position of privilege. As a researcher I came to understand that my privilege was not access to the deaf language and culture. It is an honor to be able to present fellow ASL teacher perspectives and understand they hold the same perspectives. The deaf culture is indispensable. Respect is due to the deaf community when handling their beloved signed language. ASL is center of their community; this is how hearing people are invited into their culture. However, there is a dichotomy in values, even though we are invited in there is a distaste for hearing teachers teaching their language. There must be a place of collaboration where hearing and deaf can come together for the advancement of ASL education.

Unexpectedly, as a researcher working through the coding process, I was exposed to the personal stories of hearing non-native ASL teachers. In the process of coding, Saldana (2016)

says, "...some say identity is what you do; some say it is what you value and believe". It is here that I found my identity as a researcher. I am a reflection of the hearing ASL teachers' words. I am forever changed. I have been catapulted into action for advocacy and collaboration to encourage curriculum development in the field. Researchers should be aware of the emotions which can be evoked from coding and reflecting on a topic that is close to the heart. In the beginning I was trying to articulate what the teachers had to say. I thought the emotion was fear of rejection but in reality, it was an affirmation heard through the words of the hearing ASL teachers that brought on the emotions. Research propels you to action.

Hearing ASL Teacher Reflexivity

I always felt that diversifying instruction by using visual strategies, voice instruction and total language immersion, HOLME understanding, expository teaching and modeling aspects of the lesson, and technology in instruction were important to my teaching process. These strategies were also strategies I used as a teacher to support my hearing ASL students and they were very effective in overcoming some of the challenges I identified in teaching signs and non-manual signals such as variations in signs, outdated instructional strategies, deaf advocacy, and curriculum implementation challenges. I felt that challenges in teaching signs and non-manuals could be solved by diversifying ASL instructional approaches and immersing students in both the deaf and hearing culture. My most rewarding teaching experience was modeling aspects of the lesson in sign where my hearing students would learn to produce appropriate signs and non-manual signals in suitable conversational settings. This modeling strategy was very effective and useful in overcoming some of the curriculum implementation challenges I encountered in teaching my hearing students and helped me fix early signing errors and introduce current sign vocabulary.

I also feel it is important to reflect on some of the experiences and perceptions of teachers in this study that were dissimilar to my experiences of teaching ASL to hearing students. The two divergent points were outdated strategies that were used to teach signs and non-manual signals and deaf advocacy experiences postulated by Teachers A and C. These two experiences stand out because they are not reflective of my journey in teaching ASL, and I feel it is necessary to explain why these differences exist.

I was surprised when I observed Teacher C and discovered that her novice colleagues' strategies for teaching ASL were outdated and often involved use of books and Quizlet. I became even more horrified as I reflected on the evolution of my ASL teaching experiences. I felt Teacher C was evolving in her craft while her colleague failed to evolve with current trends in ASL instructional practices. This situation inhibited Teacher C's higher level ASL classes from successful language acquisition. As an evolving teacher, I was using more interactive and student-centered strategies with ASL students even in my novice years. I have always been aware that ASL is a 3-D language, which allows teachers to use gestures, facial expressions, and body language to model how students should use signs and non-manual signals and that has been how I have taught my students over these decades. I owe my sensitivity and awareness to this area to my past professors, both deaf and hearing who modeled the beauty of ASL and deaf culture in the classroom.

Deaf advocacy as imagined by the deaf community is one area in which I have not been fully engaged. As I reflected on Teacher B's postulations about advocacy, I became aware that my years of teaching ASL have not always been underpinned by deaf advocacy. I felt some degree of disappointment as I thought about this because I am aware that advocacy is a strategy to enhance visibility in deaf communities. I started many different activities during my teaching

time where I took my ASL students out to be involved in their community and show ASL in their community, but it has never gone beyond an exposure level. I understand that hearing ASL students should also be involved because this will help them to understand and appreciate the challenges faced by the deaf community who often feel alienated from the dominant hearing community. I admit some level of disappointment where I could not identify instances when I really went beyond the basic exposure level and did not advocate for deaf people and their culture on a community level. Possibly fear of rejection from the deaf community and the reality I was part of the oppressive hearing community halted my further participation. I think this study is also my contribution to that process of advocacy. I feel these findings should help to generate and encourage the discussion about ASL education in the U.S. and how hearing non-native ASL teachers and students can advocate for the rights of this silent minority.

Limitations and Delimitations

Limitations of this study include a small sample size that limited findings to the sample of three participants, a non-probability sampling approach that limited access to diverse sampling units, and the absence of a control group that weakened the significance of the findings of this study. While there are only twelve ASL teachers in the county, I was able to interview three and include myself for a total of one third of the voices of ASL teachers from the county. I was also prevented from accessing research sites because standardized tests were in progress and this process also limited the effective collection of descriptive field-notes. This study was delimited to a sample of three hearing non-native ASL teachers who taught ASL to high school students in the southeastern United States. These teachers were educational professionals who received ASL certification and taught for a minimum of five years. My investigation was delimited to

investigating the perceptions of hearing non-native ASL teachers who teach ASL to hearing students.

Summary

This chapter discussed the major findings relating to the three research questions outlined in this study. The findings revealed that hearing non-native ASL teachers diversified their instructional approaches, deaf and hearing cultures were seen as important in teaching ASL as a second language, and the teaching of sign and non-manual signals was revealed to be very challenging. These challenges were seen as unique to this learning context because of the nature ASL that required hearing students to turn off their voices and communicate using signs and non-manual signals. The big idea that I identified in this study is the need for the hearing community to establish harmonious working relationships with the deaf community to build levels of trust and narrow the communication gap. This process can be best facilitated by advocates from both communities (deaf & hearing) whose goal is to foster collaborative working relationships to further the field of ASL education. We all have a part in the process.

References

- Abukhattala, I. (2013). Krashen's five proposal on language learning: Are they valid in Libyan EFL classes? *English Language Teaching*, 6(1), 128-131.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/elt.v6n1p128>
- Alvi, A. (2016). A manual for selecting sampling techniques in research.
http://www.mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/70218/1/MPRA_paper_70218.pdf
- Alpi, K.M., & Evans, J.J. (2019). Distinguishing case study as a research method from case reports as a publication type. *Journal of the Medical Library Association*, 107(1), 1-5.
<http://dx.doi:10.5195/jmla.2019.615>
- American Speech-Language-Hearing Association (2018). The prevalence and incidence of hearing loss in children. Retrieved from <http://www.asha.org/public/hearing/prevalence-and-incidence-of-hearing-loss-in-children/>
- Anderson, C., & Kirkpatrick, S. (2016). Narrative interviewing. *International Journal of Clinical Pharmacology*, 38(3), 631-634. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11096-015-0222-0>
- Ashton, G. (2011). Standards for learning American Sign Language. Retrieved from <http://www.interpretereducation.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/06/ASL-Standards-March-2011-draft-pub.pdf>
- Asiamah, N., Mensah, H.K., & Oteng-Abayie, E. (2017). General, target, and accessible population. *The Qualitative Report*, 22(6), 1607-1621. Retrieved from <http://www.nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr/vol22/iss6/9>

- Baxter, P., & Jack, S. (2008). Qualitative case study methodology: Study design and implementation of novice researchers. *The Qualitative Report*, 13(4), 544-559. Retrieved from <http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/QR13-4/baxter.pdf>
- Benitez-Quiroz, C.F., Gokgoz, K., Wilbur, R.B., & Martinez, A.M. (2014). Discriminant features and temporal structure of non-manuals in American sign language. *PLoSOne*, 9(2), 1-17. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0086268>
- Berger, R. (2017). Now I see it, now I don't: Researcher's position and reflexivity in qualitative research. *Qualitative Research*, 15(2), 219-234. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1468794112468475>
- Bialystok, E. (1990). The competence of processing: Classifying theories of second language acquisition. *TESOL Quarterly*, 24(4), 635-648. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/3587112>
- Brown, H.D. (2007). *Principles of language learning and teaching* (5th Ed.) White Plains, NY:Longman.
- Campbell, D. (2017). Using online grammar lessons for student fluency in American Sign Language. Retrieved from http://www.digitalcommons.csumb.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1112&context=caps_thes_all
- Cannon, J.E., Fredrick, L.D., & Easterbrooks, S.R. (2010). Vocabulary instruction through books read in American sign language for English-language learners with hearing loss. *Communication Disorder Quarterly*, 31(2), 98-112. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1525740109332832>

- Child Australia (2016). What is pedagogy? How does it influence our practice? Retrieved from <http://www.childaustralia.org.au/wp-content/uploads/2017/02/CA-Statement-Pedagogy.pdf>
- Chomsky, N. (1972). *Language and mind*. New York, NY: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich
- Chomsky, N. (1986). *Knowledge of language: Its nature, origin, and use*. New York, NY: Praeger.
- Chun, S.Y. (2014). EFL learner's beliefs about native and non-native English-speaking teachers: Perceived strengths, weaknesses, and preferences. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 35(6), 563-579.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2014.889141>
- Clark, B. (2016). Relevance theory and language change. *Lingua* 175(176), 139-153.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2015.12.007>
- Compernelle, R.A., & Williams, L. (2013). Sociocultural theory and second language pedagogy. *Language Teaching Research*, 17(3), 277-281.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1362168813482933>
- Conte-Morgan, M. (2002). Connecting the dots: Limited English proficiency, second language learning theories, and information literacy instruction. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 28(4), 191-196. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0099-1333\(02\)00282-3](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0099-1333(02)00282-3)
- Cope, D.G. (2014). Methods and meanings: Credibility and trustworthiness of qualitative research. *Oncology Nursing Forum*, 41(1), 89-91. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1188/14.ONF.89-91>
- Davidson, L. (2017). Personal experience narratives in the deaf community: Identifying deaf - world typicality. Retrieved from

- <http://www.clok.uclan.ac.uk/20486/1/20486%20Davidson%20Lesley%20Final%20e-Thesis%20%28Master%20Copy%29.pdf>
- Denzin, N., & Lincoln, Y. (2011). *Handbook of qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Dolati, R. (2012). Overview on three core theories of language acquisition and criticisms. *Advances in Natural and Applied Sciences*, 6(6), 752-762. Retrieved from <http://www.aensiweb.com/old/anas/2012/752-762.pdf>
- Dragow, E. (2016). American Sign Language. Retrieved from <http://www.britannica.com/topic/American-Sign-Language>
- Everett, D.L. (2012). *Language: The cultural tool*. New York, NY: Vintage.
- Fourie, R.J. (2000). Efficiency of a hearing person learning sign language vocabulary from a hearing media versus a teacher. *Deafness and Education International*, 2(1), 45-60. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1179/146431500790561251>
- Geitz, M. (2013). ASL handshape stories, word recognition, and signing deaf readers: An exploratory study. Retrieved from <http://www.eric.ed.gov/?id=ED560378>
- Georgeiva, M. (2014). Introducing sociolinguistics. Retrieved from <http://www.research.uni-sofia.bg/bitstream/123456789/1209/1/Introducing%20SociolinguisticsMG.pdf>
- Gomez-Laich, M.P. (2016). Second language learners' divergence from target language pragmatic norms. *SSLT*, 6(2), 249-269. <http://dx.doi.org/10.14746/ssllt.2016.6.2>
- Green, H.E. (2014). Use of theoretical and conceptual frameworks in qualitative research. *Nurse Researcher*, 21(6), 34-38. <http://dx.doi.org/10.7748/nr.21.6.34.e1252>
- Grieve-Smith., A.B., MacFarlene, J., Stately, J., & Waters, G. (2008). Effects of language experience on the perception of American Sign Language. *Cognition*, 109(1), 41-53. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2008.07.016>

- Hall, W.C., Holcomb, T.K., & Elliot, M. (2016). Using popular education with the oppressors of class: Suggestions for sign language interpretation education. *Critical Education*, 7(13), 2-18. Retrieved from <http://www.ojs.library.ubc.ca/index.php/criticaled/article/view/186129>
- Haspelmath, M., & Sims, A.D. (2010). *Understanding morphology*. Euston Road, London: Hodder Education.
- Hawkins, R. (2001). The theoretical significance of universal grammar in second language acquisition. *Second Language Research*, 17(4), 345-367. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/026765830101700404>
- Healey, C. (2015). Wearing your heart on your face: Non-manual affective constructions in American sign language. Retrieved from <http://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fpsyg.2013.00115/pdf>
- Henner, J., Caldwell-Harris, C., Novogrodsky, R., & Hoffmeister, R. (2016). American Sign Language syntax and analogical reasoning skills are influenced by early acquisition and age of entry to signing schools for the deaf. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 7(1982), 2-14.
- Horejes, T. D. (2012). *Social constructions of deafness: Examining deaf language cultures in education*. Washington, DC: Gallaudet University Press.
- Houghton, C.E., Casey, D., Shaw, D., & Murphy, K. (2010). Ethical challenges in qualitative research: Examples from practice. *Nursing Research*, 18(1), 15-25. <http://dx.doi.org/10.7748/nr2010.10.18.1.15.c8044>
- Hulin, R., & Na, X. (2014). A study of Chomsky's grammar in second language acquisition. *International Journal on Studies in English Language and Literature*, 2(12), 1-17. Retrieved from <http://www.arcjournals.org>

- Humphries, T., Kushalnagar, R., Mathur, G., Napoli, D.J., Padden, C., Rathmann, C.... & Smith, S. (2013). The Right to Language. *Journal of Law and Medical Ethics*, 41(4), 4-20.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/jlme.12097>
- IDEA Data Center (2018). IDEA quality technical assistance. Retrieved from
<http://www.ideadata.org/technical-assistance>
- Jiang, M., Green, R.J., Henley, T.B., & Masten, W.G. (2009). Acculturation in relation to the acquisition of a second language. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 30(6), 481-492. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01434630903147898>
- Kaiser, K. (2009). Protecting respondent confidentiality in qualitative research. *Qualitative Health Research*, 9(11), 1632-1641. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1049732309350879>
- Keating, E., & Mirus, G. (2003). American sign language in virtual space: Interactions between deaf users of computer-mediated video communication and the impact of technology on language practices. *Language In Society*, 32(5), 693-714. Retrieved from
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/4169299>
- Krashen, S.D. (2009). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. New York, NY: Pergamon Press.
- Kurt, K.B., & Taylor, M.M. (2008). Learning outcomes for American Sign Language skill levels 1-4. Retrieved from
<http://www.scholarworks.rit.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1062&context=books>
- Lantolf, J.P., & Pavlenko, A. (2008). Socio-cultural theory and second language acquisition. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 15, 108-124.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0267190500002646>

- Lantolf, J.P., & Poehner, M.E. (2014). *Sociocultural theory and the pedagogical imperative in L2 education: Vygotskian praxis and the research practice divide*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Lincoln, Y.S., & Guba, E.G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Lopez-Class, M., Castro, F., & Ramirez, A.G. (2011). Conceptions of acculturation: A review of statement and critical issues. *Social Sciences and Medicine*, 72(9), 1555-1562.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2011.03.01>
- Loh, J. (2013). Inquiry into issues of trustworthiness and quality in narrative studies: A perspective. *The Qualitative Report*, 18(65), 1-5. Retrieved from
https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Jason-Loh-3/publication/260312062_Inquiry_into_Issues_of_Trustworthiness_and_Quality_in_Narrative_Studies_A_Perspective/links/0c960530c1a8e125b0000000/Inquiry-into-Issues-of-Trustworthiness-and-Quality-in-Narrative-Studies-A-Perspective.pdf
- Maharaj, N. (2016). Using field notes to facilitate critical reflection. *Reflective Practice*, 17(2), 114-124. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14623943.2015.1134472>
- McCaskill, A., & O'Brian, C. (2016). Outsiders in a hearing world: A book still relevant today [Review of the book: Outsiders in a hearing world: Sociology of deafness. *American Annals of the Deaf*, 160(5), 510-513
- Merriam, S.B. (1998). Qualitative research and case study applications in education. Retrieved from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED415771>.
- Mirzaee, S., & Maftoon, P. (2016). An examination of Vygotsky's sociocultural theory in second language acquisition: The role of higher order thinking enhancing techniques and the EFL's use of private speech in the construction of reasoning. *Asia-Pacific Journal of*

Second and Foreign and Language Education, 1(18), 2-25.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s40862-016-0022-7>

Mitchell, R.E., & Karchmer, M.A. (2004). Chasing the mythical ten percent: Parental hearing status of deaf and hard of hearing students in the United States. *Sign Language Studies*, 4(2), 138-163. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1353/sls.2005.0004>

Mithcell, R.E., Young, T.A., Bachleda, B., & Karchmer, M.A. (2017). How many people use ASL in the United States? Why estimates need updating. Retrieved from http://www.researchgate.net/publication/228394977_How_Many_People_Use_ASL_in_the_United_States_Why_Estimates_Need_Updating

Moore, D.F. (2011). Waist deep in the big muddy: The individuals with disabilities education act (IDEA) and no child left behind. *American Annals of the Deaf*, 115(5), 523-525. [10.1353/aad.2011.0003](http://dx.doi.org/10.1353/aad.2011.0003)

Morford, J.P., & Carlson, M.L. (2011). Sign perception and recognition in non-native signers of ASL. *Journal of Language Learning and Development*, 7(2), 149-168. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15475441.2011.543393>

Morford, J.P., Grieve-Smith, A.B., MacFarlane, J., Staley, J., & Walters, G. (2008). Effects of language experience on the perception of American sign language. *Journal of Cognition*, 109(1), 41-53. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2008.07.016>

Nappi, J. (2017). The importance of questioning in developing critical thinking skills. *The Delta Gamma Bulletin: International Journal for Professional Educators*, 84(1), 30-41.

National Institute on Deafness and Communication Disorders (2016). American Sign Language. Retrieved from

<http://www.nidcd.nih.gov/sites/default/files/Documents/health/hearing/NIDCD-American-Sign-Language.pdf>

National Resource Governance Institute (2015). Legal framework: Navigating the web of laws and contracts governing extractive industries. Retrieved from http://www.resourcegovernance.org/sites/default/files/documents/nrgi_primer_legal-framework.pdf

Ortega, L. (2013). *Understanding second language acquisition*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Ortlipp, M. (2008). Keeping and using reflective journal in qualitative research process. *The Qualitative Report*, 13(4), 695-705. Retrieved from <http://www.nsuworks.nova.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1579&context=tqr>

Phillippi, J., & Lauderdale, J. (2017). A guide to field-notes for qualitative research: Context and conversations. *Qualitative Health Research*, 28(3), 381-388. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1049732317697102>

Pizzo, L. (2013). Vocabulary instruction for the development of American sign language in deaf children: An investigation into teacher knowledge and experience. Retrieved from <http://www.dlib.bc.edu/islandora/object/bc-ir:101408/datastream/PDF/.../citation.pdf>

Quinto-Pozos, D. (2011). Teaching American Sign Language to hearing adult learners. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 31, 137-158. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0267190511000195>

Rahman, M. (2016). The advantages and disadvantages of using qualitative and quantitative approaches and methods in language “testing and assessment” research: A literature review. *Journal of Education and Learning*, 6(1), 102-112. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/jel.v6n1p102>

- Rahman, M.M., & Pandian, A. (2016). The gap between research and practice in the field of SLA: The rationale behind it and bridging the gap. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research*, 3(3), 162-172. Retrieved from <http://www.researchgate.net/publication/301959561>
- Reagan, T. (2011). Ideological barriers to American Sign Language: Unpacking linguistic resistance. *Sign Language Studies*, 11(4), 606-635. Retrieved from <http://www.questia.com/read/1P3-2389995921/ideological-barriers-to-american-sign-language-unpacking>
- Roach, P. (2009). *English phonetics and phonology*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Roberson, L., & Shaw, S. (2015). Reflections on deaf education: Perspectives of deaf senior citizens. *Educational Gerontology*, 41, 226-237. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03601277.2014.951194>
- Rosen, R.S. (2008). American Sign Language as a Foreign Language in U.S. High Schools: State of the Art. *The Modern Language Journal*, 92(1), 10-38. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org.ezproxy.lib.usf.edu/stable/25172990>
- Rosen, R.S. (2010). American sign language curricula: A review. *Student Language Studies*, 10(3), 348-381. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1353/sls.0.0050>
- Rosen, R.S. (2014). Between-learners' outside-of-classroom uses of American Sign Language as a foreign language. *Sign Language Studies*, 14(3). <http://dx.doi.org/10.1353/sls.2014.001>
- Rosen, R.S., Delouise, M., Boyle, A.T., & Daley, K. (2014). *Native language, target language, and the teaching and learning of American sign language*. In: McKee D., Rosen R.S., McKee R. (eds) *Teaching and Learning Signed Languages*. Palgrave Macmillan, London.

- Rosen, R. (2015). Learning American Sign Language in high school. *The Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education*, 21(3), 342. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/deafed/enw020>
- Rosen, M., Turtletaub, M., Delouise, M., & Drake, S. (2015). Teacher-as-researcher paradigm for sign language teachers: Towards evidenced-based pedagogies for improved learner outcomes. *Sign Language Studies*, 16(1), 86-116. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1353/sls.2015.0026>
- Saeipoor, N., Mustapha, G., Isamil, I.A., & Krauss, S.E. (2011). Second language learner's access to universal grammar: A syntactic perspective. *Pertanika Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 19(2), 291-304. Retrieved from [http://www.pertanika.upm.edu.my/Pertanika%20PAPERS/JSSH%20Vol.%2019%20\(2\)%20Sep.%202011%20\(View%20Full%20Journal\).pdf](http://www.pertanika.upm.edu.my/Pertanika%20PAPERS/JSSH%20Vol.%2019%20(2)%20Sep.%202011%20(View%20Full%20Journal).pdf)
- Saldana, J. (2016). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*. New York, NY: Sage Publications.
- Schlesinger, A. (2016). Deaf and hard of hearing children and their families. Retrieved from <http://www.centerforchildwelfare.fmhi.usf.edu/Training/2016cpsummit/Deaf%20and%20Hard%20of%20Hearing%20Children.pdf>
- Schumann, J.H. (1985). Research on the acculturation model for second language acquisition. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 7(5), 379-392. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01434632.1986.9994254>
- Smith, P.W. (2017). The syntax of semantic agreement in English. *Journal of linguistics*, 53(4), 823-841. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0022226716000360>
- Snowdon, C., Brocklehurst, P., Tasker, R., Platt, M.W., Harvey, S., & Elbourne, D. (2014). *Death, bereavement, and randomized controlled trials (BRACELET). A methodological*

study of policy and practice in neo-natal and pediatric intensive care units. Southampton, UK: Queen's Printer and Controller.

Staden, A.V. (2013). An evaluation of an intervention using sign language and multisensory coding to support word learning and reading comprehension of deaf signing children. *Child Language Teaching and Therapy*, 29(3), 305-318.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0265659013479961>

Stefansson, E.G. (2013). Second language acquisition: The effect of age and motivation. Retrieved from <http://www.skemman.is/bitstream/1946/15018/1/BA%20EinarG.pdf>

Swaney, M.G. (2015). American Sign Language curriculum and materials. Retrieved from http://trace.tennessee.edu/utk_gradthes/3516/.

Thanh, N.C., & Thanh, T.T. (2015). The interconnection between interpretivist paradigm and qualitative methods in education. *American Journal of Educational Sciences*, 1(2), 24-27. Retrieved from <http://www.aiscience.org/journal/ajes>

The United States Census Bureau (2014). Close to half new immigrants report high English-language speaking ability-Census Bureau reports. Retrieved from <http://www.census.gov/newsroom/press-releases/2014/cb14-105.html>

Turuk, M.C. (2008). The relevance and implications of Vygotsky's sociocultural theory in the second language classroom. *ARECLS*, 5, 244-262. Retrieved from http://wwwresearch.ncl.ac.uk/ARECLS/volume_5/turuk_vol5.pdf

Tyrer, S., & Hayman, B. (2016). Sampling in epidemiological research: Issues, hazards, and pitfalls. *British Journal of Psychology Bulletin*, 40(2), 570-560.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1192/pb.bp.114.050203>

- Vaismoradi, M., Turunen, H., & Bondas, T. (2013). Content analysis and thematic analysis: Implications for conducting a qualitative descriptive study. *Nursing Health and Sciences*, 15(3), 398-405. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/nhs.12048>
- Villamizar, L.J. (2017). The effects of Vygotsky's sociocultural theory on second language acquisition and language input. *Espiral, Revista de Docencia e Investigación*, 7(1), 91-102. Retrieved from <http://www.revistas.ustabuca.edu.co/index.php/ESPIRAL/article/viewFile/1780/1474>
- Vygotsky, L., & Cole, M. (1978). *Mind in society: Development of higher psychological processes*. New York, NY: Harvard University Press.
- Wang, M. (2014). *Introduction to sign language: The visual dictionary*. Saket Block, Mandawali Fazalpur: Lakshi Publishers and Distributors.
- Ward, C., & Geeraert, N. (2016). Advancing acculturation theory and research: The acculturation process in its ecological context. *Current Opinion on Psychology*, 8, 98-104. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2015.09.021>
- Wilcox, S., & Wilcox, P. (1998). *Learning to see: American sign language as a second language* (2nd ed). Gallaudet University Press.
- Yin, R.K. (2014). *Case study research designs and methods* (5th Ed). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Yip, C., Han, N., & Sng, B.L. (2016). Legal and ethical issues in research. *Indian Journal of Anesthesia*, 60(9), 684-688. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4103/0019-5049.190627>
- Zaker, A. (2016). The acculturation model of second language acquisition: Inspecting weaknesses and strengths. *Indonesian EFL Journal*, 2(2), 80-87. <http://dx.doi.org/10.25134/ieflj.v2i2.640>

Zdrojewski, B.A. (1998). The effect of learning vocabulary words in American sign language on hearing fourth grade students. Retrieved from https://digitalcommons.brockport.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?referer=https://scholar.google.com/&httpsredir=1&article=1474&context=ehd_theses

Zubaidi, N. (2015). Sociocultural theory. Retrieved from <http://www.researchgate.net/publication/27789266>

Appendices

Appendix A: Semi-Structured Interview Protocol

Semi-Structured Interview

Introduction: I want to thank you for agreeing to do this interview. The purpose of this interview is to capture your perceptions, views, and interpretations of teaching ASL to hearing students in high school. This interview will last for a total of 180 minutes and will be administered in four 45-minute slots over a period of a week with each participant. I have organized guiding questions into Section A that will explore your socio-demographic information, Section B will explore your stories of teaching ASL vocabulary, Section C will explore your stories about deaf and hearing cultures in teaching ASL, and Section D will explore your stories of teaching manual and non-manual signals to hearing students in high school.

Section A: Socio-Demographic Profile

- (1) Gender:
- (2) Age:
- (3) Race:
- (4) I have been teaching for the past _____
- (5) My highest level of academic certification is a _____
- (6) I completed a two-year program of certification to teach ASL _____

Section B: Teaching ASL Vocabulary

- (7) I am collecting stories about hearing teachers' experiences of teaching ASL vocabulary to hearing students. Could you tell me about your experiences? I want you to share all those

experiences you find important. I will listen and take notes and you may start and stop when you are ready.

(8) Do you remember any challenges you had teaching ASL vocabulary to this group of students?

(9) Do you recall steps or processes you used to deal with those challenges?

Section B: Deaf and Hearing Cultures

(10) Please tell me your stories of how you view deaf and hearing cultures in teaching ASL to your students. I want you to share all those experiences you find important. I will listen and take notes and you may start and stop when you are ready.

(11) How have your stories changed over the years?

(12) Can you please tell me of the time you became aware that deaf and hearing cultures were part of the ASL instructional agenda?

Section D: Signs and non-Manual Signals

(13) Please tell me your stories of teaching and signs and non-manual signals to your ASL students. I want you to share all those experiences you find important. I will listen and take notes and you may start and stop when you are ready

(14) Please share your stories of some of the “big issues” that came up during this process

(15) Do you have any stories to share about how you approached those big issues?

Appendix B: Informed Consent



Informed Consent to Participate in Research Information to Consider Before Taking Part in this Research Study

IRB Study # 00038821

You are being asked to take part in a research study. Research studies include only people who choose to take part. This document is called an informed consent form. Please read this information carefully and take your time making your decision. Ask the researcher to discuss this consent form with you, please ask him/her to explain any words or information you do not clearly understand. We encourage you to talk with your family and friends before you decide to take part in this research study. The nature of the study, risks, inconveniences, and other important information about the study are listed below.

We are asking you to take part in a research study called: Teacher Instructional Experiences: A Case Study of Perceptions of High School American Sign Language Teachers Who are Hearing.

Study Staff: This study is being led by Rhonda S. Leslie, who is a student at University of South Florida. This person is called the Principal Investigator. She is being guided in this research by Dr. David Allsopp. Other approved research staff may act on behalf of the Principal Investigator.

Purpose of the study

Study Details:

The purpose of this study is to: assess hearing ASL teachers' perceptions of teacher instructional experiences using a case study research design in a sample of 3-8 ASL teachers in co-educational high schools in southeastern United States. This study will explore views hearing ASL teachers have formed of instructional approaches used to teach ASL vocabulary to non-native learners in high school, their perceptions of culture in teaching ASL as a second language, and capture hearing ASL teachers' experiences of teaching signs and non-manual signals to non-native hearing ASL learners in high school.

Participants: You are being asked to take part because you are a hearing ASL teacher working in a high school where ASL is offered as a foreign language credit.

Voluntary Participation: Your participation is voluntary. You do not have to participate and may stop your participation at any time. There will be no penalties or loss of benefits or opportunities if you do not participate or decide to stop once you start. Alternatives to participating in the study Include: You do not have to participate in this research study and may decline consent. Your decision to participate or not to participate will not affect your job status, employment record, employee evaluations, or advancement opportunities.

Benefits, Compensation, and Risk: We do not know if you will receive any benefit from your participation. There is no cost to participate. This research is considered minimal risk. Minimal risk means that study risks are the same as the risks you face in daily life.

Confidentiality: Even if we publish the findings from this study, we will keep your study information private and confidential. Anyone with the authority to look at your records must keep them confidential.

Study Procedures

If you take part in this study, you will be asked to:

- Participate in three separate, interview sessions over the course of an eight-week period, with each interview lasting 30 minutes. The interviews take place at a mutually agreed upon location. The interviews will not be recorded but the researcher will take handwritten notes. You will also be asked to review the transcripts of each interview for accuracy, as well as read and review the written case depiction after it is developed to verify its authenticity.
- Your ASL lessons may be observed at mutually agreed times during the study and the first author in this study (Rhonda Leslie) may record field-notes of her observations and interactions with you.
- This study may be published following completion. If it is, your name will **not** be included, nor any information which identify you.
-

Total Number of Participants

No more than three to eight adults will participate in this study.

Alternatives

You do not have to participate in this research study and may decline consent.

Benefits

We are unsure if you will receive any benefits by taking part in this research study.

Risks or Discomfort

This research is considered to be of minimal risk. That means that the risks associated with this study are the same as what you face every day. There are no known additional risks to those who take part in this study.

Compensation

You will receive no payment or other compensation for taking part in this study.

Privacy and Confidentiality

We will do our best to keep your records private and confidential. We cannot guarantee absolute confidentiality. Your personal information may be disclosed if required by law. Certain people may need to see your study records. These individuals include:

- The research team, including the Principal Investigator, study coordinator, research nurses, and all other research staff.
- Certain government and university people who need to know more about the study. For example, individuals who provide oversight on this study may need to look at your records. This is done to make sure the study is being done in the right way. They also need to make sure that your rights are being protected for your safety.
- Any agency of the federal, state, or local government that regulates this research. This includes the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) and the Office for Human Research Protection (OHRP).
- The USF Institutional Review Board (IRB) and its related staff who have oversight responsibilities for this study, staff in the USF Office of Research and Innovation, USF Division of Research Integrity and Compliance, and other USF offices who oversee this research.
- Your personal information collected for this research will be kept as long as it is needed to conduct this research. Once your participation in the research is over, your information will be stored in accordance with applicable policies and regulations. Your permission to use your personal data will not expire unless you withdraw it in writing. You may withdraw or take away your permission to use and disclose your information at any time. You do this by sending written notice to the Principal Investigator at the following address: 401 North Rome Ave, Tampa, FL 33606.
- While we are conducting the research study, we cannot let you see or copy the research information we have about you. After the research is completed, you have a right to see the information about you, as allowed by USF policies.
- If you have concerns about the use or storage of your personal information, you have a right to lodge a complaint with the data supervisory authority in your country.

Voluntary Participation / Withdrawal

You should only take part in this study if you want to volunteer. You should not feel there is any pressure to take part in the study. You are free to participate in this research or withdraw at any time. There will be no penalty or loss of benefits you are entitled to receive if you stop taking part in this study.

You can get the answers to your questions, concerns, or complaints

If you have questions about your rights as a participant in this study, general questions, or have complaints, concerns or issues you want to discuss call David Allsopp, 813-974-3274, or email, Dallsopp@usf.edu.

Consent to Take Part in this Research Study

It is up to you to decide whether you want to take part in this study. If you want to take part, please sign the form, if the following statements are true.

I freely give my consent to take part in this study. I understand that by signing this form I am agreeing to take part in research. I have received a copy of this form to take with me.

Signature of Person Taking Part in Study

Date

Printed Name of Person Taking Part in Study

Statement of Person Obtaining Informed Consent

I have carefully explained to the person taking part in the study what he or she can expect from their participation. I hereby certify that when this person signs this form, to the best of my knowledge, he/ she understands:

- What the study is about
- What procedures will be used
- What the potential benefits might be
- What the known risks might be

I can confirm that this research subject speaks the language that was used to explain this research and is receiving an informed consent form in the appropriate language. Additionally, this subject reads well enough to understand this document or, if not, this person is able to hear and understand when the form is read to him or her. This subject does not have a medical/psychological problem that would compromise comprehension and therefore makes it hard to understand what is being explained and can, therefore, give legally effective informed consent. This subject is not under any type of anesthesia or analgesic that may cloud their judgment or make it hard to understand what is being explained and, therefore, can be considered competent to give informed consent.

Signature of Person Obtaining Informed Consent

Date

Printed Name of Person Obtaining Informed Consent

Appendix C: Letter to Principals

Letter to Principals

401 N. Rome Ave.
Tampa, Fl 33606

February 2019

Mrs. Kim Moore
Principal
Middleton High School
4801 N. 22nd Street
Tampa, FL 33610

Dear Mrs. Moore

I am a final year student at the University of South Florida where I am pursuing a doctoral thesis entitled “Instructional Experiences: A Case Study of Perceptions of High School American Sign Language Teachers Who are Hearing.” The purpose of this research is to assess hearing ASL teachers’ perceptions of student-teacher instructional experiences using a case study research design.

I am requesting permission to recruit at least one hearing ASL teacher from your school to participate in this study. This study is expected to last for eight weeks and will begin January 2018 and end March 2018. Each participant recruited for this study will be asked to take part in three face-to-face interviews at mutually agreed times. Interviews will be split into three 30-minute slots and are expected to last for a maximum of 90 minutes. The first author in this study may observe study participants in the school setting and record field-notes. This study will be monitored by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at the University of South Florida (USF) and any questions or concerns you have about this study will be answered by the principal investigator, David Allsopp, 813-974-3274, or email, Dallsopp@usf.edu.

Sincerely,

Rhonda Leslie (First Author)