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ABSTRACT

Teacher Language Awareness in a Swedish Bilingual School for the Deaf:
Two Portraits of Grammar Knowledge in Practice

Amanda Howerton-Fox

This case study explores the relationship between teachers’ language knowledge and their grammar teaching practices within the context of a bilingual school for the deaf in Sweden, a country that has demonstrated success in educating deaf children bilingually in written Swedish and Sweden’s signed language. The study’s participants were two Swedish language teachers and their 17 elementary school students; both participants were identified as high quality teachers and models of the school’s approach to the bilingual education of deaf children. Teacher Language Awareness was selected as the theoretical construct through which to explore the relationship between teacher knowledge and practice because of its focus on knowledge-in-action, or the sites where knowledge intersects with practice. The study’s main data sources were classroom observation and stimulated recall interviews. Data were analyzed sequentially using a start list of codes derived from a review of the relevant literature. Two portraits of the teachers’ grammatical Teacher Language Awareness emerged from my analysis of the data. Suggested pedagogical applications for these portraits in teacher education programs are presented.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTRODUCTION</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background and Context</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden’s Bilingual Schools for the Deaf</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Role of Grammar in the Academic Success of Deaf Children</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limitations in Teachers’ Language Knowledge</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Guidelines for the Teaching of Grammar</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portraits of Teaching in Language Teacher Education</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deaf Education as a Unique Case of L2 Pedagogy</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement of the Problem</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for the Research Study</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement of Purpose and Research Question</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Researcher</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitions of Key Terms</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Traditions in Teacher Cognition and Language Awareness</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Framework for Research on Teachers’ Language Knowledge</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge about Grammar / Knowledge about Language</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Knowledge of Grammar / Subject Matter Knowledge</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogical Content Knowledge</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Language Awareness</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers’ Pedagogical Systems / Teachers’ Theories / BAK</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Teacher Language Awareness as a Unifying Theoretical Construct ...............36

Relationship Between Knowledge and Grammar Teaching Practices ..........37

Explicit Language Knowledge .................................................................. 39

Engagement style .................................................................................. 45

Error correction ................................................................................... 46

Input ................................................................................................. 48

Explanation ......................................................................................... 49

Knowledge of Learners ............................................................................. 52

Input enhancement strategies ............................................................. 52

Selection of content ............................................................................. 53

Use of metalanguage ........................................................................... 54

Comprehension checks ......................................................................... 56

Awareness of sociocultural issues ....................................................... 56

Language Proficiency ........................................................................... 58

Accurate and effective use of the target language(s) ......................... 58

Use of the non-native speaker advantage ........................................... 60

Beliefs and Feelings about Language and Language Teaching ............... 61

Feelings about grammar ....................................................................... 62

Perceptions of students’ feelings about grammar ................................ 69

Understandings of the role of grammar instruction ................................ 72

Understandings of stakeholder expectations ....................................... 75

Summary ............................................................................................. 76

III. METHOD ............................................................................................... 77
Christel ..............................................................................................................120

‘Model’ Teacher Characteristics ............................................................... 120

Beliefs and Feelings about Language and Language Teaching .............. 126

Feelings about grammar ........................................................................ 126

Perceptions of students’ feelings about grammar .................................. 130

Understandings of the role of grammar instruction .............................. 130

Understandings of stakeholder expectations ......................................... 135

Language Proficiency ............................................................................ 136

Accurate and effective use of the target language(s). ......................... 137

Use of the non-native speaker advantage ............................................. 137

Explicit Language Knowledge ................................................................ 138

Engagement style .................................................................................. 138

Error correction .................................................................................... 142

Input ....................................................................................................... 148

Explanation ........................................................................................... 149

Knowledge of Learners .......................................................................... 155

Input enhancement strategies ................................................................. 155

Selection of content ............................................................................... 158

Use of metalanguage .............................................................................. 160

Comprehension checks .......................................................................... 162

Awareness of sociocultural issues .......................................................... 164

Summary .................................................................................................. 166

Helena ........................................................................................................... 169
‘Model’ Teacher Characteristics ................................................................. 169

Beliefs and Feelings about Language and Language Teaching ............... 175
  Feelings about grammar ........................................................................ 176
  Perceptions of students’ feelings about grammar .................................. 179
  Understandings of the role of grammar instruction .............................. 180
  Understandings of stakeholder expectations ....................................... 182

Language Proficiency ............................................................................ 187
  Accurate and effective use of the target language(s) .......................... 188
  Use of the non-native speaker advantage .......................................... 188

Explicit Language Knowledge ................................................................ 189
  Engagement style .............................................................................. 189
  Error correction ................................................................................ 197
  Input .................................................................................................. 199
  Explanation ...................................................................................... 200

Knowledge of Learners ........................................................................... 207
  Input enhancement strategies ......................................................... 208
  Selection of content .......................................................................... 210
  Use of metalanguage ........................................................................ 215
  Comprehension checks ................................................................. 216
  Awareness of sociocultural issues ................................................... 217

Summary ............................................................................................... 218

Grammatical TLA in the Context of Bilingual Deaf Education ............... 220

V. DISCUSSION .......................................................................................... 225
Appendix I Pre-observation Interview Transcript, Christel..............................275
Appendix J Pre-observation Interview Transcript, Helena...............................288
Appendix K Stimulated Recall Interview Transcript, Christel.........................303
Appendix L Stimulated Recall Interview Transcript, Helena...........................324
Appendix M Christel’s Feedback on Her Transcripts ........................................353
Appendix N Helena’s Feedback on Her Transcripts ........................................354
Appendix O Example Concept Map ..................................................................355
Appendix P Final List of Codes ........................................................................356
Appendix Q Statement of Teckenspråk Proficiency .........................................358
Appendix R Statement of Swedish Proficiency ................................................359
Appendix S Model Teacher Matrices, Christel................................................360
Appendix T Model Teacher Matrices, Helena...................................................364
LIST OF CHARTS AND ILLUSTRATIONS

CHARTS

Table 1  Historical Trajectories of the Research Traditions in Teacher Cognition and Language Awareness  p. 20

Table 2  Chronological List of Studies on the Relationship Between L2 Teachers’ Language Knowledge and Their Grammar Teaching Practices  p. 38

Table 3  Ways in which Faculty and Staff Work to Achieve the Goals Outlined in Nilskolan’s “Pedagogical Guidelines for Language Development”  p. 80

Table 4  Christel’s Students’ Demographics  p. 82

Table 5  Helena’s Students’ Demographics  p. 83

Table 6  Descriptors of Model Teachers at Nilskolan  p. 88

Table 7  Start list of codes  p. 91

Table 8  Representation of TLA Components in the Stimulated Recall Segments  p. 99

Table 9  Codes Derived from Descriptors of Model Teachers at Nilskolan  p. 107

Table 10  Summary of Evidence of Christel’s Model Teacher Characteristics  p. 120

Table 11  Summary of Evidence of Helena’s Model Teacher Characteristics  p. 169

ILLUSTRATIONS

Figure 1  Framework illustrating the similarities and differences among theoretical constructs used in the literature to represent second language (L2) teachers’ language knowledge.  p. 23

Figure 2  Heuristic model of TLA.  p. 37

Figure 3  Graphical representation of the interactions among the four components of Teacher Language Awareness (TLA).  p. 117
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

When I take the time to think of everyone who has made this work possible, I am overwhelmed by a flood of gratitude that spills out across the ocean and in all directions:

To the teachers, students, and administrators at Nilskolan who so willingly opened their doors to me and shared their thoughts and experiences. To Christel and Helena, two expert and committed teachers with the overcrowded schedules to prove it, I cannot thank you enough for the time you gave me, let alone your insights and expertise. To Agneta, thank you for trusting me, and so allowing me in. For answering my endless questions, large and small, with a warm and friendly smile. You all have offered me a window on the possible in deaf education. You have inspired and challenged me, which is more than I would have asked for. To the Teckenspråk interpreter who worked so closely with me on this project, spending hour after hour combing through classroom video and answering my zillion questions about nuances in meaning in two languages I was still coming to know myself. And to my Swedish and Teckenspråk teachers, and my brilliant grammar students at Folkuniversitetet, whose questions taught me more about Swedish grammar than any course book.

To Dr. Robert Kretschmer. First of all, for creating a Deaf Education Masters program grounded in Linguistics that allowed me to explore my developing ideas about the nature of educating deaf children. And then, for inviting me into this Ph.D. program and making it financially possible for me to attend. For your unfailing faith that I would do as I said I would do. For all the last minute meetings and rushed signatures. For the international video conference calls in lieu of face-to-face meetings. For making time to read so carefully the thousands of words I set to paper when so much else begged your attention. For the keen and critical eye that you manage to couple so seamlessly with a fatherly acceptance. To Dr. Howard Williams for
taking me on even though no one said you had to. For your curiosity about, and willingness to engage with, areas of study outside your purview. For your calmness, warmth, and kindness that helped me feel grounded when this project, and much of the rest of my life with it, felt helplessly afloat. And to the other members of my committee: Dr. Linda Hickson, for your impeccable organization, steadfast dependability, and commitment to serving your students; Dr. Ann Senghas, for choosing to play an authentic role in this process when you could have taken a far less time-consuming path; and Dr. Stephen Peverly, for genuinely wrestling with my ideas and helping me to see them in a broader context.

To Maria Hartman, for helping me to articulate everything I already believed about teaching and learning, and—in the quietest, most gentle of ways—for continuing to help me understand all that I’ve still got wrong. To Amy Walia-Fazio, Nadine Rothman, Susannah Gill, Jillian Lundberg, and Gina Surette—my first and most esteemed colleagues—you have remained for me the brilliant, dedicated, and luminous face of education, my constant reminder that it all comes down to the work of real students and real teachers in real classrooms. Three-hundred-something pages in that becomes too easy to forget.

To Jay Pirani-Mellstrom and Parag Joshi—my very own Statler and Waldorf—for making me feel JV even while insisting I was Varsity. For taking me in time and again without ever making me feel like a guest. For being equal parts kind and brilliant. You are a rare and treasured paradox. To Swati Mehta, for late night chai and bhaji and laptop battleship and interrupting all of my interruptions. For caring about the kids that statistics overlook. For asking all the right questions and for never settling. To Megan Staples, Katy Kaminski, and Andrea Mazzariello—fellow parents and Ph.D.’s—by your example you have shown me that I do not set the bar too high, that extraordinary work is an attainable and worthwhile goal.

x
And to the family and friends outside of education who have challenged and supported me through the years. My own parents and sister, above all, for never really caring whether I got a Ph.D. or not, but caring always and only for my happiness. Thank you. To Dan Doorakian, his late father, Fran, and Mr. Hayner (my fourth grade teacher), for seeing me as a diamond in the rough and always pushing me further than I could comfortably go. To Ann and Art Fox, for your emotional investment in me and in this process, and for offering up your condo and your babysitting hours when I needed them most. Thank you, too, Aldona Sehgal, for that precious long weekend you allowed me to spend alone in your fabulous apartment so that I could finish my proposal while my husband took care of our one-year-old.

To that one-year-old, now nearly four, and to my younger son, thank you for your unaffected joy and misery, your everyday reminders of what it is to be human. I am indebted to you for my sanity and sense of perspective.

To my husband, Nathan, for listening. And listening. And listening. For countless meals, bedtime stories, and hours spent playing at the park. For believing this pursuit was worthwhile even when I questioned the purpose. For knowing I would finish even when I was unsure. For letting me be a mother and a student and requiring nothing more. For standing up for your “we’ll go back that way” philosophy even when my own “get it right the first time” was yelling louder. For being proud of me when I didn’t know how to be proud of myself. For understanding my constant struggle to get this thing to hang on its own hook.

And, lastly, to the Starbucks on Walton and Rush for saving me untold psychological angst by keeping the (literal) fire burning just long enough for me to write the last word.
DEDICATION

To my linguistics students
and fellow language teachers
who have been brave enough to ask why
and seek honestly the answer.
Chapter I
INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this study was to explore the relationship between teachers’ language knowledge and their grammar teaching practices within the context of a bilingual school for the deaf in Sweden. The school is ‘bilingual’ in the sense that students are expected to attain fluency in both written Swedish and Sweden’s signed language, Teckenspråk. The school was chosen as a research site because it is one of five schools in Sweden that has demonstrated success in educating deaf children bilingually (SPM, 2008). Teacher Language Awareness (Andrews, 2007) was selected as the theoretical construct through which to explore the relationship between teacher knowledge and practice because of its focus on ‘knowledge-in-action’ (p. 31), or the sites where knowledge intersects with practice. For the purposes of this paper, Teacher Language Awareness (TLA) is defined as teachers’ knowledge-in-action about language and language teaching, which consists of their explicit language knowledge, knowledge of learners, language proficiency, and beliefs and feelings about language and language teaching. The study was conceived through an exploratory-interpretive paradigm (Grotjahn, 1987) and employed a qualitative collective case study methodology (Creswell, 1998). Specifically, the study was ‘within-site,’ as it focused on one school context; ‘collective,’ in that two cases were analyzed;
and ‘instrumental,’ in that the cases were used to illustrate the relationship between teacher knowledge and practice within the research context (pp. 61-2). The two teacher participants who served as study cases were identified by the administration as high quality teachers and models of the school’s approach to the bilingual education of deaf children.

This chapter begins with a discussion of the Background and Context of the study. Next, I provide a Statement of the Problem that my research addresses, discuss the Need for the Research Study, and present a Statement of Purpose and Research Questions. The chapter concludes with background information on The Researcher and Definitions of Key Terms.

**Background and Context**

“I’m deaf and I have a cochlear implant,” wrote one Swedish fourth grader to his American pen pal. “I’m deaf and I have a cochlear implant.”

It was the student’s choice of conjunction that caught my eye. “I’m deaf and . . .,” rather than “I’m deaf but . . .”. I read this choice of conjunction as a powerful testimony to the child’s upbringing and education. For him, the fact that he could hear and speak with the aid of a cochlear implant did not negate his identity as a Deaf person. In essence, he was introducing himself as someone who was culturally Deaf even though he could hear. I was observing him that day in his Math class, which was conducted almost entirely in spoken Swedish. To an observer unfamiliar with the philosophy behind bilingual deaf education, it would seem very strange that a child with his speaking and listening skills was being educated in a school for the deaf. “Couldn’t he succeed in a mainstream environment?” they might ask. But that would be missing the point.

---

1 See ‘Definitions of Key Terms’ for an explanation of my use of ‘Deaf’ and ‘deaf’ and my choice not to use ‘person first language.’
Swedish parents send their children to this bilingual school for the deaf, hereafter referred to as Nilskolan (a pseudonym), so that they will become fluent in both written Swedish and Sweden’s signed language, Teckenspråk (pronounced *teck-en-SPROAK*). Some students come to the school with a stronger background in Teckenspråk than Swedish, and others—often those with cochlear implants—come with a stronger background in spoken Swedish. Regardless of hearing ability, however, Nilskolan’s students are expected to know both written Swedish and the Swedish signed language, Teckenspråk, so that they may participate in both the hearing and Deaf communities upon graduation. For students who have the ability to speak and hear, spoken Swedish is an additional instructional goal.

**Sweden’s Bilingual Schools for the Deaf**

Nilskolan is one of Sweden’s five nationally-financed bilingual schools for the deaf, all of which share a common curriculum. Approximately 10%, or roughly 500, of the deaf children in Sweden are educated in these five schools. The majority of Swedish deaf children, 84%, are in mainstream environments, and another 6% attend special classes for deaf children that are financed and organized at the local level (Svartholm, 2010, p. 169).

The method of bilingual education employed in the five nationally-financed Swedish schools for the deaf dates back to the early 1980s. At that time, the Swedish government recognized that the average deaf student, upon leaving high school, was reading “far below an age appropriate level” (Svartholm, 2010, p. 160), so they implemented legislation in an attempt to correct the problem. Proposition 1980/1981 (1981) mandated that the five nationally-run schools for the deaf in Sweden adopt a bilingual approach. The resulting national curriculum (LGr80, 1983) aimed to ensure that all deaf children be given the opportunity to attain fluency in both Teckenspråk and written Swedish. Roughly 10 years later, a revised curriculum (LPO 94, 1994)
increased the responsibility on schools for the deaf so that they were now required to *ensure* that all students would be able to communicate effectively in Teckenspråk and written Swedish. The revised curriculum included an additional requirement: that students be able to communicate effectively in a third language, written English, since English is Sweden’s second language.

Recent statistics (SPM, 2008) indicate that the schools have been successful in fulfilling these mandates with over half of their students. Deaf students in Sweden are required to pass the same national exams as their hearing counterparts in order to be granted admission to gymnasium, Sweden’s equivalent of high school. The majority of students take the national exams at the end of their ninth grade year, but deaf students—along with hearing bilingual students—take the exams at the end of their tenth grade year. In 2008, 66% of bilingually-educated deaf students passed the Swedish test (compared with 96.5% of hearing students), while 59% of deaf students passed the English test (compared with 94.3% of hearing students). Seventy-seven percent of students who were deaf passed the sign language assessment, which has not yet been standardized. According to Nilskolan’s vice principal, approximately 50-60% of Nilskolan’s students pass the English and Swedish tests, depending on the year, while nearly 80% pass the sign language assessment.

While these passing rates may seem low, it is important to keep in mind that students who pass the English and Swedish tests are assumed to have age-appropriate reading levels in those languages (Svartholm, 2010, p. 167). This means that two-thirds of the bilingually-educated deaf children across Sweden are reading on grade level in Swedish by the end of the tenth grade, and that nearly 60% are reading on grade level in a second written language, English. In contrast, recent research on the language abilities of deaf students in the United States indicates that only 12 percent of 16 year-olds read at or above the fourth grade level in their first written language.
Furthermore, Sweden’s schools for the deaf face many of the same challenges in terms of immigration and multiple disabilities as schools for the deaf in the United States. Sweden’s National Agency for Special Schools for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing (SPM, 2007) has accounted for some of the discrepancy between the performance of students who are hearing and deaf by comparing the populations of Sweden’s schools for the deaf to its mainstreamed schools. Aside from deafness, they note, students in the schools for the deaf are characterized as follows:

1) Approximately 40% of the pupils in [schools for the deaf] have additional difficulties. This includes…pupils with…some form of learning disability.
2) The ratio of pupils with an immigrant background in [schools for the deaf] is relatively high (25%). Many of them may be in a problematic linguistic situation with parents who do not know Swedish or any sign language and use another language in the home.
3) The number of pupils enrolled late in [schools for the deaf] has increased during the last few years. In 2007, 32% of all new pupils were enrolled as late as [grades] 7-10. This may cause problems…especially so when the pupil has an insufficient language when he or she begins in the special school, which is often the case both for Swedish and for sign language. (Svartholm, 2010, p. 167)

The Role of Grammar in the Academic Success of Deaf Children

While the challenges deaf children face in acquiring English language literacy are certainly complex, there is evidence to suggest that grammar is an area of profound difficulty for deaf children. Wilbur (2008) reports that most deaf 18 year-olds “do not have the linguistic competence of ten-year-old children who are hearing in many syntactic structures of English” (p. 123). Wilbur and others have identified particular elements of English language grammar that are difficult for deaf learners (Berent, 2001; King, 1981; McGuckian & Henry, 2007; Quigley, Wilbur, Power, Montanelli, & Steinkamp, 1976; Quigley, Wilbur, & Montanelli, 1976; Wilbur, 1977) and have found evidence that the difficulties faced by deaf children in acquiring grammar
contribute to their language and literacy delays (Kelly, 1996; Hermans, Ormel, & Knoors, 2010; Lichtenstein, 1998; Luckner, Sebald, Cooney, & Muir, 2005; Paul, 2003; Quigley, Wilbur, Power, Montanelli, & Steinkamp, 1976). Researchers have also found that explicit grammar instruction can improve deaf students’ declarative knowledge of English grammar (Berent et al., 2007, Cannon, 2010), as well as their ability to comprehend and produce grammatically correct English sentences in writing (Nunes, Burman, Evans, & Barros, 2010).

**Limitations in Teachers’ Language Knowledge**

Unfortunately, however, there is also substantial research evidence to suggest that many language teachers are not adequately prepared to teach grammar. Although there is limited research on the language knowledge of teachers of the deaf, the research that exists suggests that teachers are underprepared in this area (Harrison, 2007; Rittenhouse & Kenyon-Rittenhouse, 1997; Staehle, 2004; Storbeck, 1999). Furthermore, there is substantial research evidence in the field of hearing second language (L2) education that both pre-service teachers (Andrews, 1994; Bloor, 1986; Chandler, Robinson & Noyes, 1988; Williamson & Hardman, 1995; Wray, 1993) and in-service teachers (Andrews, 1997b, 1999a, 1999b; Brumfit, Mitchell, & Hooper, 1996; Huang, 2010; Pahissa & Tragant, 2009) lack the adequate language knowledge to do their jobs effectively. A few studies also suggest that, during grammar instruction, teachers are often limited in their ability to make sufficient use of the language knowledge they do possess, even when that knowledge has been measured at high levels (Andrews, 1997b; Bigelow & Ranney, 2005; Burns & Knox, 2005).

Fillmore and Snow (2000) suggest that teachers’ lack of knowledge regarding grammar stems from the lack of grammar instruction in our nation’s schools. They cite the former existence of ‘grammar schools,’ in which English grammar was taught from roughly the fifth
through the eighth grade. Except in Catholic schools, they note, this practice was “largely discontinued” in the 1960s. “Hence,” they explain, “we have had three generations of teachers who as students had little exposure to the study of grammar” (p. 29). As a result, they argue, “teachers feel insecure about their own knowledge of grammar,” and “few are able to teach students information about language structure” (p. 29). Andrews (2007) points to the same lack of grammar training in the education system and adds that, as a result, many teachers have “feelings of doubt and insecurity” about their knowledge of grammar (p. 21).

**Lack of Guidelines for the Teaching of Grammar**

This problem is compounded by the fact that, at present, language teachers do not receive clear guidance from the scholarly community on questions regarding how—or even *if*—grammar should be taught. According to Andrews (2007), grammar’s place in language education was seriously challenged in the 1970s with the growing popularity of the communicative approach to language teaching, the whole language movement, student-centered instruction, and the notion that languages are *acquired* rather than *learned*. “Many teachers,” Andrews argues, “particularly those with some exposure to the debates of recent years, remain uncertain about the role of grammar, and how it is best taught and learned” (p. 20).

Johnston and Goettsch (2000) acknowledge the benefits gained from these sweeping changes in our thinking about the teaching of language. “A major part of research in language teaching and teacher learning over the last 15 or 20 years,” they contend, “has involved the rediscovery of the basic truth that in language teaching, it is the teaching that is most important, not the language: that language teaching is first and foremost an educational enterprise, not a linguistic one” (“Teacher Knowledge,” para. 2). They regret, however, that the pendulum has swung too far: “In our quest for reflection, for whole language, for critical pedagogy and student-
centered learning, we still need to know, for example, about parts of speech, the subcategorization of verbs, phonological rules, and the semantics of tense” (“Teacher Knowledge,” para. 3).

There is ample research to support Johnston and Goettsch’s assertion that grammar instruction has a rightful place in language teaching, particularly when employed in meaningful contexts (Doughty, 1991; Doughty & Williams, 1998; Ellis, 2002, 2008; Hinkel & Fotos, 2002; Lightbown & Spada, 1990; Long, 1983, 1991; Norris & Ortega, 2001; Pica, 1983; Richards, 2002; Seliger, 1979; Skehan, 1996; Spada, 1986).

Yet, there remains a lack of clarity in the profession regarding the precise nature of grammar’s appropriate place. In 1994, Ellis reviewed the grammar teaching options being offered to teachers and concluded that it was “probably premature to reach any firm conclusions regarding what type of formal instruction works best” (p. 646). Ellis’s (2008) more recent work holds that firm conclusions have not yet been drawn. “There are still lingering uncertainties,” Andrews (2007) contends, “about the importance and role of grammar teaching within L2 pedagogy” (p. 32). This persistent uncertainty has left language teachers without substantial research-based evidence upon which to ground their decisions about how to address students’ grammar challenges. As Borg (1998a) explains, teachers are being asked to improve students’ grammar knowledge “in the absence of well-founded guidelines” (p. 10).

**Portraits of Teaching in Language Teacher Education**

Given that well-prepared teachers are one of the strongest predictors of student achievement (Darling-Hammond, 1999), it seems critical that we aim to improve the quality of language teacher education around grammar instruction. Borg (1998a, 1998c, 1999a, 1999b, 1999c, 2006) argues that the design of language teacher education programs may contribute to teachers’
uncertainties regarding the teaching of grammar. Teacher educators, he notes, “typically introduce trainees to pedagogical options in grammar teaching without being able to illustrate when, how, and why teachers in real classrooms draw upon these options” (1999b, p. 160). Freeman and Johnson (1998) agree: “The assumptions that have underlain the practice of language teacher education,” they argue, “have focused more on what teachers needed to know...than on what they actually knew, how this knowledge shaped what they did” (p. 398).

In order to address this underrepresentation of authentic classroom teaching in language teacher education, Borg, among others (Johnston & Goettsch, 2000; Popko, 2005), has made a case for integrating ‘portraits’ of L2 classroom teaching into the design of such programs. “Stimulating portraits of L2 teacher practice,” Borg (1998c) suggests, will help promote “a reciprocal relationship in which research is grounded in the realities of classroom practice but at the same time provides teachers with insights into teaching through which they can critically examine, and hence improve, their own practice” (p. 32). Borg argues further that examining the classroom practices of “high quality” language teachers is particularly important, and he points to the lack of research in this area. Andrews and McNeill (2005) and Johnston and Goettsch (2000) echo Borg’s concern. “There are certain forms of teacher knowledge possessed by experienced practicing teachers in the field,” Johnston and Goettsch argue, “and language teacher education would do very well to incorporate these into its curricula” (“Language Teacher Education,” para. 3).

Descriptive, qualitative studies from which such portraiture emerges are relatively new where grammar teaching practices are concerned. As I will discuss in Chapter II, only since the late 1990s have researchers been interested in describing the relationship between teachers’ language knowledge and their grammar teaching practices. Research of this kind is non-existent
in the field of deaf education, and this gap in our knowledge is particularly problematic given the unique features of language instruction in deaf education settings.

**Deaf Education as a Unique Case of L2 Pedagogy**

While it is clearly the case that deaf children have much in common with other English language learners (King, 1981; Paul & Lee, 2010), there are important ways in which the language-learning challenges faced by deaf children are unique. At a rather obvious level, deaf children’s difficulty with hearing the sounds of English—including structurally significant morphemes like -s and -ing—influences the nature of their language-learning experience (McGuckian & Henry, 2007). The differences are even more profound, however, in bilingual programs for the deaf, where the visual-gestural modality of sign language allows for syntactic structures that are simply unavailable in spoken languages.

Research interest in the modality differences between signed and spoken languages is relatively new. In fact, there have been far more studies focusing on the similarities between signed and spoken languages than on the differences between them (Knapp & Corina, 2008). Meier (2002) explains the dearth of research on modality differences by pointing out that signed languages have been recognized as bona fide languages only fairly recently, beginning with Stokoe’s (1960) seminal work on the structure of American Sign Language (ASL). For many years after Stokoe’s work was first published, the research on ASL and other signed languages was largely aimed at demonstrating the ways in which signed languages were similar to spoken languages and thus deserving of like linguistic esteem. It has taken some time, Meier argues, for linguists to feel “secure in the understanding that discussion of modality differences does not threaten the fundamental conclusion that signed languages are indeed languages” (p. 5).
McBurney (2002) offers a clear explanation of how the modality of a language can influence its structure. She defines modality as “the physical or biological systems of transmission” of a language, explaining that spoken languages are communicated via the vocal-auditory modality and signed languages are communicated via the visual-gestural modality. These differences in modality make available different ‘channels’ through which the languages may be conveyed, channels being defined as “the dimensions of space and time that are available to a given language” (p. 351). Time, McBurney argues, is the only channel available to spoken language, meaning that the elements of spoken language must be communicated one after the other, in a sequence. Signed languages, on the other hand, have available to them the additional channel of space.

This additional dimension makes things possible structurally in signed languages that are not possible in spoken languages, such as the overt representation of spatial relationships (e.g., pronouns, prepositions, adverbs of location) and the simultaneous layering of information (DeLuca & Napoli, 2008; Emmorey, 2002; Klima & Bellugi, 1979; Knapp & Corina, 2008; Wilbur, 2008). As Knapp and Corina (2008) explain, “the visual system is capable of perceiving multiple objects and movements simultaneously, whereas a comparable multiplicity of cues delivered to the auditory system would be jumbled beyond recognition” (p. 79). Portmanteau words are a potential exception to this rule.

Portmanteau words—such as ‘slithy’ in Lewis Carroll’s (1871) Jabberwocky—are those in which the spoken morphemes of two separate words are combined to form a single utterance. Carroll used the word ‘portmanteau’, which meant ‘suitcase’ in then-contemporary English, to describe such words because of the way in which two meanings were packed into one word. For
instance, although the word ‘slithy’ is technically nonsense, it successfully connotes the meanings of both ‘lithe’ and ‘slimy’, and is thus interpretable by the reader.

Signed languages, however, enable richer and more complex simultaneous layering. In a recent work, DeLuca and Napoli (2008) provide examples of some of the ways in which ASL takes advantage of the spatial modality. Whereas English uses prepositions to denote spatial relationships, for instance, ASL tends to represent such relationships in actual space. Take the English sentence *The boy put the cat in the box*. The ASL translation of this sentence would look something like: PAST CAT<sub>i</sub> BOX<sub>j</sub> BOY CARRY<sub>i-to-j</sub>. DeLuca and Napoli explain: “This is to be understood as making the sign PAST, then making the sign CAT and indicating spatial location (which we have designated with the locational index i), then making the sign BOX and indicating a different spatial location (designated by j), then making the sign BOY, then doing the predicate CARRY by having the hands in an appropriate shape to indicate carrying a cat-size animal and moving them from spatial location i to spatial location j, clearly moving downward into the spot j” (p. 154).

Note that in the ASL translation, the preposition ‘in’ is communicated via movement in space, thus it does not appear as an independent sign. Additionally, whereas English uses modifying phrases (e.g., adverbs) to explain how an action is carried out, ASL often incorporates modifiers into the actions themselves, either by varying the production of the signed verb or using nonmanual markers (e.g., facial expressions), or both. If we take the English sentence above, for example, and modify the verb with the adverb ‘carefully’, we get *The boy put the cat in the box carefully*. In ASL, DeLuca and Napoli explain, “one might move the whole torso with the hands/arms from point i to point j, while pursing the lips or forming a tight O with the lips” in order to demonstrate that the action was undertaken in a careful manner (p. 155).
The use of nonmanual markers in ASL goes well beyond the use of facial expressions or body language in spoken language communication. As a basic difference, ASL has no written form, so if certain words (e.g., prepositions, adverbs) are unnecessary in face-to-face communication, they are unnecessary in the language itself. As Wilbur (2008) explains, in ASL, “information is layered, and thus ASL does not need separate signs for many of the concepts that English has separate words for” (p. 129). Furthermore, nonmanual markers in signed languages perform a number of grammatical functions that they do not perform in spoken languages. Nonmanual markers that occur on the lower part of the face (mouth, tongue, cheeks, and nose) tend to provide adverbial and adjectival information, as in the case of pursed lips to indicate the adverb *carefully*. Those on the upper part of the face and head (e.g., eyebrows, head nods/tilts/shakes, and eye gaze), in contrast, tend to serve higher order syntactic functions (p. 129). Raised eyebrows, for example, indicate that the speaker is asking a *yes/no* question, while lowered eyebrows indicate a *wh-* question.

It seems clear, then, that the language knowledge required by teachers of the deaf differs from that required by teachers of second language learners who are hearing. Singleton, Supalla, Litchfield, and Schley (1998) acknowledge this difference, arguing that we should not think of deaf children as ‘English language learners’ but, more specifically, as learners of ‘English as a spoken language.’ By emphasizing that deaf children are learning a *spoken* language, Singleton et al. are not implying that all deaf children are learning to *speak* the language. Instead, they are pointing out that deaf children face a challenge unique to them when they set out to learn languages that have a *spoken* form. Because deaf children have limited access to the vocal-auditory modality, the authors argue, theirs is not a typical bilingualism, but a “modality constrained bilingualism” (p. 20). As such, in order to be successful at learning a spoken
language, deaf children will require “instructional techniques beyond ‘ESL methodologies’” (p. 21), techniques that assist students in identifying and addressing the modality differences between the two languages.

**Statement of the Problem**

The majority of deaf children in the United States are leaving high school without adequate proficiency in English, and there is evidence to suggest that a lack of English grammar knowledge contributes to these students’ difficulties. Research from the fields of deaf and L2 education suggests that many deaf educators may be underprepared to teach grammar. If we assume that teacher preparation influences teacher performance and, in turn, student achievement, then the lack of preparation among language teachers clearly deserves our research attention.

**Need for the Research Study**

Research on the actual grammar teaching practices of high quality teachers, in relation to what they know about language, is promising for its potential to inform the design of language teacher education programs. This relatively new field of research has begun to yield useful results, but has not yet been applied in the context of deaf education. Deaf educators face a unique set of challenges as language teachers that are based on the modality-based structural differences between signed and spoken languages. The bilingual deaf education context is thus a rich and important site for further research on the relationship between Teacher Language Awareness (TLA) and grammar teaching practices.
Statement of Purpose and Research Question

The purpose of this study was to explore the relationship between teachers’ language knowledge and their grammar teaching practices within the context of a bilingual school for the deaf in Sweden, a country with demonstrated success in educating children bilingually (SPM, 2008). Specifically, I have asked the following question: What is the nature of the grammatical Teacher Language Awareness of high quality teachers in a Swedish bilingual school for the deaf?

The Researcher

The past president of the World Federation of the Deaf, Yerker Anderson, has called on researchers who choose to comment on Deaf issues, inquire into the Deaf World, or research the concerns of Deaf people to make known their language skills and experience of Deaf culture (Komesaroff, 2008, p. xi). It is my intention that the following brief biography will serve that purpose.

I am a hearing woman who was first introduced to Deaf culture in 1999 while working toward a Masters degree in Reading Education. In my research for a class assignment, I learned that the majority of deaf students in the United States were graduating from high school with reading levels below the fourth grade. I—like so many people who are hearing—assumed that deaf people must be able to read and write since they can’t access the language in its spoken form. I was horrified to find that they could not. I thus began reading about deaf education, visited the schools for the deaf in my area, enrolled in ASL courses, and eventually applied for a teacher certification program in Deaf Education.

After completing that degree, during which I was required to take only two ASL courses, I began teaching in a school for the deaf where Simultaneous Communication (SimCom), or
signing and speaking at the same time, was the preferred medium of communication. Only a small minority of the school’s students were succeeding in the SimCom environment, and I was frustrated with the approach. The majority of students were neither fluent in ASL nor English, and so, in essence, had no first language. I believed that most of my students would have been more successful in a bilingual environment. After one year at the school, I left teaching to pursue my doctorate so that I could further explore questions of language teaching and learning in deaf education and work to correct what I still see as inequities in the educational opportunities afforded many deaf students in this country.

I have never been immersed in Deaf culture, and my ASL has never become fluent. I am conversant in ASL, however, and I have studied its structure in depth. I am also conversant in Teckenspråk, Sweden’s sign language. I am literate in Swedish, though I have difficulty speaking the language and understanding its spoken form.

Definitions of Key Terms

deaf/Deaf: Throughout this paper, ‘deaf’ is used to refer to all individuals who are audiologically deaf, and ‘Deaf’ is used when I am specifically referring to individuals who use sign language as their primary language and who identify with Deaf culture. See Lindgren et al. (2008, p. xiii) for a history of these usages. Also, I have chosen not to follow the convention of ‘people first language’—in which the person is named before the disability, as in “child who is deaf” rather than “deaf child” (Snow, 2010)—because it would not be in keeping with my own views, or the views of the teachers represented in this paper, to emphasize a ‘disability view of deafness’ over one that regards deafness as a cultural and linguistic difference.

grammar teaching practices: Following Borg (1998c), “instruction designed to enhance students’ awareness of the morphosyntactic features of a language” (p. 10).
Teacher Language Awareness (TLA): teachers’ knowledge-in-action about language and language teaching, which consists of their explicit language knowledge, knowledge of learners, language proficiency, and beliefs and feelings about language and language teaching.
Chapter II
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The purpose of this study was to explore the relationship between teachers’ language knowledge and their grammar teaching practices within the context of a bilingual school for the deaf in Sweden. Specifically, I have asked the following question: What is the nature of the grammatical Teacher Language Awareness (TLA) of high quality teachers in a Swedish bilingual school for the deaf? TLA (Andrews, 2007) was selected as the theoretical construct through which to explore the relationship between teacher knowledge and practice because of its focus on ‘knowledge-in-action’ (p. 31), or the sites where knowledge intersects with practice. For the purposes of this paper, TLA is defined as teachers’ knowledge-in-action about language and language teaching, which consists of their explicit language knowledge, knowledge of learners, language proficiency, and beliefs and feelings about language and language teaching.

In this chapter, I review the literature relevant to the relationship between second language (L2) teachers’ language knowledge and their grammar teaching practices. Because I am interested in teachers’ in-action knowledge, I have limited the review to studies that analyze not only what teachers know, but also what they do. All of the studies reviewed were conducted in second and foreign language contexts involving hearing children, as there have been no studies
conducted in deaf education contexts that explicitly address the relationship between teachers’ language knowledge and their grammar teaching practices. Furthermore, studies that explored teachers’ beliefs without linking them to teachers’ knowledge were not included in this review because TLA only encompasses teacher beliefs insofar as they are “bound up” with teacher knowledge, a distinction I discuss more completely later in this chapter. The sources used for this review include professional journals, books, dissertations, and reports. These sources were accessed through the following databases: Academic Search Premier, Digital Dissertations, Education Full Text, ERIC, JSTOR, Linguistics and Language Behavior Abstracts, MLA International Bibliography, ProQuest, PsycINFO, SAGE, CLIO (Columbia University), Educat (Teachers College), and Google Scholar.

I begin this chapter with a brief history of the Research Traditions in Teacher Cognition and Language Awareness, two separate but overlapping lines of inquiry that have informed the questions asked, methodologies employed, and theoretical constructs used in studies on the nature of the relationship between teachers’ language knowledge and their grammar teaching practices. Next, in a section entitled A Framework for Research on Teachers’ Language Knowledge, I integrate into a single heuristic model the various theoretical constructs used by researchers to talk about teachers’ language knowledge. In the section that follows, Teacher Language Awareness as a Unifying Theoretical Construct, I show how TLA can operate as a theoretical construct within which much of the work on the relationship between teachers’ language knowledge and practice might be situated. At the close of that section, I offer a definition of TLA based on the theoretical literature reviewed. Finally, I provide a review of the relevant literature on the Relationship Between Knowledge and Grammar Teaching Practices. A brief Summary closes the chapter.
Research Traditions in Teacher Cognition and Language Awareness

As recently as the early 1970s, educational researchers were paying little attention to the knowledge or thought processes of teachers. The dominant conceptual model at the time was what is often termed the “process-product” model (Dunkin & Biddle, 1974), and it did not recognize the role of teacher cognition in the act of teaching (Borg, 2006, p. 6). By the mid-1970s, though, attention was beginning to turn toward teacher cognition. It was at this time that two separate, though related, lines of inquiry arose: teacher cognition and language awareness. The two traditions have followed a very similar trajectory, as demonstrated in Table 1.

Table 1
Historical Trajectories of the Research Traditions in Teacher Cognition and Language Awareness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Teacher Cognition</th>
<th>Language Awareness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970s – research begins</td>
<td>National Institute of Education conference</td>
<td>poor language achievement by British students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980s – research interest proliferates</td>
<td>Shulman’s knowledge base of teaching</td>
<td>growing concerns about student language awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990s – research becomes subject-specific</td>
<td>focus on knowledge specific to Math, Science, and Language teaching</td>
<td>focus on teachers’ language awareness, specific to Grammar teaching</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The beginnings of teacher cognition research can be traced to a report presented at the National Institute of Education conference, a strong argument was made for the consideration of teacher thinking in educational research. “To the extent that observed or intended teaching behavior is ‘thoughtless’,” it read: “it makes no use of the human teacher’s most unique attributes. In so doing, it becomes mechanical and might well be done by a machine. If, however, teaching is done and, in all likelihood, will continue to be done by human teachers, the question of relationships between thought and action becomes crucial” (National Institute of Education, 1975, p. 1).
Research on the cognitive aspects of teaching proliferated in the 1980s, with a growing focus on the connections between teacher cognition research and teacher education. In the mid-1980s, Lee Shulman’s (1987) widely referenced work on the knowledge base of teaching, produced as part of the Knowledge Growth in Teaching program at Stanford University, marked a shift in research focus from teacher ‘thinking’ to teacher ‘knowledge’, which according to Borg (2006), “remains the dominant concept today” (p. 20). By the early 1990s, research on teacher knowledge had begun accumulating in particular content areas, most notably Math and Science. Research on the knowledge of language teachers also began appearing at this time, spurred on in large part by what has been called the language awareness ‘movement’.

Research aligned with the language awareness movement—which seeks “to find ways of improving the language awareness of students and of their teachers” (Andrews, 2007, p. 10)—has followed a somewhat similar trajectory to research on teacher cognition (see Table 1): Language awareness research began in the 1970s, burgeoned in the 1980s, and began to focus more intensely on the domain-specific (e.g., grammar) knowledge of teachers in the 1990s. The movement began in Britain, largely as “a response to the notoriously dismal achievements in two areas of British education: foreign language learning and school-leavers’ illiteracy” (Andrews, 2007, p. 11). By the 1980s, the language awareness of students was becoming a major concern in Britain. Although it was acknowledged, however, that “any changes in expectations about the knowledge to be acquired by learners have implications for the knowledge base needed by teachers,” researchers did not begin to focus their attention on teachers’ language awareness until the early 1990s (p. 21). Since that time, there has emerged a research literature specific to teacher language knowledge as it relates to the teaching of grammar.
A Framework for Research on Teachers’ Language Knowledge

Due, in part, to its roots in two separate research traditions—teacher cognition and language awareness—the literature on the relationship between teachers’ language knowledge and their grammar teaching practices includes many and varied theoretical constructs for talking about teacher knowledge (e.g., Teacher Language Awareness, Knowledge about Language, Knowledge about Grammar, etc.). Noting the proliferation of terms in this area of study, and wondering about the extent to which they are distinct or merely “different names for the same thing,” Borg (2003b) has argued that “a goal for this domain of inquiry should be the development of a unifying framework within which existing research can be located and which will provide clear direction for further studies” (p. 106). Figure 1 is a response to Borg’s call.

Figure 1 is a heuristic, rather than a theoretical, model. The intersections among many of the theoretical constructs presented in Figure 1 is far more complex and nuanced than the figure is intended to handle. Furthermore, there are fine distinctions in the ways that different researchers have used the terms. My goal is simply to illustrate the primary similarities and differences among the constructs so that I may: 1) render the results of existing research interpretable within a single framework; 2) provide a clearer theoretical foundation for my own study and for future research in this area.

In the research reviewed for the present study, the two terms most commonly used to refer to teachers’ language knowledge were Knowledge about Language (KAL) (Bigelow & Ranney, 2005; Borg, 2001b, 2005; Brumfit, et al., 1996; Burns & Knox, 2005; Mitchell, Brumfit, & Hooper, 1994a, 1994b; Pahissa & Tragant 2009; Popko 2005) and Andrews’ concept of Teacher Language Awareness (TLA) (Andrews, 2001; Andrews & McNeill, 2005; Luk & Wong, 2010),
which developed from his earlier concepts of metalinguistic awareness (Andrews, 1997a, 1997b) and then Teacher Metalinguistic Awareness (TMA) (1999b).

**Figure 1.** Framework illustrating the similarities and differences among theoretical constructs used in the literature to represent second language (L2) teachers’ language knowledge. The actual terms used in the literature reviewed for this paper are contained within boxes. Terms used to name equivalent or highly similar constructs are enclosed in larger, dashed boxes.
Other terms abound, however, including *Pedagogical Content Knowledge (PCK)* (Johnston & Goettsch, 2000), *formal knowledge of grammar, Subject Matter Knowledge (SMK)* (Haim, Strauss, & Dorit, 2004), *BAK* (Woods, 1996), and a variety of terms employed by Borg: *pedagogical systems* (1998c), *teachers’ theories* (1999b), and *Knowledge about Grammar (KAG)* (2001b). Each of these terms represents a theoretical construct highlighting specific aspects of teachers’ language knowledge on which the researcher wishes to focus. In the discussion that follows, I explicate the significant similarities and differences among the theoretical constructs named by these terms, so that what emerges is a framework within which findings from existing and future research might be situated (see Figure 1).

As an organizing principle for the discussion that follows, I will start at the bottom of Figure 1 with the most narrowly defined terms and work my way up to the most broadly defined. While it is more intuitive to read the figure from the top down, discussion of the figure is facilitated by detailing its most narrowly defined (or lower) concepts first, as the more broadly defined (or higher) concepts are composed of those presented beneath them in the figure.

**Knowledge about Grammar / Knowledge about Language**

Borg (2001b) uses the term ‘knowledge about grammar’ (KAG) to name the grammar knowledge that teachers draw upon in their teaching, but he does not offer an explicit definition of the term. He does, however, present KAG as a subset of ‘knowledge about language’ (KAL), a term originally defined—in the context of British curriculum debates around the Language Awareness of teachers and students—as “explicit, conscious and articulated understanding” of the nature of language (Brumfit et al., 1996, p. 71-72). Despite its original use, however, KAL has “proved to be an extremely elusive concept to pin down” (Andrews 1997a, p. 192), as it has been used differently by different researchers over the past 20 years. In an attempt to make sense
of the many and varied interpretations of KAL, Andrews (2007) reviewed literature in which the
term was used and identified “explicit knowledge about language” as the “single unifying
feature” of constructs named by the term (p. 13). Citing Ellis (2004), he defines “explicit
knowledge about language” as declarative knowledge of “the phonological, lexical, grammatical,
pragmatic and socio-critical features” of a language, including knowledge of the terminology
used for labeling those features (p. 244). Since Borg presents ‘knowledge about grammar’
(KAG) as a subset of ‘knowledge about language’ (KAL), we can infer that he is using the term
KAG to refer to explicit knowledge of the grammatical features of language. Thus, in Figure 1,
the term KAG is presented as referring to teachers’ ‘explicit grammar knowledge.’

**Formal Knowledge of Grammar / Subject Matter Knowledge**

Parallel to KAG in Figure 1 is the term ‘formal knowledge of grammar’, used by Haim et al.
(2004). Like Borg (2001b), Haim et al. do not offer an explicit definition of ‘formal knowledge
of grammar’; rather, they present it as a subcategory of the broader concept, ‘subject matter
knowledge’ (SMK). For a definition of SMK, the researchers refer readers to Richards (1998),
where it is defined as “what second language teachers need to know about their subject—the
specialized concepts, theories, and disciplinary knowledge that constitute the theoretical basis for
the field of second language teaching” (p. 8). Critically, Richards perceives language itself to be
the subject matter of L2 teaching. This conception of language as content stands in direct
contrast to the widely held notion that language is distinct from content, that language is solely
the medium through which content (e.g., literature, math, science) is processed and discussed
(see Long & Robinson, 1998).

If ‘formal knowledge of grammar’ is to be understood as a subset of SMK, it is reasonable to
presume that the term ‘formal knowledge of grammar’ refers to what second language teachers
need to know ‘formally,’ or explicitly, about grammar. In this way, the terms KAG—defined above as “explicit knowledge of the grammatical features of language”—and ‘formal knowledge of grammar’ appear to refer to highly similar theoretical constructs. Thus, both are presented as referring to teachers’ ‘explicit grammar knowledge.’ It is important to note that the difference in preposition between the two terms—‘knowledge of grammar’ and ‘knowledge about grammar’—does not denote an intended difference in meaning on the part of the researchers who have used the terms. While one could argue that the word ‘of’ implies a deeper and more intimate sort of knowledge than the word ‘about’, there is no indication in the researchers’ work that they have intended to distinguish between different levels of knowledge by using one or the other preposition.

Returning to the higher-order terms ‘subject matter knowledge’ (SMK) and ‘knowledge about language’ (KAL), it appears that they are also two different terms that have been used by researchers to refer to highly similar theoretical constructs. Richards (1998) defines SMK as what teachers need to know about language—including concepts, theories, and disciplinary knowledge—and emphasizes the point that SMK refers to what teachers know about what they teach, “rather than what they know about teaching itself” (p. 8). Similarly, Andrews (2007) defines KAL as explicit knowledge of the phonological, lexical, grammatical, pragmatic and socio-critical features of language. In this way, both terms refer to teachers’ explicit language knowledge and are thus presented as parallel terms under the heading ‘explicit language knowledge’ in Figure 1.

**Pedagogical Content Knowledge**

Directly above ‘explicit language knowledge’ is the term ‘pedagogical content knowledge’ (PCK). PCK is the term used by Johnston and Goettsch (2000) to name language teacher
knowledge. Importantly, for Johnston and Goettsch, as for Richards (1998), the ‘content’ of language teaching is understood to be language itself. According to Shulman (1987), PCK applies to neither content nor pedagogy as such, but to “the blending of content and pedagogy into an understanding of how particular topics, problems, or issues are organized, represented, and adapted to the diverse interests and abilities of learners, and presented for instruction” (p. 8). In this way, PCK incorporates three of the other categories of knowledge included in Shulman’s knowledge base for teaching: ‘knowledge of content,’ ‘knowledge of pedagogy,’ and ‘knowledge of learners.’ Thus, I have represented PCK as a construct that is inclusive of three other items in Figure 1: ‘knowledge of pedagogy,’ ‘knowledge of learners,’ and ‘explicit language knowledge’ (a rough equivalent to Shulman’s ‘knowledge of content’).

While PCK incorporates ‘knowledge of pedagogy,’ ‘knowledge of learners,’ and ‘explicit language knowledge,’ it is more than the sum of its parts. As Shulman (1987) explains, PCK is also concerned with what teachers do with their knowledge, how they draw on these three forms of knowledge to make decisions about how certain content should be “presented for instruction” (p. 8). For this reason, PCK is depicted in Figure 1 as falling within a grey triangle labeled ‘knowledge-in-action.’

The ‘knowledge-in-action’ triangle surrounds the three terms in the Figure 1 that name theoretical constructs concerned with the intersection of teacher knowledge and teacher practice. While ‘knowledge-in-action’ is not a component of teacher knowledge in the same way that, for example, ‘knowledge of learners’ or ‘explicit language knowledge’ are components of teacher knowledge, it does represent an important point of departure between various theoretical constructs of language teacher knowledge and thus serves an important function in Figure
1. Teacher Language Awareness (TLA) also falls within the ‘knowledge-in-action’ triangle, and I will turn my attention to that term now.

**Teacher Language Awareness**

I will begin my discussion of Teacher Language Awareness (TLA) by addressing its position within the ‘knowledge-in-action’ triangle. Andrews (2007) explains that he has intentionally used the word ‘awareness’ in TLA, rather than ‘knowledge’, in order to highlight TLA’s concern with ‘knowledge-in-action.’ “If I began using the word ‘awareness’ in part for historical reasons,” he writes, “it was retained deliberately, in order to emphasize the difference between the possession of subject-matter knowledge and ‘knowledge-in-action’ (i.e. awareness)” (p. 31).

Andrews later expounds on what he means by ‘knowledge-in-action’:

> There is a crucial distinction between the two dimensions of TLA: the declarative dimension (the possession of subject-matter knowledge) and the procedural dimension (‘knowledge-in-action’). In order for the L2 teacher’s handling of the content of learning to be ‘language-aware’, the teacher needs to possess not only a certain level of knowledge of the language systems of the target language, but also those qualities (i.e. the ‘awareness’) that will enable the subject-matter knowledge base to be accessed easily and drawn upon appropriately and effectively in the act of teaching. (p. 94)

TLA is thus similar to PCK in that both are concerned with how teachers use their knowledge in practice. The two constructs are also similar in their concern with ‘knowledge of learners’ and ‘knowledge of content.’

Regarding teachers’ ‘knowledge of content,’ Andrews (2007) argues that ‘explicit language knowledge’—or the ‘content’ of language teaching, as it is presented in Figure 1—is the “core” of TLA (p. 70). Furthermore, although most of Andrews’ own work is primarily concerned with the grammatical aspects of teachers’ content knowledge, he makes a point of explaining that “TLA applies to all language systems and assumes their interdependence” (p. ix). Thus, all of the
subcategories of ‘explicit language knowledge’ (e.g., KAL, SMK) depicted in Figure 1 may also
be understood as part of the theoretical construct of TLA.

Regarding teachers’ ‘knowledge of learners,’ Andrews argues that TLA involves “a complex
blend of learning- and learner-related understanding and sensitivity, such that the teacher is able
to provide the precise amount of knowledge the learner needs at a given point and to convey that
knowledge in a form that creates no barriers to comprehension” (p. 7). Furthermore, he
highlights the importance of teachers being aware of their students’ interlanguage (Selinker,
1972) so that they may “tailor their level of grammar-related input to that level” (p. 28). Citing
Krashen’s (1985) ‘input hypothesis,’ which proposes that comprehensible input is critical to
second language learning, Andrews (1999b) argues that teachers’ TLA has a major influence on
the quality of input they are able to provide their students. “If a teacher wanted her classroom to
be a major source of comprehensible input,” Andrews explains, then she would need to engage
in the following tasks, all of which would make use of her TLA: “select texts providing
comprehensible input; devise tasks entailing an appropriate level of linguistic challenge; and
control her own language to a level a little beyond the students’ current level of competence”
(pp. 164-5).

Hence, in TLA—as in PCK—both ‘knowledge of content’ and ‘knowledge of learners’ are
important components, and so are presented as such in Figure 1. The theoretical construct of
TLA, however, differs significantly from PCK in three important ways: 1) TLA excludes
teachers’ ‘knowledge of pedagogy’; 2) TLA includes teachers’ ‘beliefs and feelings about
language and language teaching’; and 3) TLA includes teachers’ language proficiency.

First, a feature of TLA that clearly distinguishes it from PCK is the exclusion of ‘knowledge
of pedagogy’ from its purview. In fact, Andrews (2007) explicitly excludes ‘knowledge of
pedagogy’ from his graphical representation of the relationship between TLA and PCK (p. 31). This exclusion makes theoretical sense in light of Shulman’s (1987) definition of ‘knowledge of pedagogy’ as “those broad principles and strategies of classroom management and organization that appear to transcend subject matter” (p. 8). Because the ‘core’ of TLA is ‘explicit language knowledge’—or, the subject matter of language teaching—TLA is not concerned with elements of teacher cognition that transcend teachers’ knowledge of language. Rather, a close reading of Andrews’ work on TLA (1997a, 1997b, 1999b, 2001; Andrews & McNeill, 2005) reveals that TLA is only concerned with pedagogical knowledge insofar as it relates to the enactment of teachers’ language knowledge. For this reason, TLA’s placement within the ‘knowledge-in-action’ triangle in Figure 1 is sufficient to represent the elements of pedagogical knowledge that play a role in teachers’ TLA.

Second, Andrews (2007) includes teachers’ ‘language proficiency’ as a crucial component of TLA, while ‘language proficiency’ is not a component of Shulman’s (1987) PCK. Andrews argues that because the content of instruction and the medium of instruction are often the same in language teaching, everything teachers say in the language classroom is necessarily “mediated through their language proficiency” (p. 27). As Andrews explains, it is important to distinguish between ‘explicit language knowledge’ and ‘language proficiency’ because a teacher may have one but not the other. On the one hand, a teacher may be highly proficient in a language but have very little formal knowledge of the grammar of the language. On the other hand, a non-native speaker may know a great deal about the grammatical structure of their L2 but be unable to use the language fluently. Andrews holds that both kinds of knowledge are drawn upon in the act of language teaching. When teachers prepare for lessons with a grammar focus, for example,
Andrews argues that they are likely to consult “both their explicit knowledge of the relevant grammar rules and their own communicative use of the grammar item” (p. 27).

Third, Andrews (2007) argues that teacher beliefs are an important component of their TLA, while teacher beliefs are excluded from the construct of PCK (Shulman, 1987). Indeed, a line of research on “pedagogical content beliefs” has attempted to address elements of teacher cognition that are not included in the construct of PCK (See Peterson, Fennema, Carpenter, & Loef, 1989; Staub & Stern, 2002; Kuntze, 2012). Andrews explains: “While subject-matter knowledge may constitute the core of TLA, any teacher’s knowledge is inevitably bound up with beliefs about that subject matter and, for example, how it should or can be taught and learned in a given context” (p. 70). Included in Andrews’ concept of subject-matter cognitions are teachers’ “feelings,” or affective responses (p. 74). Thus, teachers’ ‘beliefs and feelings about language and language teaching’ are presented in Figure 1 as a component of TLA. Importantly, the superordinate category in Figure 1, ‘beliefs and feelings about teaching,’ does not fall within the province of TLA. Andrews is clear on the point that knowledge is the “core” of TLA, and beliefs and feelings are only relevant to the construct insofar as they are bound up with teachers’ knowledge about language and language teaching. For the reasons outlined in this section, TLA and PCK are represented in Figure 1 as two separate theoretical constructs that share a concern with teachers’ ‘knowledge-in-action,’ including teachers’ ‘knowledge of learners’ and ‘knowledge of content.’

I should point out that Andrews (2007) depicts a slightly different relationship between TLA and PCK (p. 31). For Andrews, TLA is a component of PCK. He describes PCK as the “overarching knowledge base,” while TLA is the “knowledge base subset that is unique to the L2 teacher” (p. 30). On the whole, my Figure 1 and Andrews’ model (2007, p. 31) are highly
similar. They both include within the construct of TLA the following four components: knowledge of learners, knowledge of content, language proficiency, and beliefs. Furthermore, they both exclude ‘knowledge of pedagogy’ from TLA while including it in PCK. However, because Andrews depicts TLA as a component of PCK, all components of TLA are, for him, necessarily components of PCK. Thus, in contrast to Figure 1, Andrews’ model depicts both ‘language proficiency’ and ‘beliefs’ (which he includes under the heading ‘cognitions’) as components of PCK.

The first of these differences is minor. Andrews argues that ‘language proficiency’ can be understood as part of the PCK of language teachers because it is part of the knowledge base of language teachers. Remember that Andrews (2007) described TLA as the “knowledge base subset [of PCK] that is unique to the L2 teacher” (p. 30). I would be willing to grant him this concession if I agreed that TLA could be conceptualized as a subset of PCK. I do not agree with Andrews on this point, however, and that is because TLA explicitly includes teachers’ beliefs while PCK (Shulman, 1987) explicitly excludes them.

In Andrews’ model (2007, p. 31), he chooses to represent teachers’ beliefs as a part of teachers’ ‘subject matter cognitions,’ which are part of TLA, and thus part of PCK. Andrews explains that he has intentionally chosen the word ‘cognitions’, as opposed to ‘knowledge’, “in order to reflect the close interrelationship of knowledge and beliefs” (p. 30-31). I am uncomfortable with Andrews’ representation of teacher beliefs for two reasons. First, as explained above, I do not believe that beliefs can rightfully be considered part of PCK, so I do not believe that TLA can rightfully be considered part of PCK. Second, Andrews choice to incorporate beliefs into his model as one component of ‘subject-matter cognitions’ suggests that teachers’ beliefs are only relevant to TLA insofar as they relate to teachers’ knowledge of
content. However, Andrews’ description, elsewhere in his book, of the role of beliefs in TLA strongly suggests that teachers’ beliefs are relevant far beyond the scope of teachers’ knowledge of content. Namely, Andrews is also interested in teachers’ beliefs and feelings about their own language proficiency (i.e. “confidence”) and about their students as learners (i.e. “perceptions of students’ feelings about grammar”) (p. 74).

For the purposes of this paper, the precise theoretical relationship between the constructs of PCK and TLA is not particularly important. As Andrews (2007) acknowledges, there are clearly “close connections” between the two. I have made a point of disagreeing with Andrews on some of the finer points of his model only because, in the literature reviewed for this paper, teachers’ beliefs have a wider scope than teachers’ ‘knowledge of content’ and play an important role in teachers’ TLA. For these reasons, I did not feel comfortable representing teachers’ beliefs as a component of their ‘subject-matter cognitions,’ nor did I feel comfortable representing TLA as a subset of PCK, a construct that excludes beliefs from its purview. I would like to re-emphasize, as well, that Andrews and I agree on the four components of TLA: knowledge of learners, knowledge of content, language proficiency, and beliefs.

Moving upward in Figure 1, I continue with my discussion of beliefs because it is around beliefs that TLA differs most markedly from the three higher order terms: ‘teachers’ pedagogical systems’, ‘teachers’ theories’, and ‘beliefs, attitudes, knowledge (BAK)’.

**Teachers’ Pedagogical Systems / Teachers’ Theories / BAK**

The distinction made by Andrews (2007) between ‘beliefs and feelings about teaching,’ on the one hand, and ‘beliefs and feelings about language and language teaching,’ on the other, is a major point of difference between TLA and three related constructs: ‘teachers’ pedagogical systems’ (Borg, 1998c), ‘teachers’ theories’ (Borg, 1999b), and ‘beliefs, attitudes, knowledge
(BAK)’ (Woods, 1996). In Figure 1, these three terms appear one level above TLA, at the very top of the figure, and they are presented within a dashed box to indicate that they represent highly similar constructs. As Figure 1 suggests, they differ from TLA in that they incorporate the entirety of teachers’ ‘beliefs and feelings about teaching’ and that they incorporate teachers’ ‘knowledge of pedagogy.’

Woods (1996) defines ‘BAK’ as “an integrated network of beliefs, assumptions and background knowledge underlying teachers’ interpretive processes” (p. 213); Borg (1999b) defines ‘teachers’ theories’ as the “personal understandings of teaching and learning which teachers develop through educational and professional experiences in their lives” (p. 157); and Borg (1998c) defines ‘teachers’ pedagogical systems’ as the “stores of beliefs, knowledge, theories, assumptions, and attitudes that play a significant role in shaping teachers’ instructional decisions” (p. 9). These three definitions run together and are difficult to distinguish on the surface. An analysis of the nouns used by the three researchers to define the terms, however, has led me to categorize them as highly similar theoretical constructs.

Borg (1998c) uses five nouns to define ‘teachers’ pedagogical systems’: beliefs, knowledge, theories, assumptions, and attitudes. Woods (1996) uses three of the same nouns to define ‘BAK’: beliefs, assumptions, and knowledge. And Borg (1999b) uses only one noun to define ‘teachers’ theories’: understandings. Thus, ‘teachers’ pedagogical systems’ and ‘BAK’ are clearly highly similar terms, the only difference being the inclusion of the words theories and attitudes in Borg’s definition of ‘teachers’ pedagogical systems’. A researcher interested in teachers’ beliefs, however—as Woods is—will likely take their attitudes into consideration, as well. Furthermore, in considering teachers’ knowledge in combination with their beliefs, Woods is likely to touch on aspects of what Borg refers to as teachers’ theories. It is not my intention to
simplify the thinking of the researchers by suggesting that they are merely using different
words to describe the same things. What I am arguing is that, for the purposes of distinguishing
between the various terms used to describe teachers’ language knowledge, there are not
significant differences between the areas of teacher cognition and affect that the researchers take
into consideration in their research.

Similarly—regarding ‘teachers’ theories’—it seems reasonable to presume that the
understandings involved in ‘teachers’ theories’ include the knowledge and assumptions that are
part of ‘teachers’ pedagogical systems’, since knowledge and assumptions are part of the means
through which one forms understandings. Furthermore, if we are willing to accept that the notion
attitudes is largely accommodated by the term beliefs, and that beliefs are a component—along
with knowledge—of teachers’ theories, then the construct of ‘teachers’ theories’ names
essentially the same set of cognitive and affective properties as ‘teachers’ pedagogical systems’
and ‘BAK’. Borg’s (1999b) article lends support to this conclusion, since he includes teachers’
beliefs and attitudes in his analysis of their theories. He references, for example, one teacher’s
beliefs about the use of discovery methods to teach grammar and her attitudes about doing
grammar discovery work with students.

There is an important way in which these three constructs differ, however, and the difference
is reflected in the definitions quoted above. Borg (1999b) describes ‘teachers’ theories’ as the
understandings teachers have developed throughout their lives, and he offers a detailed analysis
of two teachers’ theories in the text of the article. The definition of ‘teachers’ theories’ makes no
mention of teacher practice, however, and Borg is only peripherally concerned with the teachers’
practices in the article’s text. Similarly, Woods (1996) is primarily interested in ‘BAK’ as it
relates to processes internal to the teacher: their ‘interpretive’ and planning processes. In
contrast, Borg’s (1998c) definition of ‘teachers’ pedagogical systems’ clearly specifies that the construct only concerns itself with teachers’ knowledge and beliefs insofar as they “play a significant role in shaping teachers’ instructional decisions” (p. 9). Therefore, I have distinguished between the three terms in Figure 1 by depicting ‘teachers’ pedagogical systems’ as a theoretical construct—like TLA and PCK—that is concerned with teachers’ ‘knowledge-in-action’ (Andrews, 2007, p. 31).

**Teacher Language Awareness as a Unifying Theoretical Construct**

If Figure 1 is an accurate representation of the relationships among the theoretical constructs used to talk about teachers’ language knowledge, then Teacher Language Awareness (TLA) is inclusive of all the other constructs with four exceptions: ‘pedagogical content knowledge’ (PCK), ‘teachers’ pedagogical systems’, ‘teachers’ theories’, and ‘BAK’. The primary points of difference between TLA and these four related constructs center on the role of beliefs in each of the models. While PCK is not concerned with teachers’ beliefs, ‘teachers’ pedagogical systems’, ‘teachers’ theories’, and ‘BAK’ are concerned with beliefs beyond the scope of teachers’ language knowledge.

Thus, TLA emerges as an empirically useful construct for conceptualizing teachers’ language knowledge-in-practice, which is the phenomenon addressed by the present study. In Figure 2, I offer a heuristic model of TLA, which is essentially a slice of Figure 1 that includes only TLA and its four components. Note that in Figure 2, the ‘knowledge-in-action’ triangle has been replaced with a parenthetical statement underneath TLA explaining that the use of word ‘awareness’ is meant to indicate a focus on teachers’ knowledge-in-action, rather than on their declarative knowledge alone.
Based on the model presented in Figure 2, I have derived the following working definition of TLA, as Andrews (2007) does not offer a concise definition in his work: Teacher Language Awareness (TLA) is defined as teachers’ knowledge-in-action about language and language teaching, which consists of their explicit language knowledge, knowledge of learners, language proficiency, and beliefs and feelings about language and language teaching. I will use this definition to organize the literature review that follows. The definition will also serve to inform my research design and to organize the presentation of my own research findings.

**Relationship Between Knowledge and Grammar Teaching Practices**

The literature reviewed in this section describes empirical research conducted in second and foreign language contexts that explicitly aims to relate L2 teachers’ language knowledge to their grammar teaching practices. A chronological summary of the 22 studies reviewed is offered in Table 2, which is provided as a simplified overview of the history of work in this area. In the four sections that follow, I highlight the ways in which insights derived from the existing research can be accommodated within the construct of Teacher Language Awareness (TLA) as it is defined in the preceding section: teachers’ knowledge-in-action about language and language teaching, which consists of their explicit language knowledge, knowledge of learners, language proficiency, and beliefs and feelings about language and language teaching. In this way, although
previous research in this area has been conducted from varying theoretical perspectives, I
integrate the theoretical and empirical findings of these studies into the construct of TLA so that
it may serve as a unifying conceptual framework for my interpretations of the existing literature
and for the design of the present study. This review of the literature is thus divided into the
following four sections, corresponding to the components of TLA as they have been presented in
the preceding section: 1) ‘Explicit Language Knowledge,’ 2) ‘Knowledge of Learners,’ 3)
‘Language Proficiency,’ and 4) ‘Beliefs and Feelings about Language and Language Teaching.’

Table 2
Chronological List of Studies on the Relationship Between L2 Teachers’ Language Knowledge
and Their Grammar Teaching Practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mitchell, Brumfit &amp; Hooper</td>
<td>1994a, 1994b</td>
<td>nature and use of teachers’ knowledge about language</td>
<td>secondary English and FL, UK</td>
<td>7 Ts, NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>secondary English and FL, UK</td>
<td>7 Ts, NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brumfit, Mitchell &amp; Hooper</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>nature and use of teachers’ knowledge about language</td>
<td>secondary English and FL, UK</td>
<td>7 Ts, NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woods</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>teachers’ beliefs, attitudes and knowledge in relation to their lesson planning</td>
<td>University ESL, Canada</td>
<td>8 Ts, (N)NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrews</td>
<td>1997a</td>
<td>teachers’ metalinguistic awareness in relation to their lesson planning</td>
<td>secondary ESL, HK</td>
<td>10 Ts, (N)NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrews</td>
<td>1997b</td>
<td>teachers’ metalinguistic awareness in relation to their grammatical explanations</td>
<td>secondary ESL, HK</td>
<td>14 Ts, NNS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borg</td>
<td>1998b</td>
<td>meta talk about language in classroom practice</td>
<td>adult EFL, Malta</td>
<td>2 Ts, NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borg</td>
<td>1998c</td>
<td>a teacher’s pedagogical system in relation to his grammar teaching practices</td>
<td>adult EFL, Malta</td>
<td>1 T, NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrews</td>
<td>1999b</td>
<td>teachers’ metalinguistic awareness in relation to the input made available for learning</td>
<td>secondary ESL, HK</td>
<td>3 Ts, NNS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borg</td>
<td>1999b</td>
<td>teachers’ theories in relation to their grammar teaching practices</td>
<td>adult EFL, Malta</td>
<td>2 Ts, NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borg</td>
<td>1999c</td>
<td>teachers’ use of grammatical terminology in the classroom</td>
<td>adult EFL, Malta</td>
<td>4 Ts, NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Explicit Language Knowledge

The first, and “core,” component of Teacher Language Awareness (TLA) is explicit language knowledge. As explained previously, Andrews (2007) chose the word ‘awareness,’
rather than the word ‘knowledge,’ for TLA in order to emphasize the *use*, or procedural dimension, of teachers’ language knowledge, what he calls their ‘knowledge-in-action’ (p. 31). Importantly, Andrews does not believe that teachers’ knowledge need be formalized in any single theoretical model in order for it to be useful in practice. Instead, he argues that teachers’ language knowledge should be based upon an “informed, principled eclecticism” that is generated organically through practice. “The developments in any teacher’s language awareness over the course of a career are likely to occur idiosyncratically,” Andrews explains, “as a result of a combination of factors, including exposure to theoretical developments and reflections on practical experience. The adequacy and appropriateness of an individual teacher’s language awareness at any stage of his or her career need to be considered in relation to the demands posed by the context in which that teacher is working at the time” (p. xi-xii).

Andrews’ distinction between the declarative dimension of teacher knowledge (“the possession of subject-matter knowledge”) (2007, p. 94) and its procedural dimension (“knowledge-in-action”) (2007, p. 31) is deemed critical by many of the researchers working in the field, as their aim is precisely to describe the nature of teachers’ knowledge as it is used in practice, rather than the nature of language knowledge in and of itself. As Andrews (2007) explains, “in order for the L2 teacher’s handling of the content of learning to be ‘language-aware’, the teacher needs to possess not only a certain level of knowledge of the language systems of the target language, but also those qualities (i.e. the ‘awareness’) that will enable the subject-matter knowledge base to be accessed easily and drawn upon appropriately and effectively in the act of teaching” (p. 94).

In his study of the relationship between teachers’ metalinguistic awareness and their explanations of grammar points, Andrews (1997b) points out that many of the observed
weaknesses in teachers’ explanations “seem to relate to metalinguistic awareness in operation rather than to problems with underlying declarative KAL [knowledge about language]” (p. 160, emphasis Andrews). He presents, for example, the case of Fanny, a teacher who he hypothesizes would do very well on a written test of explicit grammar knowledge. Fanny, however, not only failed to monitor her own output in the language classroom—using vocabulary that Andrews speculates was above her students’ level—she also adopted what Andrews refers to as a “scatter-gun approach to error…, blasting with equal force at anything which she perceived to be incorrect” (p. 158).

A number of other researchers and language teacher educators (Bigelow & Ranney, 2005; Burns & Knox, 2005; Johnston & Goettsch, 2000; Popko, 2005) have also addressed the complex relationship between teachers’ declarative and procedural knowledge.

As language teacher educators in a graduate ESL teacher preparation program, Bigelow and Ranney (2005) noticed that their students were not transferring their knowledge about language (KAL) to their lesson planning. The researchers wanted to identify the obstacles to such transfer so that they could develop ways of facilitating it. Through an analysis of 19 pre-service teachers’ learning journals and lesson plans, the researchers discovered that students’ ability to transfer their knowledge depended on the direction in which they were being asked to transfer it. Specifically, the students demonstrated the ability to transfer their knowledge about pedagogy to their grammar lesson plans, but they were much less successful in transferring their knowledge about grammar to their literature-based lesson plans. For example, when the students were given the grammar content in advance (e.g., the non-referential pronouns ‘it’ and ‘there’) and asked to create lesson plans around the forms, they were able to apply what they had learned about pedagogy in their design of those lessons (e.g., use authentic texts containing the form).
However, when the students were given the literary content in advance (e.g., an article on the history of Ecuador) and asked to choose a grammar objective appropriate to that content, they struggled. Many students simply did not choose a grammar target, while most others chose from a very limited range of forms—mainly regarding verb tense—compared to the many and various forms they had been exposed to in their grammar class.

Bigelow and Ranney were surprised by these results. They had expected knowledge transfer to move from the grammar class to the pedagogy class, and only in that one direction. In light of their research results, they hypothesized that perhaps it was easier for students to think about how a particular grammar point might be best taught (“path 1”) than to integrate their knowledge of grammar into instructional plans when the pedagogical context was given in advance (“path 2”). They explain: “Path 1 requires building content and meaningful tasks around a given structure. Path 2 requires the teacher to first identify the language structures required to comprehend texts or perform tasks, thus adding another cognitive layer to the planning process” (p. 195).

Burns and Knox (2005), also language teacher educators, were concerned about the lack of empirical evidence that Applied Linguistics coursework has any effect on teachers’ practice. They designed a study to investigate the extent to which two recent graduates were applying Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL), which they had studied in their teacher preparation program, in their teaching. The graduates were selected for the study because they were “enthusiastic teachers” and had been high-achieving students in the SFL course, demonstrating a deep understanding of SFL. As such, the researchers “had assumed that they would ‘naturally’ take up the pedagogical implications with no difficulty” (p. 255). What they found, however, was the opposite of what they had expected. Both teachers used primarily traditional approaches in
their teaching, such as explanations of syntactic structure delivered in a didactic style. One teacher acknowledged that this style “contrasted considerably with her belief that grammar teaching should be inductive and contextualized” (p. 244). It became apparent through interviews with the teachers, however, that both continued to struggle with the complexity of SFL and felt they needed a more thorough understanding of the theory and how it applied to their work. Throughout the course of the study, the researchers helped the teachers to reflect on their own work through an SFL lens, and both teachers began to incorporate more aspects of SFL into their teaching. Based on their findings, Burns and Knox conclude that KAL should not be seen as “static or decontextualised,” as it is “realized only in its application.” They argue that “the relation between knowledge and action is intrinsic…that the relationship between a teacher’s KAL on one hand, and classroom action and decision-making on the other, is dialectic and dynamic” (p. 254).

Johnston and Goettsch (2000) arrived at a similar conclusion. Seeking empirical evidence to support the design of a new Linguistic Analysis course in their language teacher education program, the researchers looked at the grammar explanations of four ‘excellent’ experienced teachers in order to determine what kinds of linguistic knowledge those teachers drew upon in their work. One of their main findings was that the knowledge base of these teachers was more than a “repository of inert facts,” as it is often conceived. Rather, it “frequently involved engaging in their analysis dialogically with students, helping them to go through the processes necessary for an understanding of the language” (“The Knowledge Base,” para. 2). In this way, they came to conceptualize the knowledge base of language teaching as ‘process-oriented’ in nature. “Knowledge of content,” they argue, “does not translate automatically into pedagogical content knowledge…the teacher knowing the rules is one thing, while what she does with that
knowledge (‘telling’ it to the students, or finding other ways to work with it) is something else” (“Content Knowledge,” para. 3).

Finally, Popko (2005) was also concerned with how teachers applied their language knowledge in practice. Aspiring to become a teacher educator himself, he was motivated to discover not only what teachers needed to know about language but how they needed to know it. To this end, he conducted observations and interviews with four Master’s students in an ESL teacher preparation program who were also teaching at their university’s English Language Institute for adults. He found, however, that he had significant difficulty observing the connections between teachers’ declarative language knowledge and their pedagogical practices. What he was able to observe, he explains, was that “the exigencies of the teaching situation” called on teachers to use their linguistic background knowledge as needed (p. 399). As a result, he speculates that KAL, as such, may not actually be observable in the classroom. Instead, what we can expect to observe is “the application of KAL during praxis.” If this is the case, he continues, “it may be that what is of importance to ESL teachers is not so much KAL, but the ways in which that knowledge can be used to inform their practice” (p. 402).

Despite the methodological difficulties involved in describing the relationship between knowledge and practice, researchers have been able to offer some evidence of the ways in which teachers’ language knowledge interacts with their grammar teaching practices. Often, this evidence is of the negative sort—evidence that teachers do not possess the language knowledge required to teach effectively—but there is positive evidence, as well. The relevant findings are presented below under headings that correspond to teaching behaviors correlated with teachers’ explicit language knowledge in the research: engagement style, error correction, input, and explanation.
Engagement style.

Haim et al. (2004), in their study of 10 teachers’ instructional presentations of wh-constructions, present quantitative evidence that differences in the depth of teachers’ grammatical knowledge (i.e. shallow vs. deep, as defined by a written assessment of teachers’ knowledge of wh-constructions) are correlated with observable differences in teaching approaches. Specifically, the researchers found that deep knowledge of grammar is associated with “inquiry oriented” grammar teaching, while shallow knowledge is associated with “goal oriented” grammar teaching (p. 870). In “inquiry oriented” instruction—the approach associated with deep knowledge of grammar—teachers emphasize conceptual understanding and higher-order thinking, and they perceive students to be active participants in the learning process. In contrast, “goal oriented” instruction—the approach associated with shallow knowledge of grammar—emphasizes practice and rehearsal, and students are perceived as passive recipients of transferrable knowledge.

Johnston and Goettsch (2000) and Andrews (1999b) have both found similar results in qualitative studies. Johnston and Goettsch’s study focused on the knowledge and practices of four ‘excellent’ teachers, teachers whom they assumed possessed the language knowledge necessary to teach language learners effectively. Based on their analysis of the grammar explanations of these teachers, they concluded that a defining characteristic of excellent teachers is a commitment to student-centered instructional approaches. “All four teachers,” they reported, “encouraged questions from students and devoted considerable stretches of their lessons to student-initiated discussions” (“In the Interview,” para. 13).

Similarly, Andrews’ (1999b) qualitative study of the language awareness and practices of 17 ESL teachers also revealed a relationship between deep language knowledge and student-
centered practices. Andrews profiled one teacher, Alex, who employed an “inquiry oriented” approach to teaching as defined by Haim et al. (2004). Andrews described Alex as demonstrating a “highly developed TMA” (teacher metalinguistic awareness) and noted that Alex was regularly observed using the students’ language productions in his teaching. For example, in a lesson on modals of obligation, Alex asked his students to generate a list of rules for using a swimming pool. He then used this list, which contained modals of obligation (e.g., must, have to) as a starting point for the lesson. In a lesson on using the present participle to join clauses, Alex asked his students to generate sentences based on the combination of two given sentences (e.g., He saw a man lying on the floor. He went over to help him. → Seeing a man lying on the floor, he went over to help him.). During this lesson, Alex intentionally presented his students with one pair of sentences that had two different subjects (i.e. The ambulance arrived a few minutes later. The man was taken to the hospital.) so that they would have to engage in some grammatical problem solving in order to combine the sentences in a way that retained their meaning. Alex’s students were able to solve the problem by changing the subject of the second sentence so that it was the same as the subject of the first sentence (i.e. The ambulance took the man to the hospital.), resulting in a combined sentence: Arriving a few minutes later, the ambulance took the man to the hospital. In an interview, Alex explained that his purpose in designing the lesson in a student-centered way was to see if his students could identify problems with combining the pair of sentences with mismatched subjects and to see if they could posit any possible solutions.

Error correction.

As with engagement style, in the area of error correction, Johnston and Goettsch (2000) observed the ‘excellent’ teachers in their study using a student-centered approach. The researchers highlight the challenges that such an approach poses to teachers’ language
knowledge, particularly in the domain of error correction. In classrooms with a “dialogical approach,” they explain, “a significant part of the teacher’s job consists of on-the-spot adjudication of sample sentences the students throw out,” involving not only judgments about correctness, but decisions about the source of the error and its potential implications for communication (“In the Interview,” para. 15). Borg (2001a), in his study of five teachers’ grammar teaching practices and rationales, observed similar complexities in teachers’ decision-making processes in regard to student error. Each time a student makes an error, he explains, the teacher has to consider a host of instructional factors, such as:

(a) the purpose of the activity the error occurred in (e.g., accuracy or fluency);
(b) the gravity of the error in the context it occurred;
(c) what effect they felt that ignoring it was likely to have on the student making it and/or on the rest of the class (i.e., whether the other students would ‘learn’ the error);
(d) the extent to which the error was specific to a particular student or whether it reflected an issue the whole class were having problems with. (pp. 180-1)

The teacher’s assessment of the issues above will, he argues, determine whether, when, and with whom the teacher chooses to address the error, and which strategy to use in doing so.

Popko (2005) observed one teacher, Joyce, who he argued demonstrated a theory-based approach to error-correction, an approach which required her to engage in the kind of complex decision-making described by Borg (2001a). In one example, Joyce was teaching a lesson on thesis statements, and one student produced the following sentence: *Starbucks is a place where it makes everybody happy by smell and people can get a good mood easily all over the world.* Although Joyce acknowledged that this sentence was non-native-like, if not grammatically incorrect, she chose not to correct it, citing sociolinguistic theory. “There are some arguments in sociolinguistics,” she explained, where “there isn’t one necessarily one target that we’re shooting for” (Popko 2005, p. 399). Given that the focus of the lesson was on thesis statements as an
organizational element in English writing, Joyce felt that her student had produced an acceptable sentence in that instructional context.

**Input.**

As previously noted, Andrews (1999b, 2007) places a high value on the role of input in L2 teaching. According to Andrews and McNeill (2005), limitations in TLA often “become apparent in the ways in which the subjects mediate the input made available for learning” (p. 167). Mitchell et al. (1994a, 1994b; Brumfit et al., 1996), for example, in a study designed to discover the nature of teachers’ Knowledge about Language (KAL) and the relationships between KAL and teaching practices, found that the seven teachers in their study often conveyed inaccurate messages to their students regarding the structure of language, an observation they attributed to limitations in the teachers’ KAL.

Andrews (1999b) offers specific examples of teachers conveying inaccurate grammatical messages. A teacher he calls Rose, for example, is observed using standardized exercises so formulaic that they prompt students to “produce extremely unnatural sentences” (p. 168). For example, in one exercise on indirect speech, students were encouraged to transform the sentence *The farmer told his wife ‘Go and feed the ducks now’* into *The farmer told his wife to go and feed the ducks then*. Furthermore, when asked about the lesson, Rose gave no indication that she saw any weakness in the exercise. Andrews took this as a further indication of her lack of language knowledge. Another teacher, Benjamin, who described himself as a ‘grammar person’ and had enough confidence in his own language knowledge to create his own teaching materials, was also observed presenting his students with confusing, if not misleading, information. In teaching future time, for instance, he gave his students the misleading impression that the present progressive is used only to talk about events occurring in the present, while the future
progressive is the form that should be used when talking about the future. This explanation obviously fails to account for sentences such as *I’m going to the store tomorrow morning*.

Finally, Andrews and McNeill (2005) observed a teacher named Anna presenting her students with two lists of verbs, one related to the concept of ‘increasing’ and one related to the concept of ‘decreasing’. The verbs were presented outside of any meaningful context, and pairs of verbs were presented as synonymous in a way that might have led students to produce grammatically incorrect sentences. For example, ‘increase’ and ‘augment’ were presented as synonyms, although ‘increase’ can be used both transitively and intransitively, while ‘augment’ can only be used transitively. Similarly, ‘decrease’ and ‘abate,’ which were presented as a synonymous pair, differ in transitivity: ‘Decrease’ can be used transitively or intransitively, and ‘abate’ is a strictly intransitive verb (p. 168).

**Explanation.**

Grammatical explanations, or the lack thereof, have also been identified as windows on teachers’ language knowledge. Johnston and Goettsch (2000) argue that, while grammatical explanations are only a part of what constitutes teachers’ language knowledge, “they represent a clear example of what it means to ‘apply’ knowledge of language” (“Pedagogical Content Knowledge,” para. 1).

Alex (Andrews, 1999b) provides an illustrative case of a teacher’s skillful explanation of grammar. In the lesson on modals of obligation referred to previously, he asked his students to generate rules for using a swimming pool. When all of their responses came in the negative (i.e., using the verb ‘cannot’), Alex prompted them to rewrite the rules in positive form. One student suggested using ‘may’ as a positive form of ‘cannot’. In response, Andrews argues, Alex was able to illustrate the unsuitability of ‘may’ in a way that was accessible to his students:
[Ss ‘May’]...erm may uhuh Is it a good one? For rules? If I say You may speak in English, if you don’t want to, then you don’t do it, right? So will it be OK? No. If you use the word may, it means that if you do it, very good...if you don’t do it, OK, fine. So for rules maybe not a good one. (p. 174)

In addition, Borg (1998c) presents a profile of a highly qualified and experienced teacher who he does not assign a pseudonym. This teacher referred to the ability to provide accessible grammatical explanations as involving “conscious censorship” on the teacher’s part, a strategy used to avoid confusing students with overly complicated or detailed explanations of grammar. Similarly, Eric (Borg, 1998b) is observed making “real-time decisions” to avoid grammatical terminology he felt would “in some way threaten or frighten” his students. By telling the students, “the name doesn’t matter” or “it’s not necessary to know these words,” Borg argues that Eric was consciously avoiding unnecessary complications for his students (p. 166).

The literature also includes many negative examples of teachers’ grammatical explanations, however. For example, Dina, one of the teachers observed by Andrews (1997b), is repeatedly observed offering no explanation of her grammatical corrections other than those of the type “I think it’s better,” “is it better?,” and “do you think it is much more better?” (p. 154). In a lesson on future time, for example, Dina corrected the sentence, I’m running in the 800 meters, and offered the following by way of explanation:

I’m running in the 800 meters, er you refer to the event next week huh?...it tells something about something will happen in the future...so is it better to use, I will be running in the 800 meters?...do you think it is much more better? (p. 154)

While the use of “is it better?” might be seen as a device for checking student comprehension, Andrews points out that, in a typical Hong Kong classroom, “no student would ever venture to say, ‘No!!’ or even ‘Possibly, but why?’” (p. 154).

Similarly, Rose (Andrews, 1999b) is observed offering the following explanation of the use of modals in reported speech:
Do you know under what situations we will have to change the word *must* into *had to* in reported speech? When the word *must* in the direct speech refers to something that happens in the future. So you have to change it into *had to* in the reported speech, OK? (pp. 168-9)

Rose then moved on to the next item without commenting further, “appearing to accept the lack of response to her ‘OK?’ as an indication that the students had understood” (p. 169). In an interview, Rose admitted to limitations in her language knowledge that make it difficult for her to explain grammar points. She relayed a story about what happened when a student asked her how the passive voice gets used in everyday life. Rose didn’t know, so she asked her colleagues about it and did some thinking on her own, but to no avail. “Even now,” she explained, “I really don’t know how to answer that student’s questions. I finish the worksheets with them and they know how to rewrite the sentences. But I don’t know how to explain it to them” (p. 169).

Andrews notes that there were a number of instances in which Rose offered “no explanation, exemplification or clarification,” and he speculates that the reason for this may be that she was simply unable to offer any due to a lack of explicit language knowledge (p. 169).

Joel, observed by Pahissa and Tragant (2009), also tended to avoid explaining grammar points. In contrast to Rose (Andrews, 1999b), though, Joel believed that “reasoning” with students about grammar was useless and that the only thing that might help them is “seeing the correct form repeatedly” (Pahissa & Tragant, 2009, p. 54). As a result, Pahissa and Tragant were left with the impression that “what his students saw was merely the final product, not the process of correction. They were shown ‘a better way to say it’ but the reason why that particular solution was favored remained mostly unexplained” (p. 54).

Teachers’ tendencies to avoid, or to engage with, grammatical explanations are bound up with their knowledge and beliefs about the students they are teaching. Teachers’ knowledge of their students as language learners is addressed in the following section.
Knowledge of Learners

Andrews and McNeill (2005), in their study of the Teacher Language Awareness (TLA) of ‘good’ language teachers, argue that teachers’ knowledge of their students is a defining characteristic of their highly developed TLA. “This awareness shows itself,” they explain, “in their strategies for input enhancement, the support they give all individual learners, based on knowledge and understanding of their specific problems and needs, and also the way in which they all skillfully control their own language so that it presents an appropriate level of challenge for the learners” (p. 173). In the research reviewed here, teachers’ knowledge of their students—or the lack thereof—revealed itself in five ways: 1) input enhancement strategies, 2) selection of content appropriate to students’ levels, 3) use of metalanguage appropriate to students’ levels, 4) comprehension checks to ensure student understanding, and 5) awareness of sociocultural issues related to student learning.

Input enhancement strategies.

Citing Sharwood Smith (1991), Andrews and McNeill (2005) argue that all three ‘good’ language teachers in their study demonstrated “an intuitive understanding of the importance of ‘input enhancement,’ making salient within the input the key features of the language area” (p. 172). For Anna, this involved using different colors to highlight different types of lexical items. She explained that she coded items in this way “only for familiarization.” Whether or not the students used the items in their own language production was irrelevant from Anna’s perspective. “At least they’ve seen it before,” she explained, “it’s not totally new” (p. 172). Bonnie also made use of color, highlighting different language patterns in different colors of chalk, while Trudi’s method of input enhancement involved “building up patterns on the board at
the beginning of the lesson” and then leaving them there in an attempt to “promote assimilation by the learners” (p. 173).

Selection of content.

In contrast to many other forms of teachers’ language knowledge-in-action, selection of content to meet the perceived language levels of their students was an area in which many of the teachers profiled in this literature review excelled.

Andrews (1997a), for example, sees evidence that teachers he refers to as A and X were aware of the need to assess their students’ knowledge of the present perfect before they began teaching. In a co-planning session, X explained, “I think they have previous knowledge…on Present Perfect Tense so let’s do some revision first…to check for their understandings and to check for their levels” (p. 201). A agreed that they should begin by asking the students questions about themselves to see if they would answer in the present perfect or the past.

Another pair of teachers in the same study (Andrews, 1997a) demonstrated concern for the students’ levels, but they disagreed about what that level was. K believed that, after years of exposure to English, her Hong Kong students would have a great deal of implicit knowledge about the perfect aspect, though they might have some difficulty making that knowledge explicit. She therefore felt that it wasn’t necessary to dedicate class time to teaching students the rules associated with the perfect because they already knew how to use it. M, however, adamantly disagreed. “They are not like us,” she argued. “Come on they do not speak English as well as us...They probably speak English as well as I spoke French for A-level.” Seeing her students more as foreign language learners than bilingual students, M argued that explicit grammar instruction, in the form of “definitions and examples,” would be necessary in order for the students to make sense of the perfect (p. 205).
A final pair of teachers in the study (Andrews, 1997a), T and I, were in closer agreement regarding the level of their students and addressed level-specific content modifications more specifically. In preparing to teach a lesson on the use of the past simple versus the present perfect, the teachers agreed that giving their students a simple rule regarding the vocabulary typically associated with the perfect (such as ‘already’) was below their level. “T and I are of the view,” Andrews explains, “that while such a focus may be helpful with primary school students, Form 3 students need a more sophisticated understanding of the Present Perfect” (p. 198).

Hanna (Borg, 2001a) also demonstrated a concern for meeting students at their level by differentiating between students with adequate and inadequate “entry-level knowledge of the grammar” she would be teaching (p. 166). If she felt that students’ knowledge was inadequate, then she began with explicit presentation of the grammar point. For students with more knowledge, however, she began with fluency work, both as a means of “identifying which specific points need brushing up” and as a way of providing “further opportunities for students to use the grammar correctly” (p. 166).

In one counter-example, however, a teacher “appeared to have given little or no serious thought to the previous learning of his…students” (Andrews, 2001, p. 86). In fact, when asked in an interview if he had considered any difficulties his students might have with the conditional, the teacher responded: “Their point of view?…Actually I didn’t think much…I’m not try to think of it” (p. 87).

Use of metalanguage.

Research findings suggest that, just as teachers’ assessments of students’ language ability influence the content they choose to teach, such assessments also influence the metalanguage teachers use to discuss that content. In their study of the pedagogical content knowledge (PCK)
of experienced language teachers, Johnston and Goettsch (2000) found that an awareness of “the appropriate degree of metalanguage” for particular levels of students was a characteristic shared by the teachers in their study (“In the Interview,” para. 2). The teacher profiled in Borg (1998c) explicates the need for teachers to modify grammar materials in order to make them accessible to their students. “A teacher who is well aware,” he argued, “of what her/his students can deal with orally/aurally at a moment in time, often needs to select and modify grammatical information in a way that a reference book doesn’t need to” (p. 24).

Emma (Pahissa & Tragant, 2009) and Tina (Borg, 1999c) both explicitly explained the ways in which they adapted their metalanguage for different levels of students. Emma, who was regularly observed making grammar rules explicit for her students, explained in an interview that she always adapts this practice when teaching at lower levels. When teaching low level students, the researchers note, Emma only used terminology “if she was completely sure that she would be understood” (Pahissa & Tragant, 2009, p. 51). Similarly, Tina believed that a focus on grammatical terminology was “premature” if it interfered with helping students to understand the meaning and use of grammar, which she saw as more important goals (Borg, 1999c, p. 111). Therefore, although she taught some of the same grammar content at various levels, she did so using different terminology. Borg notes that he never observed a situation in which Tina’s students “seemed alienated by her use of metalanguage” (p. 112). Tina explained her approach this way: “Perhaps at the lowest levels, you wouldn’t say ‘look, where is the auxiliary here?’; you’d probably say, ‘where’s the most important verb?’; and so on and so forth. But I think in an advanced class...I would always call an auxiliary an auxiliary, the past participle the past participle...it’s faster for them and faster for the teacher if they can put a little name on it...It can
be shorthand. Obviously, if the students don’t understand the shorthand it just gets in the way, it’s not shorthand anymore, it’s just sort of an obstacle” (pp. 111-2).

**Comprehension checks.**

It seems evident that teachers’ ability to gauge their students’ comprehension at any given time is a critical aspect of knowing their students as learners. Somewhat surprisingly, then, there are not many examples of teachers’ use of comprehension checks in the literature reviewed here. Johnston and Goettsch (2000), however, explain that all four of the experienced language teachers in their study regularly checked their students’ comprehension in order to determine if an explanation had been successful. All four teachers made regular use of immediate comprehension checks, such as paying attention “to signals given by students in their body language, especially eye contact and facial expression.” In addition, all four teachers “acknowledged the need for delayed feedback” from the students, which came in the form of grammar journals, after class conversations, and discussions during office hours (“In the Interview,” para. 17-20).

**Awareness of sociocultural issues.**

The final aspect of teachers’ knowledge of students—awareness of sociocultural issues—is addressed in some depth by Luk and Wong (2010). The researchers reference Andrews’ (2007) assertion that TLA involves “an awareness of the challenges posed for the learners by the language content of pedagogical materials and tasks” (p. 175), and they emphasize that a number of such potential challenges are sociocultural in nature. They suggest that teachers who are unaware of their students as “active meaning-makers” in sociocultural contexts may miss opportunities to scaffold their students’ language learning (Luk & Wong, 2010, p. 39).
Luk and Wong (2010) present Ronnie as an example of a teacher who possesses adequate subject-matter knowledge but lacks the requisite sociocultural awareness to maximize her students’ opportunities for learning. Ronnie was observed teaching a lesson on the thematic topic “cooking instructions,” within which she had both vocabulary and grammar objectives. As part of her vocabulary focus, she asked her students for the Cantonese translation of the English word ‘mince,’ simultaneously miming the action through which many Chinese people would prepare minced meat. When a student suggested a Cantonese verb meaning ‘to mince meat by hand,’ however, Ronnie rejected the suggestion. She was looking for an adjective form meaning ‘minced,’ a word derived from the English word that she thought would be easier for students to remember. In this way, Ronnie discredited the student’s cultural and linguistic knowledge by being too narrowly focused on what she considered the right answer (p. 37).

Also, as part of the grammar focus of her lesson, Ronnie presented a picture of a spoon resting in a pot of raw egg yolk—underneath which was written the caption, *Stir the egg yolks with the mixture*—and she asked her students for the meaning of the word ‘mixture’. She rejected both “an egg stirrer” and “a blending bowl” when they were offered by the students, however, failing to acknowledge the ambiguity of the caption when paired with the accompanying picture. Since ‘with’ can be used both to join two things that are being combined and to indicate the instrument through which an action is accomplished, it was quite reasonable for the students to presume that a ‘mixture’ was the instrument with which the egg yolks were being stirred. As Luk and Wong (2010) explain, Ronnie failed to “recognize the potential problem of her instructional discourse and other forms of semiotic input on students’ learning” (p. 39).

For Luk and Wong (2010), Ronnie’s case is a clear example of how an otherwise qualified teacher “may still display systemic conceptual and awareness blind spots about the sociocultural
nature of the meaning-making processes” in the classroom. “The essential role of text and context, and the learners in mapping from and meaning,” they argue, “makes it imperative for teachers to re-conceptualize their dominant and “expert” role...as constituting more than a knowledge possessor, knowledge giver, or a learning evaluator, but as socioculturally aware interlocutors and knowledge mediators sensitive to what the learners might have brought to the learning environments” (p. 41).

**Language Proficiency**

The third component of Teacher Language Awareness (TLA) is language proficiency. For Andrews, language proficiency affects not only “the structural accuracy and functional appropriacy of the teacher’s mediation of...language input,” but also “the quality of the teacher’s reflections about language” (2001, p. 83). In simpler terms, teachers who are less proficient in a language are less likely to produce grammatically correct and context-appropriate language, and they are also less likely to make sound judgments about what ‘sounds right’ and why. In the 22 studies reviewed herein, the teachers who spoke English as a first language were described as proficient in the language, as were many of the non-native speakers. Only seven studies (Andrews, 1997a, 1997b, 1999b, 2001; Borg, 2001b, 2005; Pahissa & Tragant, 2009) include non-native speakers with less than native-like proficiency in English in their samples. The findings of those studies regarding the role of language proficiency in TLA are presented in this section.

**Accurate and effective use of the target language(s).**

Andrews (1997b) presents Betty as a teacher whose performance offers insight into how teachers’ language proficiency can negatively influence their grammar teaching practices. In one instance, Betty was presenting a short piece about someone’s plans to run in a race, and she was
attempting to correct the following sentence: *I should to start training a few weeks ago.*

Acknowledging that something was wrong with the sentence, Betty thought aloud about what the problem might be. “It’s a bit strange,” she said, “for the last part as erm when we are talking future the future event...the writer suddenly goes into the past tense” (p. 153). Then, Betty offered an ungrammatical sentence—*I should be start training a few weeks ago*—as a correction of the sentence, which Andrews notes “conveys nothing but confusion and misunderstanding” to her students (p. 153). He argues that the limitations of Betty’s language proficiency have affected her teaching performance in two ways: “First, she appears not to understand the meaning that the writer is trying to express. Second, she produces an ungrammatical sentence as her final correction” (p. 153).

In a later study, Andrews (2001) observed Tony teaching a lesson on the use of the simple past versus the past perfect, an area with which his students had had difficulty. Tony created a short story, with associated pictures, in which he used both simple past and past perfect verbs. The students were asked to underline each verb and analyze their use. As Andrews explains, however, Tony used the past perfect inappropriately himself, choosing it instead of the past simple when there was no justification in the story’s context for doing so. Tony wrote:

> On the 7th January 1996, a terrible accident had happened. A man and a dog had been killed by a lorry near the road. They had become ghosts! One week later, an old man drove his car near the place where the accident had taken place. (p. 87)

In this way, limitations in Tony’s own language proficiency led him to create a lesson that likely only contributed to his students’ confusion regarding the use of the simple past and the past perfect.
Use of the non-native speaker advantage.

While it is clear that limitations in teachers’ language proficiency can negatively influence their grammar teaching practices, Borg, along with Pahissa and Tragant, have found some evidence that the particular struggles of non-native speakers may positively influence their teaching. Zsanna (Borg, 2005), for example, presented a strong case for the ways in which her experience learning English as a second language informed her teaching of English to other non-native speakers. Zsanna explained: “My experience shows that it doesn’t always help if you know a lot about English grammar because you know it in theory but when you have to use it under the slightly little bit of stress you just can say any old things...there are different layers of knowing foreign language and this is the most exciting for me, so how can I prepare myself and my students to deal with these situations” (p. 329)? Zsanna saw explicit grammar instruction as particularly important when students were confronted with concepts in English that they didn’t have in their native language. Explicit analysis of grammar was very helpful to her when she was first exposed to new grammatical concepts—such as the perfect, which does not exist in Hungarian—and she believed that it would be for her students, as well. “That is why non-native teachers have advantages,” she argued, “because they just learnt the same steps on their own” (p. 331).

Emma and Miquel (Pahissa & Tragant, 2009) expressed similar views. Emma believed that she could lead her students down the “shortest path” in understanding a new grammar issue by leading her students through “the same mental process” that she followed as an English language learner (p. 52). Likewise, whenever Miquel presented a new grammar item, he “always made sure students knew its equivalent as well as the adequate terminology in Catalan or Spanish,” as these tools had helped him to acquire English as a second language (p. 55).
Beliefs and Feelings about Language and Language Teaching

The final component of Teacher Language Awareness (TLA) is teachers’ beliefs and feelings about language and language teaching. As discussed above, Andrews believes that teachers’ beliefs about language and language teaching, including their feelings and understandings, are intertwined with their language knowledge and so cannot be ignored in studies of TLA. Findings reported by Woods (1996) support the centrality of teacher beliefs in their approach to language teaching. Woods develops the theoretical construct BAK, which he defines as “an integrated network of beliefs, assumptions, and background knowledge” (p. 213). In his study of the role of BAK in teaching practices of eight ESL teachers, he finds that BAK is “part of the entire cycle of planning, implementation, and assessment” (p. 248).

Andrews (2007) specifically identifies the following beliefs as relevant to grammar teaching practices: “the teacher’s personal feelings about grammar and grammar pedagogy (e.g., interest and confidence); perceptions of students’ feelings about grammar; understandings of the role of grammar in communication, and of its significance in L2 acquisition and formal instruction; understandings of the expectations of stakeholders (for instance, the school, students, parents) in relation to grammar and grammar pedagogy; and the teacher’s personal response to those expectations” (p. 74). For Andrews, a teacher’s stance on the issues listed here contributes to that teacher’s level of ‘engagement,’ a term he defines as the “readiness/willingness to engage with language-related issues,” and which he argues is “a key factor affecting the application of TLA in pedagogical practice” (2001, p. 84). Furthermore, the willingness to engage with language is identified by Andrews and McNeill (2005) as a defining characteristic of ‘good’ language teachers.
This section is divided into four subsections which correspond to the categories of belief that Andrews’ identifies as relevant to grammar teaching: feelings about grammar, perceptions of students’ feelings about grammar, understandings of the role of grammar instruction, and understandings of stakeholder expectations.

**Feelings about grammar.**

Johnston and Goettsch (2000), in their study of experienced language teachers, note that “more than one teacher commented on how much she enjoyed language analysis.” “I remember diagramming sentences,” one claimed, “and I loved that” (“Content Knowledge,” para. 7). This “love of language” is also identified by Andrews and McNeill (2005) as a characteristic of ‘good’ language teachers (p. 174). Furthermore, the research suggests that teachers who are highly engaged with the teaching of grammar are always looking for ways to enhance their own grammar knowledge. The teachers in Johnston and Goettsch’s (2000) study describe their knowledge of English grammar as something that is “continually growing and even changing” through their consultation of textbooks, reference grammars, and other knowledgeable people (“Content Knowledge,” para. 9). Andrews and McNeill (2005) also observe teachers’ consultation of external sources in what they describe as teachers’ “quest for self-improvement” (p. 171).

Bobbi is described by Burns and Knox (2005) as a teacher who is continually looking to improve her own grammar knowledge. “I very often actually learn as I teach,” she explains. “For me it’s actually, I’ve learnt a great deal of grammar just through teaching because you know you come up against a problem you have to think about it and then you go away and you read about it and then you come back in a more prepared way but I’m finding students are always throwing up stuff I can’t answer or can only partly answer” (p. 249).
Likewise, Zsanna, a teacher profiled in Borg’s (2005) study on the relationship between teachers’ Knowledge about Language (KAL) and their grammar teaching practices, seems to exemplify the “quest for self-improvement” described by Andrews and McNeill (2005). A native Hungarian speaker and former teacher of Russian, Zsanna strove continually to improve her knowledge of English grammar through consultation of textual resources, but also through her students. She was observed, for example, teaching a lesson on perfect aspect, an area of English grammar she admitted to struggling with. Despite uncertainties about her own knowledge, however, she chose to engage in an open discussion on this topic with her students, encouraging them to ask questions and generate examples. For Borg, her willingness to make herself vulnerable in this way reflected “her belief that having an adequately developed KAL is less about always knowing the answer when students ask questions and more about knowing that there is always more to learn” (Borg, 2005, p. 331). Zsanna explains: “There are always questions that students might ask and you don’t know the answer or you don’t know the answer in the way they require it....I am really happy and that is why I came to this school because I wanted to be challenged in this way, so I used to teach in...[other schools]...and I just didn’t have the possibility to develop” (p. 331).

Bobbi’s (Burns and Knox, 2005) and Zsanna’s (Borg, 2005) ability to find grammar explanations when they searched for them sets them in opposition to Rose (Andrews, 1999b). Recall the story about Rose that I relayed in the section on grammatical explanations, in which Rose’s student had asked her about the use of the passive voice. Rose did attempt to find an answer—she asked her colleagues and then thought about the question on her own—but she couldn’t come up with a satisfying explanation. Perhaps Rose lacked the motivation that Bobbi and Zsanna shared, or perhaps she lacked knowledge of, or access to, quality resources. A third
possibility is that Rose, who was rarely observed offering grammar explanations at all, lacked confidence in her own ability to explain the passive voice.

Andrews and McNeill (2005) explain that, for some of the teachers in their study, the teachers’ “perceived lack of KAL (Knowledge about Language) was a source of considerable anxiety,” leading to “fear” and “panic” on the teachers’ part (p. 159). A number of researchers have observed that teachers’ lack of confidence in their own language knowledge can negatively influence their grammar teaching practices. Mitchell et al. (1994a), for example, argue that “teachers’ regular avoidance of technical vocabulary in KAL-related talk seemed linked to a lack of knowledge/insecurity in using grammatical or discourse terminology” (p. 203). Similarly, Borg (1998b) observed one teacher, Martha, who preferred planned talk about grammar because she lacked confidence in her ability to handle more spontaneous, grammar-based discussions. Furthermore, in a later analysis of the data, Borg (2001a) explains that Martha allowed the thematic content of her materials to determine the grammar foci in her class, while more confident teachers created their own materials or consulted outside resources when necessary.

Noting the powerful influence of teachers’ confidence on their practice, Borg (2001b) dedicates an entire study to the relationship between teachers’ self-perceptions of their grammar knowledge and their grammar teaching practices. He cites several researchers who have uncovered evidence of this link in studies outside the L2 context. Numrich (1996) and Richards, Ho, and Giblin (1996), for example, both found that novice teachers reported avoiding grammar because they perceived their own knowledge to be inadequate. Shulman (1987), in contrast, profiled a teacher, Colleen, who taught grammar, but did so in a style very unlike the style she used to teach literature. While teaching a piece of literature, he explains, a content domain in which Colleen felt comfortable, she used a “student-centered, discussion-based style”; when
teaching grammar, however, in which she was less sure of her knowledge, “Colleen looked like a
different teacher,” adopting a “highly didactic, teacher-centered” approach (p. 18). In a post-
observation interview, Colleen admitted that she intentionally avoided eye contact with a student
who typically asked good questions because she doubted her ability to provide the answers. The
differences observed in Colleen’s teaching styles are similar to those observed by Haim et al.
(2004) between teachers with deep and shallow knowledge of grammar: Teachers whose
knowledge was characterized as deep used a more student-centered approach, while teachers
whose knowledge was characterized as shallow used a more teacher-centered approach.

Based on his review of the literature, and the data from his own work (1998c, 2001b), Borg
generates a list of six “specific aspects of grammar teaching which [language] teachers’
perceptions of their KAG [knowledge about grammar] may influence”:

1) the extent to which teachers teach grammar
2) their willingness to engage in spontaneous grammar work
3) the manner in which they respond to students’ questions about grammar
4) the extent to which they promote class discussion about grammar
5) the way they react when their explanations are questioned
6) the nature of the grammatical information they provide to students (p. 27)

Borg’s (2001b) own study profiles two language teachers: Eric, with high confidence in his
knowledge of grammar, and Dave, with low confidence. At a basic level, Borg’s descriptions of
Eric’s and Dave’s teaching styles are in line with findings from previous research: Eric’s
approach to grammar teaching is described as student-centered, impromptu, and interactive,
while Dave is described as having a more planned and teacher-directed style.

Eric, Borg (2001b) explains, “rarely walked into the classroom with a predetermined
grammar lesson, preferring to seize on language issues which arose during the course of
activities, and to utilize a repertoire of techniques to help students think about these issues” (p.
22). He was regularly observed taking student questions and redirecting them to the rest of the
class so that the students would think critically about grammar and engage in open dialogue about grammatical issues.

In contrast, Borg (2001b) describes Dave as exhibiting a more limited repertoire of strategies, preferring to avoid grammar instruction altogether. “If I could avoid it, I would,” he explained. “I don’t think I’m really all that keen when I have to do grammar...cause I don’t feel very comfortable with it. That is, I always have the feeling that I might be asked something that at the moment will catch me unawares and I won’t be able to answer at that time” (p. 24). Dave relayed an episode from early in his career when a student asked him a question about the form of past tense verbs that he couldn’t answer, a powerful memory that was “always at the back of [his] mind.” Dave was always wary of situations in which he might not be able to provide an explanation, or when he “might not come up with all the exceptions” (pp. 24-5), and this worried him to the point that he felt anxious about the teaching of grammar and so minimized formal grammar work. Dave believed strongly that his students expected him to know everything there was to know about grammar. “If it’s something in grammar and the teacher doesn’t know the answer,” he explained, “I think the student will automatically say ‘what a horrible teacher’” (Borg, 2005, p. 335).

Borg’s (2001b) work also reveals additional complexities, however, in the relationship between confidence and practice. Eric, for example, only adopted his characteristic student-directed, impromptu style “when he felt confident that he knew the answer” (p. 23). When less confident, he often answered the question directly himself, discouraging discussion. In one instance, when Eric was asked a question about the difference between the expressions ‘on time’ and ‘in time’—an issue about which he lacked confidence—he declined to answer, saying he’d address the question in a later class, which he did. In an interview, Eric explained, “I was
actually aware with that one that I’d had difficulty with that one before, and I’ve never come up with anything very satisfactory for the students” (p. 23). Eric wanted to consult outside sources so he could come back to the class with a well-formed answer. Here, the teacher was displaying an awareness of his own awareness, acknowledging the limits of his own knowledge and seeking outside resources to support his students.

Another strategy employed by Eric (Borg, 2001b) when he lacked confidence was to “cover himself” during grammatical explanations. For example, while teaching the word order of direct and indirect questions, he provided students with the following general rule: “If the sentence starts with a question word, use a question form; if not, use an affirmative.” He then added a caveat, however, telling the students that this rule was “not 100 per cent, but it’s 90 per cent.” When asked about the episode in an interview, Eric explained: “I was covering myself...I didn’t feel confident enough to say that is the rule without exceptions” (p. 24).

The research suggests that teachers like Eric (Borg, 2001b), who are confident in their own grammar knowledge, have a less negative interpretation of gaps in their knowledge than teachers who lack confidence. More confident teachers even display a willingness to admit those gaps to their students, which less confident teachers, such as Dave (Borg, 2001b), are often loathe to do. Tina, who appears in Borg’s (1999c) study of teachers’ use of grammatical terminology in the classroom, was confident in her own knowledge of grammar. Like Eric (Borg, 2001b), Tina would decline to answer students’ questions until a later lesson, letting her students know she was unsure of the answer. For example, a student had requested a name for the structure would + have + past participle, and Tina explained that she hadn’t come across one but would look into it. In response, a student wryly referred to the construction as ‘nameless construction.’ When asked how she felt about the student’s response, Tina explained, “I was reasonably confident that
the fact that I didn’t know the name for this wouldn’t mean that I was completely ignorant on the subject. I know a fair bit about grammar and I’ve never come across a name for that, so probably if there is it’s not very important” (p. 112). Tina’s confidence seemed to extend to her perception of her role as a language teacher. Although she had a strong knowledge of grammar, she emphatically did not see herself as a ‘grammar rule expert.’ “I like to think,” she explained, “that my students leave the classroom as better English speakers/listeners...My job is finding the best ways of doing this in the classroom and not reassuring my students that I have a perfect and complete knowledge of English grammar rules” (p. 113).

Perhaps not surprisingly, then, Dave (Borg, 2001b) reacted very differently from Tina (Borg, 1999c) when challenged by a student on his grammatical knowledge. In one such instance, he was observed exhibiting a defensive posture, which Borg (2001b) notes was “totally out of keeping with his typically accepting, open, polite, and relaxed demeanor in the classroom” (p. 25). In this episode, Dave had told the students that ‘angry’ could do the work of an adverb in sentences like “I am angry.” A student replied that, in Italian, ‘angry’ would still be an adjective in that sentence. Dave responded in the following way: “I said it’s ‘doing the work’; in the structure of the sentence it’s appearing as if it is an adverb because it’s modifying a verb and not describing a noun. ‘Doing the work of’, OK?” (p. 25).

Furthermore, Borg (2001b) notes that Dave exhibited a range of instructional strategies in other curricular areas—such as reading, writing, and vocabulary—but, in grammar, he stuck to a single, didactic approach. Generally, he would present students with a group of sentences containing the target structure and ask them to induce rules from the data. Because the students were often unable to do so, however, Dave typically taught the rules explicitly, relying on “categorical information gleaned from grammar reference books” (p. 26). Borg discusses Dave’s
case as an example of teachers developing “separate strands of pedagogical expertise” (p. 27),
even within a single discipline, such as the teaching of English. Borg speculates that Dave’s
avoidance of grammar, which was based on a lack of confidence, had kept him from developing
the expertise that might, in turn, lead to improved confidence. Dave’s “career-long insecurity
with grammar,” Borg explains, “had led him to minimize it in his work, and without the ongoing
experience which fosters expertise, his pedagogical content knowledge for grammar teaching had
not grown” (p. 28).

Dave (Borg, 2001b) and Colleen (Shulman, 1987) are similar cases, then, in that both
teachers displayed markedly different teaching styles depending on what they perceived to be
their own areas of expertise. The case of Miquel, a teacher profiled by Pahissa and Tragant
(2009), presents an interesting twist on the same theme. A non-native speaker of English, Miquel
was very confident in his grammar knowledge, but he lacked confidence in his communicative
competence. For this reason, he focused almost exclusively on grammar. Pahissa and Tragant
explicitly compare Miquel to Borg’s Martha (Borg, 1998b) and Dave (2001b, 2005), both of
whom taught less grammar as a result of their lack of confidence. Clearly, then, understanding
the relationship between teacher confidence and classroom practices is not as simple as labeling
teachers either confident or unconfident. Rather, it involves identifying teachers’ “separate
strands of pedagogical expertise” (Borg, 2001b, p. 27) and analyzing the ways in which these
interact with teachers’ handling of various curricular areas in the classroom.

Perceptions of students’ feelings about grammar.

A number of researchers have found evidence to support Andrews’ (2007) claim that it is not
only teachers’ feelings about grammar that can influence their practices, but also teachers’
perceptions of their students’ feelings about grammar. Eric (Borg, 1998b, 2001b), for example,
the highly confident teacher who regularly engaged students in dialogue around grammar, explained that his decision to do so was largely based on his belief that students “enjoy an intellectual spot in the lesson where they can reflect about language” (1998b, p. 166). He also believed that students were particularly motivated to learn grammar when the foci of grammar lessons grew out of their own errors (p. 165).

In another study, Borg (1998c) profiles an experienced, highly qualified, and professionally esteemed teacher who was chosen for the study because of his commitment to L2 teaching. This teacher, to whom Borg does not assign a pseudonym, shared Eric’s belief that students want to receive formal grammar instruction, and so he regularly engaged in it as a way of “appeasing students’ concerns,” even though he did not believe it would make a difference in their English language proficiency.

Other teachers have expressed the opposite belief that their students dislike grammar and are insecure about grammatical terminology. Some of these teachers have been observed avoiding the use of metalanguage as much as possible in their teaching. Joel (Pahissa & Tragant, 2009), for example, objected strongly to the use of terminology and saw it as an “obstacle for students, something they are scared of and something teachers should avoid” (p. 53). Instead, he focused mainly on communicative practices, believing not only that these would prove more useful to students, but also that students preferred them. Joel avoided correcting many of his students’ errors, as well, believing that too many corrections would discourage them. It is unclear the extent to which Joel’s perceptions of his students’ feelings about grammar were projections of his own feelings about grammar, but he did explain in an interview that “grammar had been practically absent in his process of foreign language learning” in both French and English (p. 54).
Similarly, Andrews (1997a), quotes a teacher, K, in a co-planning session discouraging the use of metalanguage because she believed it would bore and confuse her students. When another teacher suggested that they explicitly teach the perfect, K objected that “they’ll fall asleep after number two” (p. 204). “I wouldn’t give them all these like little name things” (e.g., negative form, negative question), she continues, “cos it’ll just get too confusing” (p. 206). In this case, Andrews speculates that the teacher is insecure about her own grammar knowledge and assumes that her students share her insecurities (p. 206).

There is evidence, however, that some teachers engage in formal grammatical instruction, using grammatical metalanguage, even though they believe their students dislike it. Emma, for example, another non-native English speaker profiled by Pahissa and Tragant (2009), believed strongly that the grammatical knowledge she possessed in her L1 had been an asset in her understanding of English grammar, and she worked to help her students develop deep grammatical knowledge in both languages. Through her educational training and teaching experience, however, she’d come to believe that a communicative approach to language teaching was more motivating for students. As a result, she had begun teaching grammar within a more communicative context. “I used to prioritize grammar,” she explained, “and would stop debates to correct a missing -s of the third person singular; now I am more tolerant with grammar errors” (p. 52).

Finally, Andrews (1999b) profiles Benjamin, a teacher who shared Emma’s belief that students don’t enjoy studying grammar because they don’t have enough opportunities to use it in spoken English. He still believed it was important for them to learn grammar, however, for tests and examinations. So, as he explained, he continued to ‘feed’ it to them: “It’s like instant
noodles…feed them, and they have to try to have it, eat it yeh…learn something they need mechanically to fit in the examinations and tests” (p. 170).

**Understandings of the role of grammar instruction.**

Eric (Borg, 1998b, 2001b), Borg’s (1998c) teacher without a pseudonym, Joel, Emma (Pahissa & Tragant, 2009), K (Andrews, 1997a), and Benjamin (Andrews, 1999b) all express ideas regarding the role of grammar instruction in language acquisition. Generally speaking, for Eric, Emma, and Benjamin, grammar instruction is seen as an important part of L2 acquisition, while Joel, K, and the teacher profiled in Borg (1998c) perceive it to be largely unnecessary. In the research reviewed for this study, teachers’ beliefs regarding the role of grammar instruction in L2 acquisition and communication seemed to be roughly divided into three categories.

One category is represented by Joel (Pahissa & Tragant, 2009), K (Andrews, 1997a), and the teacher profiled in Borg (1998c), all who saw language learning as a primarily communicative enterprise in which the explicit teaching of grammar is largely irrelevant. The teacher profiled in Borg (1998c) explained his perspective on the role of grammar instruction in L2 acquisition this way: “I’ve done this present perfect umpteen times with a million people,” he explains. “I still believe that nothing I’ve ever done in a classroom consciously with students, language focus, has actually helped them to acquire the present prefect, for example” (p. 27).

The other two categories, in contrast, are comprised of teachers who believed that explicit teaching of grammar would support the development of learners’ grammatical competence. The difference between these last two groups lies in the perceived value of communicative contexts. In one, teachers believed that explicit grammar instruction, devoid of a communicative context, would lead to improved language learning and communication. In the other, teachers believed
that grammar instruction was valuable in language acquisition and communication, but only when presented within a larger communicative context.

Rose (Andrews, 1999b) is perhaps the clearest example of a teacher who believed in the value of grammar instruction even when it was divorced from communicative work. She explained, “I think to learn a language, we have to know the basic rules. I think we have to learn grammar in a more traditional way. That means taking notes and then remembering... and then recite the rules. I think we have to memorize it instead of making use of the communicative method to...learn grammar” (p. 167). Rose remained a “firm believer” in her approach despite the fact that, year after year, her students did not seem to internalize the grammar they’d been taught. She called her students “absent-minded” because, even though they were taught “the same grammar item in form 1 to form 7,” they still failed to understand (p. 167). In an earlier study, Andrews (1997a) observed a teacher, M, who insisted that her students be taught explicit rules even if they were bored by the instruction. When it was brought to M’s attention by another teacher, K, that the lesson she was planning might bore the students, the dialogue continued as follows:

M: Yeah...that’s tough...they’re gonna have to learn it, aren’t they?
K: I know but it sort of defeats the object in a way
M: ...well learning grammar isn’t exactly the most exciting thing in the world, is it? (p. 204)

In the same study, Andrews observed another teacher, S, who expressed views similar to those expressed by Rose and K. Also observed in a co-planning session, S argued strongly for presenting grammatical rules to students so that they would have clear rules in their heads as they were using the language. “Although it is a kind of rote-learning,” she explained, “I think whatever...language that you want to learn, you have to learn the grammar by working hard by remembering all the rules so I think yeah you have to give them erm the clear rules” (p. 198).
The third group of teachers presented in the research also believed grammar instruction to be critical to language learning, but they emphasized the value of situating grammar instruction in communicative contexts. The experienced teachers presented by Johnston and Goettsch (2000) for example, all placed great emphasis on students’ language production as an indicator of the extent to which students were able to “use” or “apply” what they had learned about both form and meaning (“Knowledge of Learners,” para. 8). Borg (2001a) also profiles five teachers who believed in a relationship between grammar instruction and language learning, but who emphasized the importance of a communicative context for language learning. For example, all five of the teachers he studied—Martha, Hanna, Tina, Eric, and Dave—“adhered to the practice of not interrupting students to correct grammatical errors which occurred during oral fluency work,” believing that students benefit from opportunities to focus on communicating their message without worrying about their errors (p. 177). For Martha, in particular, “language was, above all, a means of communication, as opposed to an object of linguistic study” (1998b, p. 161), yet she included “a sequence of gradually less controlled [grammar] practice” in her lessons. Martha believed that, through such practice, students’ grammar knowledge would be converted into the ability to apply it in communication (2001a, p. 174). Tina and Hanna shared similar views on the value of grammar practice, believing it helped prepare students for use of the target items in communicative situations. Eric and Dave also believed that the relationship between communication and grammar was strong, as they both believed that practice of grammatical forms served to reinforce students’ understanding of the use of those forms in communication.
Understandings of stakeholder expectations.

The final category of beliefs identified by Andrews (2007) as being bound up with teachers’ language awareness (TLA) and potentially influencing grammar teaching practices is teachers’ understandings of, and responses to, stakeholder expectations. Andrews includes the school, students, and parents as examples of stakeholders, though the local and national communities might also be added to this list. The literature reviewed for the present study contains few examples of teachers’ practice being influenced by the expectations of stakeholders, perhaps because stakeholder expectations were not commonly an area of research focus. Borg (1998c), in his detailed portrait of one teacher’s pedagogical system, does look explicitly at the influence of such factors, and finds that they “did not appear to interfere with the implementation of the teacher’s pedagogical system” (p. 30).

In three cases, however, researchers do observe stakeholder expectations exerting influence on teachers’ grammar teaching practices. Burns and Knox (2005), for example, report that one teacher in their study, Sandra, experienced “potent institutional influences and constraints” on her practice. Sandra was required by school personnel to teach “pre-specified grammar points that she saw as traditional.” Furthermore, “she was not entirely convinced that the syllabus met student needs and felt under considerable pressure to cover the content in a short period” (p. 243). In Sandra’s words:

We are given the worksheets to work on...and there are so many things, they want to cover so many things it’s like, oh it’s too late, they’re always in a rush to cover so many things that will be relevant to them. (p. 243)

Similarly, Pahissa and Tragant (2009) observed the influence of an English language exam, the selectivitat, on the practice of two teachers in their study. Joel, who generally adopted an “anti-grammar” stance—believing that language teaching should be conducted in wholly
communicative contexts—did, in fact, engage in some grammar instruction in order to prepare his students for the selectivitat exam. The researchers also note that, for Miquel, a teacher already inclined toward explicit grammar instruction, “the selectivitat exam is decisive in his teaching practice” (p. 58). “My purpose with students,” he explained, “is basically practical: they will have to pass a written exam, in which there is no speaking whatsoever, so grammar may help them write a good composition” (p. 56).

Summary

This review of the literature began with a brief history of the research traditions in teacher cognition and language awareness in order to illustrate the ways in which these two lines of research have converged in the study of the relationship between teachers’ language knowledge and grammar teaching practices. I then integrated into a single framework the various theoretical constructs used by researchers to explore L2 teachers’ language knowledge. Based on that framework, I presented a heuristic model, and corresponding definition of Teacher Language Awareness (TLA), which were used to organize my review of the literature. Thus, although the studies reviewed in this chapter were conducted from varying theoretical perspectives, the theoretical and empirical findings of those studies have been interpreted under a single construct, TLA. The construct of TLA, as it is defined in this chapter, also served to inform the research design of the present study—which is discussed in more detail in Chapter III—and the presentation of my own research findings in Chapter IV.
Chapter III

METHOD

The purpose of this study was to explore the relationship between teachers’ language knowledge and their grammar teaching practices within the context of a bilingual school for the deaf in Sweden. Specifically, I have asked the following question: What is the nature of the grammatical Teacher Language Awareness (TLA) of high quality teachers in a Swedish bilingual school for the deaf? For the purposes of this paper, TLA is defined as teachers’ knowledge-in-action about language and language teaching, which consists of their explicit language knowledge, knowledge of learners, language proficiency, and beliefs and feelings about language and language teaching.

In this chapter, I detail the study’s methodology in the following sections: Research Design, Site, Participants, Data Collection and Analysis, Trustworthiness, and Limitations. I conclude the chapter with a brief Summary.

Research Design

The present study was conceived through an exploratory-interpretive paradigm (Grotjahn, 1987) and employed a qualitative collective case study methodology (Creswell, 1998).
The exploratory-interpretive paradigm is based on a constructivist ontology in which the nature of reality is not seen as fixed or objective, but constructed via the interpretations of individuals and communities. Grotjahn (1987) describes the exploratory-interpretive paradigm in two parts. First, it is exploratory in the sense that it emphasizes the importance of engaging in “as unbiased an exploration as possible” when doing scientific inquiry (p. 56). In this way, it is distinguishable from the paradigms that undergird hypothesis-testing research. Second, and corresponding with its exploratory intentions, research conceived through this paradigm almost exclusively employs interpretative procedures of data collection and analysis, such as text analysis, unstructured or semi-structured interviews, and observations. As Borg (1998c) explains, when “applied to the study of grammar teaching, this paradigm allows an exploration of how teachers approach grammar in their work and an understanding, from their perspective, of the factors behind their instructional decisions” (p. 11).

Within the framework of the exploratory-interpretive paradigm, the present study was best suited to case study methodology, as the aim was to explore a “bounded” social phenomenon (Creswell, 1998, p. 61): the grammatical Teacher Language Awareness (TLA) of two high quality teachers within the context of a bilingual school for the deaf in Sweden. More specifically, the case study was ‘within-site,’ as it focused on one school context; ‘collective,’ in that two individual cases were studied; and ‘instrumental,’ in that the cases were used to illustrate the nature of TLA within the research context (pp. 61-2).

Site

The site of the study was Nilskolan (a pseudonym), one of five bilingual schools for the deaf in Sweden. The school is ‘bilingual’ in the sense that students are expected to attain fluency in both written Swedish and Sweden’s signed language, Teckenspråk. Nilskolan serves
approximately one hundred fifty students between the ages of six and seventeen and employs approximately sixty teachers. Approximately half of the teachers are deaf or hard of hearing, a fact which distinguishes Nilskolan from the other four bilingual schools in Sweden, where hearing teachers outnumber deaf and hard of hearing teachers to varying degrees. The city where Nilskolan is located is the center of Sweden’s Deaf community; there are more deaf people per capita there than anywhere else in the country.

Nilskolan has demonstrated success in educating deaf children bilingually. According to the school’s vice principal, approximately 50-60% of Nilskolan’s students pass the English and Swedish tests, depending on the year, while nearly 80% pass the unstandardized assessment of Sweden’s signed language, Teckenspråk. At the time this research was conducted, the school’s demographics were undergoing changes due to recent rises in both immigration and cochlear implantation (Svartholm, 2010). These changes were most evident in the school’s early grades where many students were entering school with spoken Swedish as a first language.

Teachers at Nilskolan are not required to use any specific language curriculum. They are, however, expected to follow the guidelines laid out in the school’s “Pedagogical Guidelines for Language Development,” a statement of the school’s approach to bilingual deaf education. My translation of this document, which was approved by the school’s vice principal—a lead contributor to the document—is included as Appendix A. The document concludes with list of nine specific ways in which the school’s faculty and staff work in order to reach the goals outlined in the document. This list is included as Table 3, and is meant to serve as a summary description of the school’s approach to bilingual deaf education.
Table 3

Ways in which Faculty and Staff Work to Achieve the Goals Outlined in Nilskolan’s “Pedagogical Guidelines for Language Development”

1) Students are introduced to Swedish Sign Language in many different contexts and across different subjects to obtain a rich vocabulary and expressive language skills.
2) Students meet with Swedish, spoken and/or written, in many different contexts and across different subjects to obtain a rich vocabulary and expressive language skills.
3) When the teaching and instruction are in spoken Swedish, there is quality hearing equipment so that listening conditions are optimum.
4) Our teachers have extensive experience regarding what it means to the deaf to learn Swedish through print, as well as the special difficulties a deaf student may encounter in their literacy learning, where print is based on spoken language.
5) Our teachers work with the school’s speech therapists and hearing technicians around each individual student.
6) In conversations with parents and students, we discuss each student’s needs and possibilities. These conversations lead to decisions on how we can create the best conditions for the student’s fullest possible development in both Swedish Sign Language and Swedish.
7) We work with students’ identities, hard of hearing or deaf, with or without technical aids. And an important part of this work is to make students aware of different strategies that can be helpful in everyday life.
8) Our sign language environment is unique in that the language used by about half of our staff is their first language.
9) In order to maintain the skills of our staff, we work continuously to develop their skills in areas that benefit our students’ language development.

Furthermore, teachers in the early elementary grades—including the two participants in this study—were encouraged to use books from the Kiwi literacy curriculum (Körling, 2006). The first through third grade teachers had chosen the Kiwi books, along with Nilskolan’s administration, because the series and its associated curricular suggestions were in line with the school’s own philosophy of language education.

Kiwi is a general education literacy curriculum that originated in New Zealand and was republished in Swedish in 2006. The curriculum consists of 120 books divided into three categories: Klara (Ready), Färdiga (Steady) and Gå (Go). The ‘Ready’ books are aimed at pre-readers; the ‘Steady’ books are aimed at beginning readers; and the ‘Go’ books are aimed at more advanced readers. According to the Swedish publisher, the Kiwi books were designed to
make early reading “pleasurable” for students through “varied content and engaging stories.” The books are meant to be read in the context of shared and guided reading lessons. Teachers are supposed to take their students on a ‘picture walk’ (*bild promenad*) through each book—using the pictures to help students understand the meaning—before they focus on the book’s language. The creators of the curriculum also urge teachers to communicate “positive expectations of student success” in their presentation of the books (Sonoma Utbildning, 2012).

The *Kiwi* curriculum includes a teacher’s guide and a series of workbooks that address various issues related to literacy, including comprehension and writing skills, as well as grammar and vocabulary. While Nilskolan’s teachers were not required to use the workbooks or to follow the suggestions in the teacher’s guide, both of the teacher participants in this study made use of the *Kiwi* curricular materials to varying degrees.

**Participants**

The study’s participants were two Swedish language teachers, whom I’ll refer to as Christel and Helena, and their 17 students.

Christel was a deaf woman in her 50s teaching a third grade class of six students. She was raised by hearing parents who were advised not to sign with her because it would interfere with her Swedish language development, and a grandmother with whom she developed home signs. She acquired Teckenspråk through her interaction with deaf peers once she began attending schools for the deaf. She was certified as both a preschool and elementary school teacher of the deaf. In addition to her teacher education requirements, Christel also took extensive coursework in both sign language and Swedish linguistics, qualifying her to teach Teckenspråk and Swedish as a second language through the high school level. Christel had been teaching for 22 years, all
of them at Nilskolan. She had worked primarily in the early grades: first through fourth. Christel did not make use of any assistive listening devices.

Christel had six students in her class, three girls and three boys, all between the ages of 8 and 10. Five students were profoundly deaf and wore unilateral cochlear implants; one was hard of hearing and wore bilateral hearing aids. Three had deaf parents. Four were born in Sweden to Swedish parents and used both Teckenspråk and spoken Swedish at home. Two boys had parents who were immigrants, but they were both born and raised in Sweden, and both families used Teckenspråk and Swedish at home. One boy was in the process of being assessed for the presence of a learning disability. The demographics of Christel’s students are summarized in Table 4.

Table 4
Christel’s Students’ Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>M/F</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Deaf/HH</th>
<th>Deaf parents</th>
<th>Home language(s)</th>
<th>Assistive devices</th>
<th>Disabilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Betty</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Swedish deaf</td>
<td>yes (2)</td>
<td>Swedish, TSP</td>
<td>CI (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Algerian parents deaf</td>
<td>Swedish, TSP, Arabic</td>
<td>CI (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joana</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Swedish deaf</td>
<td>yes (2)</td>
<td>Swedish, TSP</td>
<td>CI (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maddi</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Swedish HH</td>
<td></td>
<td>Swedish, TSP</td>
<td>hearing aids</td>
<td>CI (1)</td>
<td>suspected, cognitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yassin</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Swedish deaf</td>
<td></td>
<td>Swedish, TSP</td>
<td>CI (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collin</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Polish-Iranian parents deaf</td>
<td>Swedish, TSP</td>
<td>CI (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. All student names are pseudonyms. ‘TSP’ stands for Teckenspråk.

Helena was a hard of hearing woman in her 30s teaching a first grade class of 11 students. Helena was raised in a bilingual—Teckenspråk and Swedish—household. She used Teckenspråk with her mother and grandmother, who were both deaf, and she spoke Swedish with her father.
and brother, who were both hearing. Helena attended hearing schools throughout her life. She was certified as a teacher of the deaf through the seventh grade, and she had also taken extensive coursework in sign language linguistics and Swedish as a second language. She had been teaching for 13 years, all of them at Nilskolan. She, too, had worked primarily in the early grades: first through fourth. Helena wore hearing aids.

Helena had 11 students in her class, four girls and seven boys, all between the ages of 6 and 7. Eight students were profoundly deaf; three of them wore unilateral cochlear implants, and one wore bilateral implants. The other four deaf students, along with two hard of hearing students, wore hearing aids. One student was hearing but had lost the ability to speak due to a recent tracheotomy. Five students had deaf parents. Seven students were born in Sweden to Swedish parents; one had parents who were immigrants; and three were immigrants themselves but had lived in Sweden at least three years. Regardless of nationality, nearly all of Helena’s students used Teckenspråk as one of their home languages. The two exceptions were the hearing boy who had recently had a tracheotomy and the boy from Ethiopia who had two hard of hearing parents; both of these students used only Swedish at home. Two students had been diagnosed with CHARGE syndrome, a pattern of birth defects that results in physical difficulties that differ from child to child; one of those students had also been diagnosed with vision loss. The demographics of Helena’s students are summarized in Table 5.

Table 5
Helena’s Students’ Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>M/F</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Deaf/ HH</th>
<th>Deaf parents</th>
<th>Home language(s)</th>
<th>Assistive devices</th>
<th>Disabilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dennis</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Swedish deaf</td>
<td>yes (2)</td>
<td>TSP</td>
<td>hearing aids</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>HH</td>
<td>TSP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>HH</td>
<td>yes (2)</td>
<td>Swedish,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>hearing aids</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CHARGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Kendra 7 F Chinese (arr. at 3) deaf yes (2) TSP TSP hearing aids
Anna 7 F Chinese (arr. at 4) deaf yes (2) TSP hearing aids
Hera 7 F Swedish deaf Swedish, TSP TSP CI (2)
Angela 7 F Swedish deaf TSP TSP hearing aids
Olle 7 M Gambian parents deaf TSP CI (1)
Karlos 7 M Ethiopian parents (arr. at 3) deaf HH (2) Swedish CI (1)
Elvin 7 M Swedish N/A Swedish none mute due to tracheotomy
Mikel 6 M Swedish deaf TSP CI (1)

Note. All student names are pseudonyms. ‘TSP’ stands for Teckenspråk. The abbreviation ‘arr.’ stands for “arrived in Sweden.”

Christel and Helena were ‘purposively’ selected as research cases (Miles & Huberman, 1994, p. 28). Specifically, their cases were ‘instrumental’ (Creswell, 1998, pp. 61-2) in that they were meant to illustrate the nature of the Teacher Language Awareness (TLA) of high quality bilingual teachers of the deaf within the research context. The teachers selected as cases thus had to meet two criteria: 1) They had to be identified as ‘high quality’ teachers; and 2) They had to be recognized as ‘model’ teachers within the research context, in the sense that their teaching practices had be aligned with the school’s approach to bilingual deaf education.

Finding teachers who met both of these criteria was somewhat complicated methodologically. I began by consulting the school’s vice principal, Agneta (a pseudonym), who I believed was qualified to identify high quality, model language teachers at the school for two reasons. First, she regularly engaged in the observation and evaluation of the school’s language teachers. Second, she was a lead contributor to the school’s “Pedagogical Guidelines for
Language Development”, a statement of the school’s approach to bilingual deaf education (see Appendix A).

My first conversation with Agneta about the selection of participants transpired in October 2008. At that time, Agneta gave me a copy of the school’s “Pedagogical Guidelines” document (Appendix A), which she explained represented Nilskolan’s approach to bilingual deaf education. As noted previously, the “Pedagogical Guidelines” document concludes with a list of nine specific ways in which the school’s faculty and staff work in order to reach the goals outlined in the document (see Table 3). At that meeting, Agneta identified Christel and Helena as teachers whose practice exemplified the approach described in the “Pedagogical Guidelines” document.

I observed both teachers for three months between November 2008 and March 2009 to ascertain the extent to which their practices seemed aligned with the school’s language teaching approach as outlined in the “Pedagogical Guidelines” document (Appendix A). I also observed one teacher from each of the other elementary school grades as a means of comparison. Each of those teachers was observed at least twice. After three months of observation, I concurred with Agneta that Christel’s and Helena’s language teaching practices seemed aligned with the school’s approach to bilingual deaf education.

Making a determination that the teachers were high quality was more difficult, particularly given cross-cultural differences between Sweden and the United States around measures of teacher accountability. Students’ standardized test scores, for example, are not used to determine teacher quality in the early grades because students do not take the national exams until they are applying to high school. Instead, teacher quality is measured entirely on the basis of classroom observations. The principal of Nilskolan explained to me that observations by the administration
are used to evaluate the teachers’ skills around instruction, communication with students and parents, cooperation with colleagues, and problem-solving. On these four measures, both Christel and Helena have received excellent reports throughout their teaching careers at Nilskolan. A letter from the school’s principal explaining these criteria, and testifying that Christel and Helena are considered high quality teachers at the school, is included as Appendix B.

After selecting the teacher participants, I discontinued work in the school from March 2009 to August 2010, during which time I took maternity leave and completed my research proposal. When I returned to the school in September 2010, Helena was teaching first grade, and Christel was teaching third grade. I observed both teachers in October and November of 2010 in order to re-familiarize myself with their teaching practices and to familiarize myself with their students.

At this time, I also underwent a more systematic study of the extent to which their teaching practices were aligned with the school’s pedagogical guidelines as laid out in the School’s “Pedagogical Guidelines for Language Development” (Appendix A). As a starting point, I used the list of nine specific ways in which the school’s faculty and staff work in order to reach the goals outlined in the document (see Table 3). Aside from item four, which refers to teachers’ experience and knowledge, each item on this list describes an observable attribute. Thus, using this list as a foundation, I was able to develop a set of observation criteria for determining the extent to which Christel and Helena could be described as model teachers at Nilskolan.

I began by rewriting item four as an observable attribute. Instead of referring to the teachers’ “experience regarding what it means to the deaf to learn Swedish through print,” I referred to how teachers address students’ difficulties with language and literacy learning. I also split this component into two separate attributes: one describing how teachers address literacy learning
and the other describing how they address language acquisition. My decision to do so reflects my belief that teaching a child a language and helping a child to become literate in that language are two different enterprises, even when reading and writing are the only means through which the child produces and accesses the language, as is often the case when the child is deaf.

Next, I eliminated from the list anything that the teachers did not have control over. This included the first two and last two items on the list (1, 2, 8 and 9). Items 8 and 9—which referred to teacher demographics at the school and its professional development policies, respectively—were clearly out of the teachers’ control. With respect to items 1 and 2, individual classroom teachers do not have control over whether or not students are exposed to Swedish and Teckenspråk across contexts and subjects; they only have control over students’ exposure to Swedish and Teckenspråk in their own classrooms. Within the context of the classroom, however, Christel and Helena could be expected to demonstrate a focus on vocabulary and expressive language skills in both Swedish and Teckenspråk. I thus rewrote items 1 and 2 as four descriptors, each one focusing on one language and one skill (e.g., Teachers address students’ vocabulary development in Swedish; Teachers’ address students’ expressive language skills in Swedish).

Item 6 refers to teachers discussing students’ needs and possibilities with parents and students. I knew it was possible that I would not have access to these conversations, but I did expect to observe teachers differentiating instruction based on their understandings of different students’ needs and possibilities. So, I wrote a descriptor based on that expectation. Finally, item 3—on the use of quality hearing equipment when instruction is in Swedish—was relevant to Helena, who is hard of hearing and occasionally spoke Swedish with students who could
understand her, but not to Christel, who is deaf and whom I never observed speaking with students or using any audio aids in her instruction.

Having excluded the irrelevant items from the list and expanded items where necessary, I rewrote the list as nine descriptors of teachers who could be described as model teachers at Nilskolan, as measured by their alignment with the school’s “Pedagogical Guidelines for Language Development” (see Table 6).

Table 6
*Descriptors of Model Teachers at Nilskolan*

1) Teachers address students’ vocabulary development in Swedish.
2) Teachers address students’ vocabulary development in Teckenspråk.
3) Teachers address students’ expressive language skills in Swedish.
4) Teachers address students’ expressive language skills in Teckenspråk.
5) Teachers address the difficulties deaf students may encounter in learning Swedish through print.
6) Teachers address the difficulties deaf students may encounter in their literacy learning, where print is based on a spoken language.
7) Teachers work with the school’s speech therapists and hearing technicians around each individual student.
8) Teachers differentiate instruction based on assessments of individual students’ needs and possibilities.
9) Teachers work with students’ identities—hard of hearing or deaf, with or without technical aids—making them aware of different strategies that can be helpful in everyday life.

I kept these descriptors in mind as I observed the teachers’ classes over the course of those two months (October, November 2010). Based on my observations, I felt confident that Christel and Helena could be described as model teachers at the school. However, because I did not yet have IRB approval to conduct research, I did not feel comfortable collecting any data to support that claim at the time. During the data analysis phase of the study, I revisited the issue of verifying that the participants were model teachers. I describe this process in the section entitled ‘Analysis of Transcripts and Classroom Observations.’
Research into teacher knowledge and teacher thinking is concerned with phenomena that cannot be observed directly. As Borg (2006) explains, this makes it a challenge for researchers “to identify data collection strategies through which these phenomena can be elicited” (p. 167). In Borg’s review of the research on teacher cognition, he finds that four data collection methods are most commonly used in the field: self-report instruments (e.g., questionnaires, tests), verbal commentaries (e.g., interviews), observation, and reflective writing. Observation and interview were chosen as the two primary data collection methods in this study for their ability to offer insight into the phenomenon under study—the nature of the grammatical TLA of high quality teachers in a Swedish bilingual school for the deaf—while requiring as small a time commitment as possible from the participants. Self-report instruments and reflective writing were also less appropriate for this study, as TLA has behavioral, not only cognitive, properties.

All observations and interviews were recorded on both audio and videotape. A Samsung HMX-H200 HD digital camera was used for collecting all video at resolution HD 720/60p in MP4 file format. I used a Livescribe 4GB Echo Smartpen to collect the audio and a Livescribe Dot Paper notebook to take notes during the interviews and observations. In this way, I could easily play back sections of audio that corresponded to my handwritten notes by clicking on the text in my notebook. The pages of the Livescribe notebook are also easily converted to PDFs, which could then be imported into my data analysis software. All data were analyzed with the assistance of ATLAS.ti (Version 6.2) qualitative research software. I chose this software because it would allow me to code and analyze a variety of file types, including text, PDF, audio, and video. I also found the user interface straightforward in comparison with NVivo. It was necessary for me to trim the video segments for import into ATLAS.ti. I did this using ImTOO
Video Editor (version 2). No changes were made to the resolution of the video during this process.

I collected and analyzed my data sequentially in the following six stages:

1) pre-observation semi-structured interviews
2) classroom observations
3) analysis of interview/observation data and identification of key instructional episodes
4) post-observation semi-structured stimulated recall interviews
5) transcription of interviews
6) analysis of transcripts and classroom video.

At each stage, data were analyzed using a flexible list of codes that began as a ‘start list’ (see Table 7). Miles and Huberman (1994) use the term ‘start list’ to describe a provisional list of codes, often based on previous research, that help a researcher to begin data analysis. This list of codes may then be modified throughout the process of data collection and analysis to accommodate the new data. My start list, presented in Table 7, consisted of 15 codes, each representing one component of Teacher Language Awareness (TLA).

The 15 codes were derived from my review of the literature. Specifically, each component of TLA, as it is presented in Figure 2, was assigned a category: 1) Explicit Language Knowledge = ELK, 2) Knowledge of Learners = KOL, 3) Language Proficiency = LP, and 4) Beliefs and Feelings About Language and Language Teaching = BEL. Then, subordinate codes (e.g., ELK: engagement style) were generated to represent the subcategories under each of these components, as described in my review of the literature. For example, the first component of TLA, as it is defined for this paper, is Explicit Language Knowledge. Under this general heading, previous research has revealed four subcategories of teacher knowledge and practice: ELK: engagement style, ELK: error correction, ELK: input, and ELK: explanation. The other
three components of TLA have been similarly broken down into subcategories to generate a start list of codes grounded in the findings of previous research.

Table 7
Start List of Codes

ELK: EXPLICIT LANGUAGE KNOWLEDGE
   ELK: engagement style
   ELK: error correction
   ELK: input
   ELK: explanation

KOL: KNOWLEDGE OF LEARNERS
   KOL: input enhancement strategies
   KOL: selection of content
   KOL: use of metalanguage
   KOL: comprehension checks
   KOL: awareness of sociocultural issues

LP: LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY
   LP: accurate and effective use of the target language(s)
   LP: use of non-native speaker advantage

BEL: BELIEFS ABOUT LANGUAGE AND LANGUAGE TEACHING
   BEL: feelings about grammar
   BEL: perceptions of students’ feelings about grammar
   BEL: understandings of the role of grammar instruction
   BEL: understandings of stakeholder expectations

The sequential nature of data collection and analysis meant that data were “collected and analyzed throughout the period of fieldwork, with each successive stage of data collection being influenced by the analysis of the data already collected” (Borg, 1998c, p. 12). In line with the exploratory-interpretative paradigm, sequential analysis allowed me to engage in ongoing, successively deeper, analysis of the interpretive data. The five stages of data collection and analysis employed in this study are described in the following sections.

Pre-observation Semi-structured Interviews

Before beginning classroom observations, I conducted an interview with each teacher to learn about her educational background, teaching experience, and beliefs about language teaching. The interviews were semi-structured in format (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009), loosely
focused around pre-determined themes. See Appendix C for a list of my pre-observation interview questions, based on those used by Borg (1998c).

The interview questions were formulated to address all four components of Teacher Language Awareness (TLA) as they are presented in Figure 2: 1) explicit language knowledge, 2) knowledge of learners, 3) language proficiency, and 4) beliefs about language and language teaching. The interviews were not designed, however, to help me gain any information about the procedural dimensions of the teachers’ knowledge, their “knowledge-in-action” (Andrews, 2007, p.31). Codes representing the specific components of TLA the question was intended to address appear to the left of each question in Appendix C.

My decision to use a semi-structured format, rather than a structured one, was based on the advantages of the semi-structured format as described by Borg (2006). According to Borg, the use of semi-structured format can do all the following:

1) minimize the effects of the asymmetrical relationship between interviewer and interviewee;
2) facilitate the researcher’s task of interpreting participants’ experiences from their point of view and of representing those experiences in the participants own language;
3) generate answers which are more elaborate and qualitatively richer;
4) make it possible for the researcher to make and explore unexpected discoveries;
5) encourage interviewees to play an active part in the research...
   communicating the sense-making processes through which they interpret their own experiences. (p. 203)

I communicated with the teachers via a certified Teckenspråk interpreter who was qualified to interpret between Teckenspråk and English. I spoke English throughout both interviews, occasionally using Swedish words or Teckenspråk signs to clarify my meaning with either the interpreter or the teacher. Although I am conversant in both Swedish and Teckenspråk, I was not skilled enough in either language to handle the content of the interviews. Christel, who is deaf,
used exclusively Teckenspråk throughout the interviews. Helena, who is hard of hearing, used a combination of Teckenspråk, spoken Swedish, and spoken English. When she spoke English, the interpreter was not involved in the communication. When she spoke either Swedish or Teckenspråk, the interpreter translated her remarks into spoken English. In this way, both I and the teachers were able to use whatever language was most comfortable during the interviews.

The pre-observation interviews lasted approximately one hour each. My interview with Christel was conducted in my home, which was quiet. My interview with Helena was conducted at her home. Her 4 year-old son was at home with her, but the setting was generally quiet, and there were infrequent interruptions. After completing the pre-observation interviews, I wrote a memo describing my initial thoughts regarding the teachers’ language learning histories, teacher training experiences, and ideas and beliefs regarding language teaching.

Classroom Observations

After I conducted the pre-observation interviews, I was a non-participant observer (Woods, 1986) in each teacher’s classroom for four consecutive weeks, observing each teacher for approximately 12 hours. The observations were unstructured in that I attempted to collect a “full account of the events under study” rather than looking for “categories of behavior…identified in advance” (Borg, 2006, p. 229). All observations were supplemented via both descriptive and reflective field notes (Bogdan & Biklen, 2003), copies of classroom materials, and samples of student work.

The classroom observations were videotaped because the vast majority of classroom interactions occurred via Teckenspråk, making it nearly impossible to observe and take detailed notes simultaneously. I worked to desensitize participants to my presence by observing each class for two months prior to the beginning of data collection. Furthermore, I was assured that
the students were very comfortable with having a video camera in the classroom, as their teachers often videotaped lessons for professional development purposes as well as to give students the opportunity to celebrate and analyze their use of Teckenspråk.

I took both descriptive and reflective field notes (Bogdan and Biklen, 2003) during the observation phase of the research. Descriptive field notes were used to make note of any significant details that I observed but that the video did not catch. These notes were kept free of interpretation. Reflective field notes, in contrast, were used to capture more subjective ideas, such as “speculations, feelings, problems, ideas, hunches, impressions, and prejudices” (p. 114). During the observation stage, I also collected copies of all documents relevant to the instructional episodes I have observed. These included teaching materials and student work samples. After completing the classroom observations, I reviewed all of the field notes and relevant documents I had collected and wrote a short, summary memo describing themes I was beginning to notice regarding the nature of the teachers’ grammatical TLA.

**Identification of Key Instructional Episodes**

While observing, I began analyzing the observation data (i.e. videotapes, field notes, documents) in order to identify ‘key instructional episodes’. ‘Key instructional episodes’ is a phrase borrowed from Borg (1998c), which for the purposes of this study, was defined as instructional episodes that illustrated the nature of the teachers’ grammatical TLA. As such, each key instructional episode involved either the teachers or the students bringing attention to a morphosyntactic feature of language. Out of the 24 hours of video data collected, 7:11 hours were identified as key instructional episodes: 3:56 hours drawn from Christel’s video data (approximately 33% of her total data) and 3:15 hours drawn from Helena’s video (approximately 25% of her total data). I reviewed each of these key instructional episodes with a Teckenspråk
interpreter, the same one who interpreted all four teacher interviews, to ensure that I had a complete understanding of each episode.

**Semi-structured Stimulated Recall Interviews**

Both stimulated recall interviews were conducted within a week of my final observation of that teacher. They were each approximately 90 minutes in length. I communicated with the teachers via the same interpreter who had worked with me in the pre-observation interviews. She was a certified Teckenspråk interpreter who was qualified to interpret between Teckenspråk and English. As in the pre-observation interviews, I spoke English; Christel used exclusively Teckenspråk; and Helena used a combination of Teckenspråk, spoken Swedish, and spoken English. When Helena spoke English, the interpreter was not involved in the communication. When she spoke either Swedish or Teckenspråk, the interpreter translated her remarks into spoken English. In this way, both I and the teachers were able to use whatever language was most comfortable during the interviews.

**The stimulated recall procedure.**

Borg (2006) describes the stimulated recall procedure as a “form of interview [that] involves the use of a stimulus (most often a video recording) to elicit verbal commentaries about the cognitions (typically thoughts or decision-making) occurring during previously preformed behaviors” (p. 209). He explains that the methodology is commonly used as an interpretive method in teacher cognition research because “it provides teachers with the opportunity to verbalize their thinking, in a relatively free, open-ended manner” (p. 210). Although the stimulated recall technique was originally designed for information-processing research that aimed to uncover precisely what a participant was thinking at a particular moment in time, the approach has been adapted for the purpose of stimulating teachers’ thinking about their actions.
and rationales. When the stimulated recall methodology is used for the latter purpose—as it was in the present study—the interviews tend to be less rigidly structured, in that there are few pre-scribed questions and the participants are encouraged to stop the videotape at their own discretion in order to comment on their teaching practice (Borg, 2006; Calderhead, 1981; Gass, 2012; Gass & Mackey, 2000).

The trustworthiness of stimulated recall methodology is not uncontested, but most of the arguments against it pertain to situations in which the methodology is used to prompt teachers to recall exactly what they were thinking at a precise moment in time. In such situations, there are concerns about the extent to which teachers are able to accurately report information that’s no longer available to them in short-term memory. There are also concerns that the video itself might supplement teachers’ own memories and/or create new experiences for them that disallow their memory of the event as they experienced it (Borg, 2006). However, in research designs such as the one employed in this study—where stimulated recall methodology is used merely as a catalyst to generate teachers’ thinking about their practice—the above concerns are less relevant.

Two other issues regarding the trustworthiness of stimulated recall methodology are relevant to this study, however: 1) the chance that the researcher’s interview prompts might influence the ways in which teachers report their thinking, and 2) the potential for teachers to offer post-hoc rationalizations of their behavior when they are under pressure to explain their actions (Borg, 2006). To address the first of these concerns, I made my prompts as open-ended as possible, simply presenting teachers with the tapes and asking them to elaborate on what they were trying to do at the time of the recording and why. I also invited the teachers to stop the video at their discretion to comment on what they were seeing. The potential for teachers to offer post-hoc
rationalizations is a more serious concern, which I’ve addressed through the verification procedures of prolonged engagement and data triangulation (Creswell, 1998), which are described in more detail in the Trustworthiness section of this chapter.

**Choosing the stimulated recall video segments.**

In order to prepare for the stimulated recall interviews, I needed to select approximately 20-25 minutes of video per teacher to share with her during the interview. To do this, I began by consulting my field notes. I was looking for episodes that were representative of the teachers’ approach to grammar instruction but that also reflected as great a variety as possible of the components of the teacher’s grammatical Teacher Language Awareness (TLA). Episodes where the teacher appeared to diverge from her typical approach to grammar were also of interest. Using these criteria, I compiled a list of potential video segments for each teacher. I selected 22:57 minutes of video from Christel’s 3:56 hours of video (roughly 10% of Christel’s observed grammar instruction), and I selected 26:13 minutes of video from Helena’s 3:15 hours of video (roughly 13% of Helena’s observed grammar instruction).

Next, to ensure that I had data that were rich in elements of TLA, I coded the segments using the start list of codes in Table 7. For this analysis, however, I only used the codes relevant to the teachers’ explicit language knowledge (ELK) and knowledge of learners (KOL). I did not code for teachers’ beliefs and feelings (BEL) because they were not directly observable in the classroom video, and I did not code for language proficiency (LP) because my skills in Swedish and Teckenspråk were not sufficiently developed to allow me to do so. The Teckenspråk interpreter assured me, however, that the teachers’ productions in both languages were native-like throughout the key instructional episodes.
The coding matrices I developed for selecting video segments for the stimulated recall interviews are included as Appendices D (Christel’s matrix) and E (Helena’s matrix). In these matrices, the selected video segments are listed in the left-most column, and the codes representing the components of TLA are listed across the top. An ‘x’ indicates that evidence of the TLA component heading that column is present in the corresponding video segment. The numbers in the bottom row indicate the total number of occurrences of each TLA component across the selected video segments.

Table 8 shows the range of totals for the elements of TLA present in each teacher’s video segments. Christel’s row in Table 8 shows that 14 video segments were selected for Christel’s stimulated recall interview, totaling 22:57 minutes in length. The ‘Range’ column under ‘Selected Segments’ shows that the least represented components of TLA in Christel’s data (CC = comprehension checks; SC = sociocultural awareness) were in evidence in 6 of Christel’s video segments, while the most represented TLA components (IE = input enhancement; CS = content selection) were in evidence in 11 of Christel’s video segments. The average representation of TLA components across Christel’s video segments was 8.3, and the median value was 8. Helena’s row in Table 8 shows that 22 video segments were selected for Christel’s stimulated recall interview, totaling 26:13 minutes in length. Helena’s values were higher across the board for the ‘Selected Segments’, except that the least represented TLA component in Helena’s data (ML = use of metalanguage) was in evidence in only 4 or her 22 segments. The low frequency of metalanguage in Helena’s grammar teaching is not surprising given that her students were 6 and 7 year-olds. Thus, I concluded that the selected segments were sufficiently representative of the teachers’ TLA.
Table 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Selected Segments</th>
<th>Discussed Segments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N(mm:ss)</td>
<td>Range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christel</td>
<td>14(22:57)</td>
<td>6-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helena</td>
<td>22(26:13)</td>
<td>4-19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = Total number of video segments.

The ‘Discussed Segments’ heading at the far right of Table 8 represents the video segments that the teachers actually ended up discussing during their stimulated recall interviews. The values under ‘Discussed Segments’ differ from those under ‘Selected Segments’ because I had to make decisions about which video segments to skip as I neared the 90 minute time limit of the stimulated recall interviews. Thus, though I selected 14 segments for Christel’s interview, Christel only discussed 13 episodes, reducing the total length of video segments to 22:07 minutes. In Helena’s interview, I had to cut five video segments, reducing the total length of video segments reviewed to 19:11 minutes. The cuts I made to Helena’s video segments brought her range, mean, and median values closer to Christel’s, so that the discussed segments were more evenly representative of the components of TLA for both teachers.

Transcription of Interviews

The pre-observation interviews and stimulated recall interviews were transcribed in full using Express Scribe Professional Software (version 5.45) and an Infinity Digital Transcription USB Foot Pedal. Since the interviews were being conducted in multiple languages and with the assistance of an interpreter, the transcription process was particularly complex. Five factors contributed to the complexity of the transcription process: 1) the fact that the words being transcribed were most often not the actual utterances of the participants, but interpretations; 2) the presence of interpreter-authored utterances; 3) the untranslatability of certain Swedish words.
into English; 4) the richness of visual information present in the interviews; and 5) the fact that English was not a first language for either the interpreter or Helena, who often used spoken English in her interviews.

First, the vast majority of the words spoken in the interviews were not actually spoken by the participants themselves, but were the interpreter’s translations into English of utterances originally produced by the participants in either Swedish or Teckenspråk. Thus, the words recorded on tape were already one step removed from the original utterances of the participants.

Second, the interpreter occasionally produced utterances that were not direct translations of a participant’s utterance. The phenomenon of interpreter-authored discourse is given comprehensive treatment by Metzger (1999) and is discussed more fully later in this section.

Third, the participants and the interpreter chose not to translate certain words from Swedish to English, either because they couldn’t think of an acceptable English translation or because there was, in fact, no accurate English translation. For example, Helena, when she was speaking English during an interview, did not translate the Swedish word ‘hjälpverb’ into English, likely because she was not aware of the corresponding term ‘auxiliary verb’ in English. On another occasion, the interpreter did not translate the Swedish preposition ‘på’ because the word does not have a satisfactory translation in English. Among other words, the word can be translated as ‘on’, ‘at’, ‘in’, or ‘for’, depending on the context.

Fourth, while there is a visual component to all communication, the interviews conducted for this study were particularly rich in visual information because much of the communication took place ‘in the air.’ Although the interpreter translated the majority of the participants’ signed communication into either English or Swedish, some of the signs produced by the participants
were not interpreted into spoken language, likely because their meaning was self-evident or because the interpreter knew that I understood the meaning.

Finally, neither the interpreter nor Helena, the hard of hearing teacher who often used spoken language in her interviews, were native English speakers. For this reason, utterances produced in English often contained awkward diction or ungrammatical constructions. I was thus left with some difficult decisions regarding whether or not to edit utterances produced in English by Helena and the interpreter.

To guide this very complex transcription process, I consulted the work of other researchers who have attempted to transcribe interviews across languages and cultures: Halai (2007) and Arndt (2011). Both researchers were fluent in the languages of their participants—Urdu and English in the case of Halai’s research and ASL and tactile ASL in the case of Arndt’s—so neither required the use of an interpreter. Both, however, faced challenges regarding how to convert multilingual interview data into English transcripts for the purpose of interpretive analysis and quotation, and Arndt dealt specifically with signed interview data. As Halai (2007) notes, literature on how to deal with bilingual data is sparse, and I was unable to locate a single article on the transcription of interpreted interview data in any language. I was thus left to improvise somewhat and develop rules for my transcription (see Appendices F and G) that would allow me to create written English transcripts which remained as faithful as possible to the participants’ original utterances.

Like Halai (2007) and Arndt (2011), I employed the concept of “interim texts”, defined by Clandinin and Connely (2000) as “texts situated in the spaces between field texts and final published research texts” (p. 133). Creating these interim texts enabled me to move gradually and methodically from the data captured on video to the written transcripts on which I would
perform my analysis. I developed rules to guide the creation of each text until I arrived at the final “transmuted text.” Halai used the term transmuted text to describe her final research text because, although it faithfully reflected the original data, it had been “recreated” through the transcription process (p. 344). The interim texts created at every stage were saved so that I would be able to retrace my steps at any point in the analysis and make changes to the process if necessary. The transcription process that led me through the various interim texts to the final, research texts follows. An example of one segment of transcript text at each stage of its transmutation is included as Appendix H.

**Interim Text 1: transcribing audio data verbatim.**

Due to personal circumstances, I did not begin the transcription process until nearly eleven months after the initial interviews were recorded. Therefore, before writing anything down, I watched the videotape of each interview in its entirety in order to refamiliarize myself with the interview context and aid my memory of the interview event. Immediately following my review of each videotape, I began to create a verbatim record of the audio portion alone.

The word ‘verbatim’ is problematic when it comes to discussions of interview transcripts, however. As Kvale and Brinkmann (2009) explain, transcription is itself an initial form of data analysis in that it involves “sampling” from multi-dimensional oral conversations. For example, should intonation, pauses, and emotional expressions, such as laughter, be transcribed? And if so, to what level of detail? As there are no standard or universally correct answers to these corrections, Kvale and Brinkmann advise researchers to answer the questions for themselves with their own intended use of the transcripts in mind. The transcripts I was creating were to be used for meaning analysis, rather than for detailed conversation analysis. I thus chose to use Poland’s (2002) “Abbreviated Instructions for Transcribers”—intended for use by researchers
not analyzing their transcripts at the level of conversation analysis—as a starting point for devising the transcription rules for my first level of interim texts.

My own transcription rules for creating Interim Text 1 are included as Appendix F. I modified Poland’s (2002) “Instructions” by adding rules to reflect both the trilingual nature of my interview data and the fact that the interviews were conducted with the help of an interpreter.

Italics, parentheses, and single quotes were used in various combinations to reflect whether words were produced in Swedish or Teckenspråk. These strategies were also used to indicate whether words were being produced as references to the words themselves (e.g., “I can’t pronounce the word ‘sjuksköterska’ in Swedish.”) and whether signs were being produced simultaneously with speech (e.g., “He said ‘kick’ (/KICK/).”).

My transcription rules also included codes for handling interpreter-authored utterances. Note that most interpreter utterances were coded as participant utterances. The only utterances attributed to the interpreter were those that were not direct interpretations of a participant’s utterance. Metzger (1999) created a taxonomy of interpreter-authored utterances in order to specify the work that such utterances do in an interpreted conversation. Using this taxonomy, Metzger, Fleetwood and Collins (2004) analyzed three different interpreted interactions (a medical interview, a college classroom, and an information interview) and identified eight types of interpreter utterances that were not simple translations of another’s discourse. The researchers categorized those eight types into two groups: relayings, which convey information about the interaction; and interactional management, which affect the flow of the interaction.

An example of relaying is when an interpreter repeats a word that was only used one time by the speaker, but was not seen the first time by a deaf interlocutor. An example of interactional management is when an interpreter summons the deaf person to pay attention so that he or she
will not miss the information being signed. Metzger et al. identify four types of relayings: explanations, repetitions, requests for clarification, and source attributions (i.e., when the interpreter indicates who is speaking); and four types of interactional management: introductions, responses to questions, summonses, and interference (i.e., when the interpreter causes a change in the physical environment, such as bumping into a participant, and comments on it). I have adopted this taxonomy in the coding of my transcripts in order to label interpreter-authored utterances and to distinguish them from the utterances of the participants.

**Interim Text 2: reviewing visual data against transcription.**

After having completed a verbatim transcript of the audio portion of the interview, I watched the videotape once again, this time reading along from my first interim text. The purpose of this review of the visual data against my initial transcription was threefold: 1) to make note of any meaningful non-verbal data not captured by the audiotape (e.g., facial expressions, gestures, production of signs); 2) to identify and label any interpreter-authored utterances; and 3) to correct any errors in Interim Text 1. I used the same transcription rules to complete Interim Text 2 that I used to complete Interim Text 1 (see Appendix F).

**Transmuted Text: editing for readability**

The goal of this third stage in the transcription process was to prepare a readable transcript, primarily in English, that could be shared with the participants for their approval and analyzed as a research text. I am aware of the methodological and ethical issues raised by the editing of interview transcripts. Poland (2002) cautions against such editing, particularly prior to the analysis stage: “It is my opinion,” he explains, “that although the tidiness of quotations may be appropriate when an author is writing up qualitative research for publication, this should occur after the analysis has taken place and should be done by the researcher, who should take care that
what is removed does not appreciably alter the meaning of what was said” (p. 634). Kvale and Brinkmann (2009), however, argue that editing transcripts for readability prior to analysis may be appropriate, even preferable, when the transcripts are to be sent back to the interviewees for review: “Oral language transcribed verbatim may appear as incoherent and confused speech, even as indicating a lower level of intellectual functioning. […] If transcripts are to be sent back to the interviewees, rendering them in a more fluent style should be considered from the start” (p. 187).

The readability of the transcripts I had created up to this point suffered not only from the fact that oral language translates clumsily onto paper, but from three other factors, as well. First, much of the oral language produced during the interviews was produced by an interpreter who was making sense of what the participants were saying as she was interpreting it. This led to a great many false starts and rephrasings that were not attributable to the participants themselves. Second, both the interpreter and the hard of hearing participant, Helena, are speakers of English as second language. As a result, their spoken English contains grammatical errors and awkward diction that they would most likely notice, and potentially find embarrassing, on paper. Third, Swedish words appear in the verbatim transcript. Sometimes these words need to remain in Swedish because there is no direct translation or because translating the word to English would render the speaker’s utterance nonsensical (e.g., “The word ‘lära’ can mean either ‘teach’ or ‘learn’.”). Other times, however, the word is in Swedish only because the speaker could not think of the English translation or found it easier to express themselves in Swedish for a moment. This peppering of the transcript with Swedish words did not serve any research purpose for this study—I am not interested in code-switching, for example—and so unnecessarily interfered with the transcripts’ readability. Furthermore, the participants were going to be reviewing the
interview transcripts in English, a non-native language for them, so the task of deciphering an unedited verbatim transcript would have been daunting.

Based on the factors explained above, I decided to edit the transcripts for readability before I presented them to the participants for review. After having watched the videotapes once through, transcribed the audio in full, and then re-watched the videos alongside the transcripts, I felt confident that I could produce a coherent, English text without altering the meaning of what was said. I generated a set of rules for the creation of the Transmuted Texts, which can be found in Appendix G. An example of one segment of transcript text at each stage of its transmutation is included as Appendix H. The four interview transcripts—a pre-observation interview (POI) and stimulated recall interview (SRI) with each teacher—are included as Appendices I (POI – Christel), J (POI – Helena), K (SRI – Christel), and L (SRI – Helena).

After completing readable transcripts of all four interviews according to the rules in Appendix G, I emailed each participant her two transcripts and asked her to review them and make any comments or changes. I did this not only as a means to improve the trustworthiness of the research design, but also as a method of back translation. I asked that the participants try to return the transcripts to me with their comments and changes within two weeks. The participants’ comments and changes were then included in the coding and analysis. They are included in Appendices M and N.

**Analysis of Transcripts and Classroom Video**

This section is broken into two subsections. In the first subsection, I explain my procedures for verifying that the participants were ‘model’ teachers, which involved comparing the teachers’ practices to the guidelines laid out in the school’s “Pedagogical Guidelines for Language
Development” (see Appendix A). In the second subsection, I explain my procedures for creating portraits of each teacher’s grammatical TLA.

**Verifying that the participants were ‘model’ teachers.**

As described in the section entitled ‘Participants,’ I created a list of nine descriptors of model teachers at Nilskolan (see Table 6) based on the school’s “Pedagogical Guidelines for Language Development” (see Appendix A), a document detailing the school’s approach to bilingual deaf education. I then assigned a code to each of those nine descriptors for use in analyzing the data collected for each teacher. A list of the nine codes associated with the descriptors of model teachers at Nilskolan appears in Table 9.

Table 9
*Codes Derived from Descriptors of Model Teachers at Nilskolan*

MT: MODEL TEACHER
- MT: vocab – Swedish
- MT: vocab – TSP
- MT: expressive language – Swedish
- MT: expressive language – TSP
- MT: Swedish through print
- MT: deaf literacy difficulties
- MT: speech therapists/audiologists
- MT: differentiated instruction
- MT: identity/strategies

*Note:* ‘TSP’ stands for Teckenspråk.

In order to analyze the extent to which Christel’s and Helena’s teaching practices were aligned with Nilskolan’s approach to bilingual deaf education, I felt it necessary to look beyond the key instructional episodes that I had selected for my analysis of the teachers’ grammatical Teacher Language Awareness (TLA). By definition, the key instructional episodes I had chosen for the latter analysis were narrowly focused on the teachers’ approach to grammar instruction. The descriptors of model teachers (see Table 6) derived from the school’s “Pedagogical
Guidelines” document (see Appendix A), however, applied to all aspects of language teaching. Therefore, I believed that an analysis of the teachers’ representative language lessons would yield a more accurate picture of their status as model teachers at Nilskolan.

For this purpose, I selected two lesson segments to analyze for each teacher: a 20 minute segment from a reading lesson and a 10 minute segment from a writing lesson. The teachers’ reading lessons, which were all shared reading experiences, tended to range from about 20 to 40 minutes in length. Their writing lessons ranged from about 10 to 15 minutes in length, and most often involved the teachers conferencing with students individually while other students continued writing independently. After observing the teachers for four weeks and reviewing the full seven hours of key instructional episodes, I felt confident in my ability to select segments for each teacher that reflected her general approach to language and literacy instruction. I then analyzed these four segments—one reading and one writing segment per teacher—using the nine model teacher codes listed in Table 7.

Finally, I reviewed the descriptive and reflective field notes that I had collected throughout my classroom observations. During those observations, I had been careful to record any evidence I observed related to the teachers’ status as model teachers as measured by their alignment with the descriptors of model teachers at Nilskolan (see Table 6). This third layer of analysis was particularly useful for identifying evidence related to teachers’ work with students’ identities, since much of this work occurred outside the boundaries of language and literacy lessons.

Creating portraits of the teachers’ grammatical TLA.

The primary data used for creating portraits of the teachers’ grammatical Teacher Language Awareness (TLA) were the video segments reviewed by the teachers during the stimulated recall interviews—roughly 25 minutes of video per teacher—and the transcripts of those interviews.
My decision to focus my analysis on these two data sources was grounded in my understanding of the theoretical construct of TLA: Because TLA encompasses both behavioral and cognitive aspects, I wanted to examine most closely data that offered me insight into the teachers’ actions in relationship to their thoughts about those actions. I believed that video of particular lessons, coupled with the teachers’ comments on those lessons, would offer me the richest insight into the teachers’ grammatical knowledge-in-action.

I began my exploration of the teachers’ grammatical TLA by coding each teacher’s pre- and post-observation interview transcripts using the start list of codes in Table 7. I proceeded to code the video segments reviewed by each teacher in her stimulated recall interview. I opted to code the video directly in ATLAS.ti, rather than to create transcripts of the video data before coding them, because the video data were sufficiently rich in visual content that I did not want to reduce them to written form before I had performed my analysis. The transcribed quotations from the key instructional episodes that appear in this paper were thus created after the analysis phase, for the purpose of helping me to support my claims about the data. All classroom interactions were interpreted for me by a Teckenspråk interpreter; thus, the transcription rules I used to record classroom interactions were the same rules I used for creating transcripts of the teacher interviews (see Appendices F and G).

Throughout the coding process, I wrote analytic memos to capture my developing thoughts about the data. According to Glaser (1978), analytic memos are “the theorizing write-up of ideas about codes and their relationships as they strike the analyst while coding” (cited in Miles and Huberman, 1974, p. 72). It was in these analytic memos that I began to form my insights into the nature of the teachers’ grammatical Teacher Language Awareness (TLA) in the context of this
bilingual school for the deaf. I also made modifications to my coding scheme throughout the coding process in order to better accommodate my research data.

After coding all four interview transcripts and the video segments reviewed during the stimulated recall interviews, I reviewed my codes and memos. I combined codes where possible and began to create links among them, both conceptually and within Inspiration (version 9), a software program for creating graphic organizers and concept maps. For an example of one of these graphic organizers, see Appendix O. I preferred to work outside of ATLAS.ti for creating concept maps so that, as my ideas about the data changed, I could feel free to link and unlink codes and memos without affecting the data as it was stored in the data analysis software. I then consolidated my analysis into written summaries.

After having composed these initial summaries of the data, I proceeded to review the video of the remaining key episodes, roughly eight and a half hours per teacher. This data was less rich than the video linked to teacher commentary, since the teachers had not been given an opportunity to comment on these particular lessons. It did, however, serve to provide supporting or disconfirming evidence for my developing analysis of the data. Therefore, I did not code these video data in their entirety. Rather, I coded only the segments that provided powerful evidence either to confirm or disconfirm my developing understanding of each teacher’s grammatical TLA.

As I analyzed these remaining videos, I continued to modify my codes. Thus, the list of codes with which I began my analysis of the Transcript and Video data (Table 5) underwent a number of changes during the coding process. My final list of codes is included in Appendix P. It includes two new codes related to the educational context at Nilskolan, namely that the teachers were working with elementary age children (CON: elementary ed) and that the majority of
students were using cochlear implants (CON: cochlear implants). It also includes a set of codes related to possible influences on the teachers’ TLA, as described in the interviews. These include their experiences growing up deaf or hard of hearing, their own language learning experiences, and their teacher training.

At this point, I was ready to create portraits of each teachers’ grammatical TLA grounded in the transcript and video data. These portraits are presented in Chapter IV: Findings.

**Trustworthiness**

Prolonged engagement, data triangulation, member checks, and clarification of researcher bias (Creswell, 1998) were employed to strengthen the trustworthiness of my findings.

In order to establish *prolonged engagement*, I spent three months at the site between November 2008 and March 2009, observing classes and meeting with teachers over coffee to discuss their work and my research interests. I then spent another three weeks at the site in order to re-familiarize myself with the students and with classroom procedures before beginning four consecutive weeks of data collection. *Data triangulation* was ensured via the collection and analysis of multiple forms of data: semi-structured background interviews, observations, field notes, memos, documents, and stimulated recall interviews. Furthermore, I solicited *member checks* of my pre-observation and stimulated recall interview transcripts in order to take into account the “informants’ views on the credibility of the findings” (Creswell, 1998, p. 202) and as a means of back translation.

Finally, I attempted to *clarify any researcher bias* in Chapter I, in a section headed ‘The Researcher.’ Here, I offered a brief biography, commenting on all assumptions and biases that I thought might have an effect on the present study. Insofar as it was possible, I have made every effort to bracket my own biases throughout the process of data collection and analysis by
choosing data collection and analysis procedures that allowed teachers to discuss their beliefs and practices without being confined by my expectations as a researcher. Specifically, I have chosen to employ a semi-structured interview format, rather than a more structured format, in order to allow teachers more control over the conversation. I have also chosen to employ an unstructured observation format, allowing the content of the observations to influence the development of the analytic codes used to describe them.

**Limitations**

As is the case with all qualitative research, a potential limitation of this study is the subjectivity of the researcher. Acknowledging this limitation, I have taken the following steps to limit the effects of researcher bias on my findings: clarifying researcher bias, prolonged engagement, data triangulation, and member checks.

Generalizability is also a concern, as the study only examines the practices of two teachers in a single school. The findings of this study are thus not generalizable to other contexts in a traditional sense. However, as I explain in the Discussion chapter, the portraits produced as a result of this study could be useful in the context of any language teacher education program, particularly those preparing teachers of the deaf. Furthermore, my insights regarding the nature of grammatical Teacher Language Awareness (TLA) as it operates specifically in a bilingual school for the deaf may help to guide future research in this relatively unexplored area.

Finally, the trustworthiness of my findings might also be influenced by the fact that I conducted my research in a foreign culture and that I am not fluent in two of the languages of instruction at Nilskolan (i.e., Swedish and Teckenspråk).

In order to address the issue of cultural difference, I consulted Stephens (2009), who presents four variables for determining culturally appropriate research:
1) *What,* in terms of cultural factors, need to be identified in the content and methodology of research?
2) *Where,* in terms of locus of control, will the research and publication be carried out?
3) *Why,* in terms of personal or professional reasons is the research being done?
4) *Who,* in terms of personnel will be involved in the research, and to what extent will research be both empowering and reflexive for researcher and researched? (p. 28)

To address the *what* question, I have read extensively on the history of bilingual deaf education in Sweden and have had prolonged engagement with the site. I had also lived in Stockholm for just over three years at the time of data collection and was actively engaged in studying Sweden’s languages (signed and spoken) and cultures (hearing and Deaf) for most of that time. Furthermore, as discussed in the Trustworthiness section, I have made every effort to bracket my cultural biases. In terms of *where,* the locus of control will be with the participants, as I will play the role of non-participant observer in their school context. Regarding questions of *why* and *who,* this research is being conducted as the final degree requirement in my doctoral program, but it is also meant to serve Nilskolan’s community by providing a thoughtful mirror on their practice.

To address the issue of linguistic difference, I employed a Teckenspråk interpreter, who was certified to interpret to and from English, to assist with all interviews and transcriptions. I also shared my English interview transcripts with the participants as a means of back translation. I was, however, unable to assess the language proficiency of the teachers in either Swedish or Teckenspråk because my knowledge of the languages was insufficient to make such judgments. As language proficiency has been identified as one of the four components of TLA, this presented a serious limitation to my study. Thus, in order to address this gap, I received statements of the teachers’ native-like proficiency in both languages from independent raters. The Teckenspråk interpreter who interpreted the interviews and classroom video testified the
teachers’ native-like proficiency in Teckenspråk. Nilskolan’s professional development coordinator, a native speaker of Swedish who specializes in language education, testified to the participants’ native-like proficiency in Swedish. These statements can be found in Appendices Q (Teckenspråk proficiency) and R (Swedish proficiency).
Chapter IV

FINDINGS

The purpose of this study was to explore the relationship between teachers’ language knowledge and their grammar teaching practices within the context of a bilingual school for the deaf in Sweden. Specifically, I have asked the following question: What is the nature of the grammatical Teacher Language Awareness (TLA) of high quality teachers in a Swedish bilingual school for the deaf? For the purposes of this paper, TLA is defined as teachers’ knowledge-in-action about language and language teaching, which consists of their explicit language knowledge, knowledge of learners, language proficiency, and beliefs and feelings about language and language teaching.

This chapter begins with a section entitled Presentation of the Data: The Portraits, in which I explain my decision to present the data as detailed portraits of each teacher’s grammatical TLA. Next, I report my findings for each teacher—Christel and Helena—in turn. This chapter concludes with a section entitled Grammatical TLA in the Context of Bilingual Deaf Education, in which I highlight the characteristics of Christel’s and Helena’s TLA that seem unique to the context of bilingual deaf education.
Presentation of the Data

The Portraits

As discussed in Chapter I, many researchers argue that there is an underrepresentation of authentic classroom teaching in language teacher education. Teacher educators, Borg explains (1999b), “typically introduce trainees to pedagogical options in grammar teaching without being able to illustrate when, how, and why teachers in real classrooms draw upon these options” (p. 160). Borg, Popko (2005), and Johnston and Goetsch (2000) have made a case for integrating portraits of L2 classroom teaching into the design of teacher education programs in order to ameliorate this problem. “Stimulating portraits of L2 teacher practice,” Borg (1998c) suggests, will help promote “a reciprocal relationship in which research is grounded in the realities of classroom practice but at the same time provides teachers with insights into teaching through which they can critically examine, and hence improve, their own practice” (p. 32). It was my aim with the present study to produce two such portraits. Thus, the findings are broken into two main sections: Christel and Helena.

Each teacher’s portrait begins with a description of that teacher’s ‘model’ teacher characteristics, as based on the school’s “Pedagogical Guidelines for Language Development” (see Appendix A), a document detailing the school’s approach to bilingual deaf education. The data analysis process I used to create these descriptions is described in Chapter III in the section headed, ‘Verifying that the participants were ‘model’ teachers.’ I have chosen to begin each portrait with a description of the teacher’s model teacher characteristics because these descriptions provide a general overview of each teacher’s approach to language teaching beyond the scope of grammar instruction.
Next, I present a portrait of each teacher’s grammatical Teacher Language Awareness (TLA), organized around the four components of TLA derived from my review of the literature: explicit language knowledge, knowledge of learners, language proficiency, and beliefs and feelings about language and language teaching. The order in which I discuss the four components of TLA in this chapter, however, differs from the order in which they were discussed in Chapter II. In Chapter II, the order in which the components were discussed was fairly random, based entirely on the order in which they appeared in Figure 1. In this chapter, the order in which I discuss the components of TLA was determined by my understanding of the interactions among those elements, which was based on my analysis of the data. I discuss the interactions among the components of TLA in the next section.

**Interactions Among the Components of TLA**

Figure 3 is a diagram meant to represent my understanding of the interaction among the elements of TLA.

*Figure 3. Graphical representation of my understanding of the interactions among the four components of Teacher Language Awareness (TLA).*
In Figure 3, teachers’ beliefs and feelings about language and language teaching (BEL) are represented by a cloud that encompasses the other three components of TLA. I have represented teachers’ beliefs and feelings this way because I see them as operating in the background of—and interacting with—everything that teachers think and do. Teachers’ beliefs about their learners influences what they come to know about their learners (KOL), just as what teachers know about their learners plays a role in their beliefs and feelings about language and language teaching. In a similar way, what teachers believe and feel about language and language teaching influences the kinds of explicit language knowledge (ELK) they acquire, just as the nature of teachers’ explicit language knowledge plays a role in their beliefs about language and language teaching. Finally, while it is certainly true that teachers’ proficiency in a language (LP) can influence their beliefs and feelings about that language and how to teach it, I think it is also true that one’s beliefs and feelings about a language (e.g., if they believe it is a beautiful or ugly language) can have an effect on how proficient they become in that language.

Moving toward the center of Figure 3, explicit language knowledge (ELK) and knowledge of learners (KOL) are represented as having an interactive relationship. While it is obvious that teachers’ knowledge of their learners is necessarily limited by their own explicit language knowledge, it also seems likely that teachers who know their learners particularly well may experience enhancements to their explicit language knowledge as a consequence. For example, a teacher who has previously had difficulty understanding the rules of the subjunctive may gain clarity on the subject by paying close attention to the kinds of errors his students’ make when attempting to use the form.

Finally, at the bottom of Figure 3, language proficiency (LP) is depicted as acting like a filter that mediates teachers’ declarative knowledge about language (ELK) and learners (KOL).
Andrews (2007) explains how teachers’ language proficiency acts as a filter on their explicit language knowledge (ELK): “Because the content of instruction and the medium of instruction are often the same in language teaching, everything teachers say in the language classroom is necessarily “mediated through their language proficiency” (p. 27). When teachers prepare for lessons with a grammar focus, for example, Andrews argues that they are likely to consult “both their explicit knowledge of the relevant grammar rules and their own communicative use of the grammar item” (p. 27). Language proficiency acts as a filter on teachers’ knowledge of learners (KOL) in a similar way. When teachers assess the correctness of their students’ language productions, for example, these assessments are mediated not only through the teachers’ explicit grammar knowledge, but also their beliefs about the appropriate communicative use of the structure, beliefs that will be affected by the teachers’ own proficiency in the language.

My understanding of the relationships between the four components of Teacher Language Awareness (TLA), as expressed in Figure 3, has motivated the following order for my presentation of the teachers’ portraits: (1) ‘Beliefs and Feelings about Language and Language Teaching,’ (2) ‘Language Proficiency,’ (3) ‘Explicit Language Knowledge,’ and (4) ‘Knowledge of Learners.’ Presenting teachers’ beliefs and feelings first makes sense if we assume that those beliefs and feelings operate in the background of—and interact with—everything that teachers think and do. Presenting language proficiency second makes sense because the final two elements, explicit language knowledge and knowledge of learners, are both mediated through—and thus affected by—teachers’ language proficiency. Of the last two elements, explicit language knowledge should come first not only because it is the “core” of TLA (Andrews, 2007, p. 70), but also because it is a more stable component of TLA than knowledge of learners. By that I mean only that teachers’ knowledge of their learners will, of necessity, change with each new
group of learners, while their explicit language knowledge has the potential to remain constant across pedagogical contexts.

Each section is then further divided into subsections that correspond to the subcategories of each component of TLA. For example, the first component of TLA is ‘Beliefs and Feelings about Language and Language Teaching.’ Under this general heading, previous research has revealed four subcategories: feelings about grammar, perceptions of students’ feelings about grammar, understandings of the role of grammar instruction, and understandings of stakeholder expectations. The other three components of TLA have been similarly broken down into subcategories based on discussions of teachers’ language knowledge in the literature. The findings on each teacher’s grammatical TLA are thus presented in four major sections with 15 subsections.

Christel

‘Model’ Teacher Characteristics

A numerical summary of Christel’s model teacher characteristics is presented in Table 10. The numbers in Table 10 were derived from my coding of a 20-minute reading lesson, a 10-minute writing lesson, and my field notes.

Table 10
Summary of Evidence of Christel’s Model Teacher Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>VS</th>
<th>VT</th>
<th>ES</th>
<th>ET</th>
<th>Sw</th>
<th>Li</th>
<th>SH</th>
<th>DI</th>
<th>Id</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading Lesson</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing Lesson</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Notes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. High frequency characteristics (N>15) are shaded gray. VS = Swedish vocabulary; VT = Teckenspråk vocabulary; ES = expressive Swedish; ET = expressive Teckenspråk; Sw = learning Swedish through print; Li = Literacy; SH = speech and hearing; DI = differentiated instruction; and Id = identity.
The coding matrix I used to analyze Christel’s model teacher characteristics is included as Appendix S. In the matrix, an ‘x’ indicates that evidence of the ‘model teacher characteristic’ heading that column is present in the lesson or field notes. The numbers in the bottom row indicate the total number of occurrences of each characteristic. For example, within Christel’s reading lesson, there were 20 examples of her addressing Swedish vocabulary (VS) and only four examples of her addressing Teckenspråk vocabulary (VT).

As is clear in Table 10, I saw evidence of all nine descriptors of model teachers at Nilskolan (see Table 6) in Christel’s teaching, though attention to Teckenspråk vocabulary (VT) and speech and hearing (SH) occurred much less frequently than the others. Helena’s data showed a similar distribution of values, which I will discuss later in the paper. In the paragraphs that follow, I will first address the breakdown of the evidence across the three data sources: the reading lesson, the writing lesson, and my field notes. Second, I will discuss the low frequency characteristics: Teckenspråk vocabulary (VT) and speech and hearing (SH).

Beginning with the top row of Table 10, Christel’s reading lesson, it is clear that Christel focused primarily on four of the descriptors of model teachers at Nilskolan: Swedish vocabulary (VS), expressive Teckenspråk (ET), learning Swedish through print (Sw), and Literacy (Li). Given that the focus of her lesson was on reading a Swedish text, these results are not surprising. Throughout the lesson, Christel regularly called her students’ attention to elements of printed Swedish (Sw) that she thought might be challenging for them (e.g., prepositions, tense, the definite article, the copula), including potentially difficult Swedish vocabulary (VS) (e.g., flea, beetle, trembled, fear, scared). At the same time that she focused on these elements of Swedish text, Christel called her students’ attention to the expression of those elements in Teckenspråk (ET). For example, Christel explained to her students that they should not sign prepositions as
individual words (e.g., on), but should express the meanings assigned to the prepositions in ways appropriate to Teckenspråk (e.g., use one hand to indicate a surface and physically place the subject, signed with the other hand, on that surface).

Finally, Christel focused a large portion of her instructional time in the reading lesson on helping the students develop literacy skills (Li). For example, she used a text-covering strategy, employed in most of her reading lessons, to encourage her students to think about the meaning of the text—as derived from the illustrations—before they got caught up in the words. In this way, the students’ first look at the text was typically rewarding—not often affirming their predictions—rather than confusing or overwhelming. Christel’s text-covering strategy also helped students to activate their schema about the text, which likely helped them to make better sense of the words on the page than if they had experienced them ‘cold.’ Christel also called the students’ attention to textual conventions. She explained, for example, that quotations indicate spoken words, and that spoken words tend to appear in the present tense even if the story itself is recounted in the past. She also called their attention to italics in the text, explaining that the words in italics were words being sung by the characters.

Christel’s writing lesson also contained substantial evidence of her focus on learning Swedish through print (Sw) and literacy (Li). Regarding learning Swedish through print (Sw), she called students’ attention to the definite article, correct word order, and the use of the conjunction ‘and’ to connect items in a list. Regarding literacy (Li), she put particular emphasis on the conventions we use in writing in order to make our texts accessible to the reader: correct spelling, the use of commas to break up items in a list, the use of hyphens to indicate continuing text, the proper form for writing the date, and the proper use of capital and lower case letters. Christel also demonstrated attention to two other model teacher characteristics during her writing
lessons, characteristics that were not in strong evidence in her reading lesson: expressive Swedish (ES) and differentiated instruction (DI). Given that writing is a means of expressing Swedish, the evidence of Christel’s attention to expressive Swedish (ES) overlapped significantly with her attention to learning Swedish through print (Sw) and literacy (Li). Essentially, when she asked students’ to focus on elements of Swedish print (Sw), she also asked them to *produce* those elements (ES); likewise, when she focused on conventions in written text (Li), she also asked students to *write* using those conventions (ES). In addition, she pushed one student to express herself more completely by writing about specific examples of the “different things” she liked to do when it was cold outside. Finally, there is evidence of Christel differentiating instruction (DI) throughout this writing lesson, as Christel held writing conferences with each student, addressing their needs on an individual basis. Ross needed help with the definite article and capital letters, for example, while Joanna needed help with the use of commas and the conjunction ‘and’ to combine items in a list.

The last data source I used to assess the extent to which Christel displayed characteristics appropriate to a model teacher at Nilskolan were the field notes that I kept throughout data collection and analysis. Noticing that I had seen very little evidence of three model teacher characteristics in the reading and writing lessons—Teckenspråk vocabulary (VT), speech and hearing (SH), and identity (Id)—I reviewed my field notes for evidence of these characteristics. While I was able to locate teaching episodes that reflected Christel’s attention to students’ identities as deaf and hard of hearing people, there was not much research evidence to support a focus on Teckenspråk vocabulary (VT) or speech and hearing (SH). I will address these gaps in the data after discussing the evidence of Christel’s focus on students’ identity (Id).
My field notes pointed me clearly to two different teaching episodes in which Christel took up students’ identity (Id) as an area of focus. One episode was prompted by a conversation between me and Christel in American Sign Language (ASL), which the students witnessed and took interest in. The other was prompted by a student being disciplined for hiding his signs behind his coat while signing with another student on the playground.

In the first episode focused on identity (Id), Christel had used ASL to explain to me that one student was sick and would be returning tomorrow. Noticing that her students were watching the exchange with interest, Christel took the opportunity to explain to them that she was communicating with me in ASL, the sign language used in the United States. She went on to teach them a few signs in ASL, and then made a special point of calling their attention to the fact that they were all “multilingual” because they knew Teckenspråk and Swedish and were learning English and ASL. She concluded with an empowering statement about how it will be very important for them to know English when they travel because English is used all over the world.

In the second episode focused on identity (Id), all of Christel’s students, except Ross, had come back to class after recess. Christel explained that Ross was being disciplined for hiding his signs behind his coat on the playground. Christel then compared hidden signing to what hearing people do when they speak in the presence of deaf people. “Everyone at Nilskolan can sign,” she explained, “but only some can speak and hear…” She asked the students what it means to be at a bilingual school. Betty answered that it means they have two languages: Swedish and Teckenspråk. Christel responded, “Yes. Also, you talk, but not everyone talks. If you’re talking with one of your friends who talks, and I walk up, you need to switch. That way everyone can interact.” Joana then recounted a story of being hurt when other students were signing under the table, and Christel empathized: “My family and everyone I knew were hearing. Then I met deaf’
people. Ah! I could talk with people, and it felt so good.” Christel concluded the discussion by, again, making an empowering statement about the benefits of being deaf. “All of you hear pretty well with your implants,” she said. “But if you’re outside of school and a lot of people are talking, do you understand well? (Students shake their heads.) That’s why Teckenspråk is your comfortable language. When it’s really loud, hearing people can’t hear either. But we can sign in those situations. It doesn’t bother us.”

Turning, finally, to the bottom-most row of Table 10, it is clear that Christel demonstrated at least some evidence of all nine of the descriptors of model teachers (see Table 6) outlined in Nilskolan’s “Pedagogical Guidelines” document (see Appendix A). It is also clear, however, that she paid much less attention, overall, to Teckenspråk vocabulary (N = 5) and to issues regarding speech and hearing (N = 2).

That Christel devoted little instructional time to speech and hearing (SH) is not surprising given that she is a profoundly deaf woman who communicates with her students exclusively in sign language. Christel acknowledged her inefficacy as a teacher of spoken Swedish in her pre-observation interview, explaining that she did not possess knowledge of “Swedish as a spoken language” (POI 6:31). By this, she meant she did not have phonetic knowledge of the language, or the ability to produce or hear the spoken language herself, and thus was unable to accommodate fully her students with cochlear implants who were learning Swedish in its spoken form. There was limited evidence in my field notes that Christel addressed speech and hearing. In the episode focused on English and American Sign Language (ASL), Christel pointed out to her students that the ‘w’ at the end of English word ‘tomorrow’ is not pronounced like a ‘v’, as it would be in Swedish. In another episode, she allowed students to leave her class for speech without hesitation.
The infrequency with which Christel addressed Teckenspråk vocabulary is a bit more surprising, however. My best guess as to why she spent proportionately little instructional time on Teckenspråk vocabulary is that she did not perceive this as an area of great need for her students. Most of her students were fluent users of Teckenspråk, half of them with deaf parents, and it is reasonable to presume that they already possessed extensive vocabularies in the language. A second, and perhaps complementary explanation, is that Christel’s approach to Teckenspråk vocabulary instruction was less explicit than her approach to Swedish vocabulary instruction because she was a constant model of Teckenspråk vocabulary and could introduce new signs in meaningful contexts. Because vocabulary instruction was not a research focus of this study, I do not have Christel’s thoughts on this issue.

Beliefs and Feelings about Language and Language Teaching

In this section, the evidence relevant to Christel’s beliefs and feelings about language and language teaching is presented. The section is divided into the following four subsections: feelings about grammar, perceptions of students’ feelings about grammar, understandings of the role of grammar instruction, and understandings of stakeholder expectations.

Feelings about grammar.

Andrews (2007) describes teachers’ feelings about grammar and grammar pedagogy as including both their interest in the subject and their confidence in their own knowledge of the subject and how to teach it. Previous research (Andrews & McNeill, 2005; Borg, 2005; Burns & Knox, 2005; Johnston & Goettsch, 2000) also indicates that teachers with a positive affect regarding grammar work toward self-improvement of their own knowledge of the subject. The evidence suggests that Christel was extremely interested in grammar, very confident in her ability to teach it, and continually looking for ways to improve her own knowledge.
Christel described herself as someone who has always loved language, and linguistics in particular. She recalled enjoying her English and German foreign language classes, which began when she was in seventh grade, more than she enjoyed studying Swedish because her foreign language teachers focused on the grammar of the languages while her Swedish teacher focused primarily on copying sentences and pronouncing words. Christel didn’t study the form of Teckenspråk until she entered her teacher training program at the age of 34, and she remembers her first exposure to the grammar of sign language as a life-altering experience. “34 years of age,” she said, “and I was for the first time aware about sign language. I could speak and I could have discussions about my own language for the first time when I was 34. So I felt that, should I be bitter? Should I be angry because I didn’t have that knowledge before? Or should I feel that, “Ah, this is better than nothing.” Because lots of people my age never had any information or teaching about our own language while we were small” (POI 6:12). Before that experience, Christel explained, she knew sign language, but she didn’t know about sign language. She couldn’t “explain” it. “Hearing people,” she explained, “they say all the time: ‘Why do you use your face so much when using sign language?’ And it was very hard for me to explain. And afterwards, it was much easier for me to explain. […] I now had the tools to explain to other people why sign language was as it was. And afterwards I felt very strong. I was very proud about my language because it was the first time I actually could explain what I was doing” (POI 6:14).

Christel also deepened her knowledge of Swedish during her teacher preparation program. Due to her courses in Swedish as a second language, Christel explained that she could now “go more into depth about the Swedish language, how to effectively teach the Swedish language to deaf children” (SRI 6:19). She gave credit to the linguistic coursework she took in college for her
ability to teach deaf children effectively: “Through these—sign language at the University and Swedish as a second language—after those two and getting all that information, I could later teach deaf children (SRI 6:19).

In terms of confidence, Christel said that “the easiest part” of language teaching was giving her students knowledge about Teckenspråk and Swedish: “I love to teach about sign language because I know what I’m doing. I have many years of experience, and I love to give them my experience. I feel it’s very fun. I like it very much. […] And also the Swedish language. How to read books, and explaining and presenting the books through sign language. […] Also the grammar” (POI 6:39). Christel did make a distinction, however, between her confidence in her ability to teach Swedish as a second language to deaf students and her confidence in her ability to teach Swedish as a spoken language, or the phonetic components of the language. When she began her teaching career, she explained, “it was quite easy to work with the groups—hard of hearing and deaf students—because they were using sign language as a first language” (POI 6:31). With the arrival of cochlear implants, however, the demographics of Christel’s students changed so that, now, many of the students were learning Swedish as their first language through the auditory channel, rather than as a second language in a solely written form. Given her status as a Deaf person who does not speak, Christel did not feel as well-prepared to teach students who were learning spoken Swedish. “Today,” she explained, “the new students with cochlear implants, they are not profoundly deaf. They don’t use sign language as the first language, and we need to have other teaching methods. They have Swedish, but not Swedish as a second language. They have Swedish, spoken Swedish, and for me, it’s difficult. And I say, ‘Stop. I cannot teach all the students and use my methods. I have Swedish as a second language, but—I feel—not Swedish as spoken language’ (POI 6:31).
Furthermore, despite her confidence in her abilities as a language teacher, Christel said that her “greatest weakness” as a teacher was working with students who struggle with language. She talked at length about one student in particular, Yassin, who had “learning difficulties.” “I think it’s very hard,” she said, “how to teach him, what method is the best way to give him the opportunity to learn” (POI 6:41)? She was so concerned about his language learning that she had recently called for a special meeting with his parents and the faculty, an Elev Vårds Konferens (Students’ Care Conference), to discuss his education. She explained that these conferences were only held when a teacher identified something “very special” with one student so that the student wasn’t “reaching the goals.” In such cases, a special evaluation of the student’s needs and a special curriculum might be necessary.

Christel did not show any evidence of being discouraged by her difficulties with Yassin, however. Instead, she described his situation as “exciting” and demonstrated a sincere interest in deepening her understanding of him and improving her approach to his education. During her stimulated recall interview, she interrupted the video more than once to comment on how exciting it was to watch Yassin’s signing, which she described as “a little bit odd” but “interesting.” Christel’s interest in Yassin was in keeping with her general approach to self-reflection and self-improvement. “I always take notes,” she explained, referring to her reflection on her teaching practice, “and try to do an evaluation of myself all the time to see what is a good way to teach” (SRI 2:20).

Furthermore, during her stimulated recall interview, Christel explained that watching herself on tape and discussing her work with an outsider was beneficial for her. “I think it’s very interesting,” she volunteered, “to have somebody to discuss with, to start to develop myself, and to have other eyes to see actually what I’m doing. It’s very interesting” (SRI 2:42). She also
explained that she was currently discussing her approach to bilingualism with other teachers at Nilskolan and that she thought the video was “very rich and very good material” for helping her to see how she was working (SRI 2:2).

Perceptions of students’ feelings about grammar.

Christel expressed some concern that young children might not respond favorably to too great a focus on grammar. “I don’t give them too much grammar in the beginning,” she explained, “when they’re so small. Because it’s too tough, and it’s too much. I need to focus on their curiosity more than to just put in so many facts in the beginning” (POI 6:40). She discussed her decisions about when to use metalanguage in similar terms, explaining that using metalanguage can make learning “too heavy” for them and take the “fun” out of learning language (SRI 2:29). When she did focus on the form of language, however, she felt that the feedback from her students was positive. She explained that she loved teaching about sign language and Swedish and had a lot of fun doing so. “And also,” she added, “I can see them, they’re very alert, they really enjoy taking all this information. It works very well” (POI 6:37).

Understandings of the role of grammar instruction.

Overall, Christel believed strongly that grammar instruction should be linked to communicative purposes. The evidence suggests that Christel had three main purposes for engaging students in grammar instruction: 1) to aid their reading comprehension, 2) to improve their writing skills, and 3) to improve their expressive signed communication. For Christel, these three goals were interdependent; she believed that the most effective way to help her students make sense of Swedish as a written language was to show them the ways in which grammatical constructions were used differently to convey meaning in Swedish and Teckenspråk. Many of
these grammatical differences were related to the modality differences between written and signed languages. Christel explained:

OK, they can see the text. But, I don’t want them to just sign it [word for word]. I would like them to see the whole picture, actually what is it saying? And in sign language, it’s much richer than just these [Swedish] words. So that’s why I’m spending so much time to help them to understand. There are a lot of polysyntactic signs, you know, lots of things are happening at the same time within one sign. Because later, when they have all this, they know how sign language is working and how to process this language, sign language, it will be much easier for them to read and understand, actually, the text. (SRI 2:17)

In the above quote, Christel is communicating one of the core tenants of her approach to grammar teaching in a bilingual deaf education context. She believes it is of fundamental importance to help her students break Swedish sentences down into their component grammatical parts and demonstrate for them how the meaning communicated by those parts gets communicated, visually, in Teckenspråk. She helps her students move between the two languages in the opposite direction, as well: unpacking polysyntactic signs into the Swedish words that could be used to communicate the same meaning.

In regard to reading, Christel repeatedly explained her choice to focus on particular grammar issues as being motivated by her desire to improve her students’ understanding of written Swedish. In all cases, the issues she chose to address represented differences in form between Swedish and Teckenspråk that she believed might confuse her students. For example, she chose to focus her students’ attention on the difference between the definite and indefinite forms of the Swedish word for ‘flea’ (loppan and loppa, respectively). She explained that she expected these word forms to confuse her students because there is no distinction between ‘loppan’ and ‘loppa’ in Teckenspråk. Similarly, the Swedish word ‘hålla’ (to hold) has many different meanings depending on the particle that occurs after it, but each of those meanings is expressed via a unique sign in Teckenspråk. Christel took the time to show the students each of the forms of
‘hålla’ and to explain the differences among them, even though she knew they might be missing some of the information. “I keep telling them again and again,” she explained, “because I know that this word is actually going to appear several times” (SRI 2:19). Prepositions were also an area of focus for Christel because prepositions appear regularly in students’ reading but are used very rarely in Teckenspråk.

A final example of Christel focusing on grammar in order to aid students’ reading comprehension involved the use of different tenses in written storytelling. During one of her guided reading lessons, Christel explicitly drew her students’ attention to the fact that the story was being told in the past tense but everything the characters were saying was written in the present tense. When I asked her why she chose to focus on this difference with the students, she explained that they might find it confusing: “Why is it now and past, present and past, why are we jumping between past and present all the time?” (SRI 2:7). Again, although there are ways to communicate tense in Teckenspråk, there are not inflected verb forms, per se. Furthermore, someone telling the same story in Teckenspråk would not need to jump back and forth between two tenses. Instead, the signer would establish at the outset that the story had happened in the past, and the listener would assume that the dialog had occurred contemporaneously.

Second, Christel expressed a belief that teaching students grammar would help them improve their writing skills. After noticing, for example, that her students were struggling with the placement of periods in their writing, she created an inquiry-based lesson in which the students were shown a text devoid of periods and asked to place them correctly. She explained that she wanted them to experience the text without punctuation as readers so that they would understand the purpose of using punctuation in their own writing. “You have to stop it,” she explained—‘it’ referring to the flow of words in a text—“to understand actually where to put the
period in the text. And how to break it. So they would understand, when they read, as the reader, understand, “OK, this is this: connected. This is a new sentence” (SRI 2:27). Christel also explained her focus on verb tense and pronouns as being motivated by her desire to help students improve their own writing. Regarding tense, she explained that it was important for students to “choose the right form” in their writing (SRI 2:4), and not to get “confused” and “mix” the tenses (SRI 2:31). Regarding pronouns, Christel explained that her students had a habit of repeating names over and over again in their writing. She wanted them to understand that using pronouns could render text “much easier to read and more fun to write, more fun for other people to read” (SRI 2:28).

Christel’s belief that a focus on grammar could help her students improve their writing was revealed, also, through the rationales behind her error corrections. When she corrected one student, Joanna, on the misuse of a pronoun, for instance, she explained that she did so because she was concerned about the student’s writing. “I have to explain to her,” Christel said, because “she doesn’t actually understand fully how to create a text” (SRI 2:39). Similarly, when another student, Yassin, incorrectly conjugated the verb ‘bli’ (to become) after a modal, Christel said, “I think sometimes I need to explain to him directly…to make him understand…because he could get stuck with this” (SRI 2:37).

The third rationale Christel used for engaging in grammar instruction was that it would help her students improve their expressive Teckenspråk. Christel used Teckenspråk grammar at all times—except when she was explicitly making a point about the difference between Swedish and Teckenspråk word order—and she encouraged her students to do the same. For example, in one episode, Christel asked her students to translate into Teckenspråk the title of the book they were reading: Jag är Kungen på Berget (I am the King on the Mountain). She strongly
emphasized the need to ignore the Swedish word order and communicate the accurate meaning of the passage in Teckenspråk. The Teckenspråk translation she produced was, ‘/I MOUNTAIN STAND(-on) KING I(head-nod)/’. Not only does the word order of this construction differ in Swedish and Teckenspråk, but a few of the words that appear in Swedish construction (i.e. ‘am’, ‘the’, ‘on’) are not present in the Teckenspråk translation.

Instead of producing the preposition ‘on’, Christel inflected the sign /STAND/ to show the subject’s (a flea’s) position on top of the mountain. She did this by holding the sign for mountain (forearm, hand, and fingers forming an upward slope, palm down) on her left hand while creating a curled ‘V’ with the index and middle fingers on her right hand (to indicate a crouching insect) and placing her right hand physically on top of her left. In this way, Christel could visually demonstrate that the flea (the curled ‘V’ on her right hand) was standing on top of the mountain (the slope she had maintained on her left hand). Instead of producing the sign ‘am’, Christel nodded her head while producing the phrase-final ‘I’, a non-manual marker used in Teckenspråk to indicate that the first-person pronoun is the subject.

After reviewing this episode on tape, Christel explained her motivation for emphasizing the grammatical differences between Swedish and Teckenspråk this way: “I would like to give them awareness, how they translate from Swedish text to sign language. Earlier, I gave them—in first grade—that ‘am’, ‘I am’, ‘on’: We don’t use that in sign language. So I would just like to remind them: ‘Not ‘am’. […] Sometimes I remind them how we use sign language because I would like them to remember that, and not to forget how sign language works compared to Swedish” (SRI 2:8).

The only times when Christel did not follow Teckenspråk grammar in her signing were when she was explaining a specific point about Swedish word order. On these occasions, she
used the modified word order of her signs to focus students’ attention on the form of the Swedish language explicitly. Upon observing herself signing in Swedish word order, Christel interrupted the video to make this comment: “As you see, I’m signing following the Swedish text. I’m signing Swedish, so they will understand actually what words to use. That’s quite interesting that I’m signing following strictly the Swedish. So, I’m asking myself, more or less, if it’s to make them understand” (SRI 2:30). It is clear from Christel’s commentary, here, that she was not entirely comfortable with signing in Swedish word order even when the purpose was to make an explicit point about the ways in which Swedish grammar different from Teckenspråk grammar.

**Understandings of stakeholder expectations.**

Christel named two outside forces that had an influence on her work as a language teacher: Nilskolan’s language curriculum and her students’ parents.

Regarding Nilskolan’s language curriculum, Christel acknowledged that the school’s curriculum influenced her work, but she did not express any feelings, positive or negative, about its influence. When I asked her if the school encouraged teachers to teach language in any particular ways, she said only, “We have to follow the curriculum. […] Hopefully everybody’s doing their job to reach the curriculum” (POI 6:44).

Christel did feel, however, that the expectations of parents, particularly those of students with cochlear implants, influenced her ability to teach language effectively. “The parents say that they need to have spoken language,” she explained, “but the spoken language may not be enough for them. And we see that they need to have sign language, because we can see—if we just talk to them, speak to them, and explain Swedish through speaking—we can understand that they’re not going to understand it. So we have to give them sign language, also. We can see that, even though the parents want them just to have spoken language, more or less” (POI 6:34).
Christel said that it was most challenging to explain the need for sign language to parents of children in the first grade. “First grade parents,” she argued, “haven’t been given good information about sign language from the beginning, from the doctors or from the teams” (POI 6:34). The doctors advise parents to give their children cochlear implants, Christel explained, and then the parents, who are hearing themselves, “focus on hearing all the time” (POI 6:34). Christel felt that it was necessary to provide the parents with “good arguments” for why their children should also learn sign language. “Maybe they can use the spoken language at home,” she argued, “but in school, they actually need sign language. It’s like, we have to put our effort in knowledge, not in hearing training and teaching them how to speak. That’s not the main focus we should have in school. They can speak at home. But in school, we should put our effort in knowledge” (POI 6:35).

By the time students enter the second grade, Christel explained, “the parents are more or less OK. They understand more. But, in first grade, it’s very hard” (POI 6:36). Christel contrasted her current relationship with parents to that she experienced when she first began teaching at Nilskolan. “If I compare to ten, fifteen years ago, maybe, it was much easier,” she said. “The children got sign language very early because there weren’t any cochlear implants. But today it’s different. So, they are actually postponing sign language. They don’t give sign language to the children so early today. They’re focusing on speech” (POI 6:36).

**Language Proficiency**

As I explained in the Limitations section of Chapter III, I was unable to personally assess the language proficiency of the teachers in either Swedish or Teckenspråk because my knowledge of the languages was insufficient to make such judgments. Instead, I received statements of the teachers’ native-like proficiency in both languages from independent raters. The Teckenspråk
interpreter who interpreted the interviews and classroom video testified to Christel’s native-like proficiency in Teckenspråk (see Appendix Q). Nilskolan’s professional development coordinator, a native speaker of Swedish who specializes in language education, testified to Christel’s native-like proficiency in Swedish (Appendix R). What is presented in the following sections is evidence regarding Christel’s own views on her language proficiency. The section is divided into two subsections: accurate and effective use of the target language and use of the non-native speaker advantage.

**Accurate and effective use of the target language(s).**

Christel was very confident in her ability to teach both Teckenspråk and Swedish and enjoyed teaching both languages very much. As a profoundly deaf woman who did not speak, however, she was concerned about her inability to teach Swedish as a spoken language, or the phonetic components of the language, to students who could hear as a result of cochlear implant surgery. “I cannot teach all the students and use my methods,” Christel explained. “I have Swedish as a second language, but—I feel—not Swedish as a spoken language” (POI 6:31). Christel described herself as having “Swedish as a second language” because she learned written Swedish as a second language through her native language, Teckenspråk.

**Use of the non-native speaker advantage.**

The term ‘non-native speaker advantage’ is used to describe the language learning insights and strategies unique to those language teachers who have, themselves, learned the language they are teaching as a second language. Christel never referred to the non-native speaker advantage explicitly. There was some evidence, however, that she used the knowledge she had gained from learning Swedish as a second language to help her predict areas of potential confusion for her students in their reading and writing of Swedish. She chose, for instance, to
emphasize the use of articles, particles, prepositions, and tense—all of which function very differently in Teckenspråk and written Swedish—and so are particularly challenging for deaf learners of Swedish as a second language.

**Explicit Language Knowledge**

In this section, the evidence relevant to Christel’s explicit language knowledge is presented. The section is divided into the following four subsections: engagement style, error correction, input, and explanation.

**Engagement style.**

Christel’s style of engaging her students in grammar instruction was, with few exceptions, inquiry oriented. Christel tended toward a more goal oriented approach, however, when working with students whom she had identified as struggling language learners.

Christel’s inquiry oriented style was in keeping with her student-centered approach to teaching. At one point during the stimulated recall interview, Christel stopped the tape spontaneously because she was so upset to see that she had remained standing while having a conversation with a seated student. “I think it’s so terrible,” she said, “that she’s actually looking up at me. It would be much better if I was sitting down because then we would have better eye contact. I feel so tall compared to her. She feels like she’s actually looking up to me” (SRI 2:26). Christel explained that she wanted to help students learn to think on their own. “I would like them to understand for themselves,” she said. “To think by themselves. To understand, actually, why” (SRI 2:34).

Christel’s inquiry oriented style was evident in a lesson designed to get her students to pay more attention to the beginning and endings of sentences in their writing. Instead of directly teaching a lesson on subjects and predicates, she composed a text with no punctuation and asked
the students to talk about where they thought it needed periods and capital letters. What seemed a very concrete task—inserting periods and changing lower case letters to capital letters—was actually quite complex. In order for the students to put the periods in the right places, they had to have a fairly deep understanding of the concept of the ‘sentence’ as a unit of thought containing a subject and a predicate. Furthermore, Christel pushed her students to justify their placement of periods and capital letters. This prompted a student-initiated discussion about the use of pronouns as sentential subjects.

Similarly, when Christel wanted to call students’ attention to the fact that stories are often told in the past tense while the dialogue in those stories is written in the present, she asked them if they had noticed the quotation marks and words in italics in the text: “What do quotation marks mean? What do the words in italics mean?” Her students responded, correctly, that the words in quotations were words being spoken by the characters, while the words in italics were words being sung by the characters. She then called their attention to the verb tense of the words in quotations and italics and queried her students about the difference between those verbs and the other verbs on the page.

In another lesson, Christel wanted to illustrate the changes in meaning that occur when the Swedish verb ‘hålla’ (to hold) co-occurs with different particles. While ‘hålla’ by itself simply means ‘to hold,’ as in ‘to hold a book,’ ‘hålla om’ means ‘to embrace’, ‘hålla med’ means ‘to agree with,’ and ‘hålla mig’ means ‘to keep myself,’ as in ‘to keep myself warm.’ To show the students that each of these verb-particle combinations had a different meaning in the language, she wrote each in a sentence and asked the students to come to the front of the room to perform the meaning of the sentences. As a group, they discussed which performances were accurate and modified any that were not.
Also, when Christel engaged the students—as she often did—in conversations about the differences between Swedish and Teckenspråk, she rarely demonstrated the differences by performing the translation herself. Instead, she would choose a Swedish phrase from their reading and ask the students to come to the front of the room and translate it themselves. Sometimes, she would declare the translation ‘*perfekt!*’, and other times she would accept pieces of it and ask other students to try until they had come up with an acceptable translation. As an example, in the following episode, Christel was asking the students to translate the title of the book they were reading: “*Jag är Kungen på Berget*” (I am the King on the Mountain):

Christel: How would I translate this title into Teckenspråk?
Collin: /I KING MOUNTAIN/.
Christel: Exactly. There’s no ‘är’ (am). /I/. Don’t mouth ‘jag’ (I). Just /I/ with your lips closed. /I KING MOUNTAIN/ /MOUNTAIN KING I STAND(-on)/. You don’t use ‘på’ (on). /I MOUNTAIN KING STAND(-on) I(head-nod)/. (40:1)

In the excerpt of classroom discussion recorded above, Christel had a very specific idea of the Teckenspråk translation that she wanted—’/I MOUNTAIN STAND(-on) KING I(head-nod)/’—but instead of telling the students how to do the translation, she asked them. Collin’s answer, ’/I KING MOUNTAIN/’, was very close to the translation that Christel eventually settled on: ’/I MOUNTAIN STAND(-on) KING I(head-nod)/’. He did two things correctly: He avoided the use of the preposition ‘är’ (am) and the use of the preposition ‘på’ (on). Christel praised him on those points and then proceeded to model a slightly more advanced translation, including two features Collin had missed. First, Collin did not inflect the verb ‘/STAND/’ in order to represent its relationship to the mountain via the inflected verb, ‘/STAND(-on)/’, as described above. Second, he did not produce the phrase-final ‘/I/’, with its associated head nod, added for emphasis in sign language.
Christel did not always use an inquiry oriented style, however. In fact, she explained that she had difficulty using an inquiry approach when working with students she identified as struggling language learners. “My weakness are the ones who are struggling,” she explained, “who don’t know how to read. How to just let them go, how to make them start to understand. If I build the ground, how to let them to continue building on by themselves on that ground. That’s the hard part. How should I?—I would like to have them reading by themselves. That’s my weak side: how to do that well, how to strengthen them, how to make them able to read by themselves” (POI 6:42). The ways in which Christel’s engagement style seemed to be affected by her level of confidence in different instructional contexts recalls the findings of Borg (2001b) and Shulman (1987), discussed in Chapter II in the section headed, ‘Feelings about grammar.’

Christel tended toward a more goal oriented approach to grammar instruction when she was working with her struggling students at the individual level. For example, on one occasion, a student named Joana asked Christel how she should spell the Swedish word ‘berätta’ (to tell). Christel first asked Joana how she was planning to use the word in her writing: Was it going to introduce the text, for example, as in “Now, I will explain…”? Or conclude the text, as in “Here, I explained…”? Christel proceeded to teach a mini-lesson on the future (ska berätta), present (berättar) and past (berättade) forms of the verb, as they would be used in the context of a piece of writing. Joana appeared to understand Christel’s mini-lesson, since she used the forms of ‘berätta’ (to tell) correctly in her writing.

Further examples of Christel’s tendency toward a more goal oriented approach to struggling learners are provided in the following section: ‘Error correction.’
Error correction.

Christel discussed her ideas about error correction in the pre-observation interview. She explained that one of her professors from her teacher training program had a very clear view on correcting students’ grammatical errors:

> We should not look at the grammar and point out the grammar is wrong. We should never say, “This is wrong.” You should instead look at the text, the form of the text and performance. And look at, “How do they express themselves? What can we do better?” And analyze it. And it’s also very sensitive, you know, language has so much to do with the person, also. It’s very hard just to go directly and say, “This is wrong. This is wrong.” You should maybe approach it in a different way. And we, as teachers, should show them, “OK, you did this. Maybe you should do this, instead.” And by showing them, copying maybe other texts and showing them—not using their own texts, because it’s very sensitive to be talking about their own texts—but we are using other texts and saying, “Well, if you look at this text, analyze this text, what do you think is very good in this? And why is it good? […] So the students could understand, “OK, this is how I should use the Swedish language,” or “this is how I should write.” By doing analysis of different texts. Not pointing out their wrongs and mistakes. I got this theory from the University and also from the teacher training program. (POI 6:26)

On the whole, Christel’s approach to error correction seemed in line with her expressed philosophy. A lesson referred to previously, in which Christel was asking her students to supply the missing punctuation in a text, is a good example of Christel’s general approach to error correction. Prior to designing that lesson, she had noticed that students were struggling with the use of punctuation in their own writing. Instead of correcting them directly, however, she designed an inquiry-based lesson through which she could help them work on the use of punctuation to delineate units of thought in a less threatening way.

Similarly, during the course of her lesson on the Swedish word ‘hålla’ (to hold), Christel discovered that her students didn’t understand the meaning of one verb plus particle construction: ‘hålla med’ (to agree with). She had written a sentence using the verb on the board—“Jag håller med dig om att det är roligt” (I agree with you about that being fun)—and
asked the students to tell her what it meant. Two students then suggested very reasonable, but incorrect answers. First, Joana said she thought it meant that one person was holding another person by the hands and spinning them around. In this case, Joana correctly interpreted the particle ‘med’ to mean ‘with,’ but did not recognize that the meaning of ‘hålla’ (to hold) changes to ‘agree’ when it is followed by ‘med.’ Also, it seems likely that Joana interpreted the particle ‘om’ to mean ‘around,’ as it does in other Swedish expressions, rather than ‘about.’ So, her interpretation was something like: ‘I hold with you around and that is fun.’ Christel did not correct her, but responded approvingly: “Interesting.” Next, Ross suggested that the sentence meant that one person thought it was fun to embrace another person. Like Joana, Ross correctly interpreted the particle ‘med’ to mean ‘with,’ but did not recognize that the meaning of ‘hålla’ (to hold) changes to ‘agree’ when it is followed by ‘med.’ Ross also seemed to ignore the particle ‘om’ altogether. Christel smiled and nodded in response to his answer, as well, and then proceeded to explain the meaning of ‘hålla med’ (to agree with).

I rarely observed Christel correcting students’ grammar directly. When she did make explicit corrections, she cited the students’ particular struggles with language learning as motivating her choice to do so. Joana and Yassin, two students that Christel identified as struggling with language learning, were the only two students I saw her correct directly.

In one such example, Joana had composed the sentence, ‘Jag ska berätta om hur man håller de sig varma,’ which translates as the grammatically incorrect sentence: “I am going to talk about how people keep they themselves warm.” The pronoun ‘de’ (they) in this sentence is unnecessary because the reflexive pronoun ‘sig’ (themselves) is already doing the work of referring back to the subject, ‘man’ (people). Christel began by telling Joana she could erase the ‘de’. Joana got her eraser and did so. Then, Christel started to explain that the ‘de’ was “extra.”
Joana interrupted, demonstrating her understanding of Christel’s point by smiling and repeating the sign ‘/EXTRA/’ while nodding and smiling. When Christel watched the video of this exchange, she explained her approach this way:

[Joana’s] Swedish is—when it comes to text, creating text—she must practice more when it comes to creating text. I have to explain to her. The other ones, they understand more or less. But she doesn’t actually understand fully how to create a text. I’ve been thinking a lot about Joana’s understanding when it comes to text because she’s very good at signing, but not so good at creating text by herself, how to actually make a Swedish sentence correctly. So I have to check with her sometimes, how she produces text, writing text. So that’s why I’m having these discussions. (SRI 2:39)

All other instances I observed of Christel correcting a student’s error directly occurred with Yassin. In her interviews, Christel repeatedly referred to the difficulties Yassin faced as a language learner, both in Teckenspråk and Swedish. Four of the error correction episodes I observed between Christel and Yassin were related to his signed contributions in class. Two were related to his written Swedish.

Three of Christel’s corrections of Yassin occurred during a lesson in which Christel was trying to call the students’ attention to various prepositions in a particularly complicated Swedish passage. She pointed to the two-word preposition ‘ut ur’ (out from) and looked to the students for a definition. Yassin responded, “Clock.” “Yes, clock is ‘ur’,“ Christel responded, “but not here.” Christel commented on this episode in the stimulated recall interview. “That’s typical,” she said: “He’s quite often—he talks about other things. ‘Ur’, it’s the same word as ‘clock’. You know ‘out of’, it’s the same word. […] And I try not to get off track too much because I still have to say, OK, correct him: "That’s correct, but now we’re talking about this” (SRI 2:11).

On another occasion, she asked the students to tell her the meaning of the word ‘längs’ (along), which had appeared in the text they were reading. Yassin confused the preposition ‘längs’ (along) with the adjective ‘längst’ (longest), and Christel pointed out his error with a
direct, “No, not longest.” She then fingerspelled both words for Yassin, producing the final ‘t’ in ‘längst’ (longest) with added emphasis to demonstrate how it differed in form from the word ‘längs’ (along). In a different lesson, he was similarly confused between the prepositions ‘utför’ (downhill) and ‘utanför’ (outside). Christel corrected him, explaining the differences in meaning between the two prepositions and fingerspelling both words, adding emphasis to the ‘tan’ in ‘utanför’ (outside) to show how it differed in form from ‘utför’ (downhill).

In a separate lesson, on the different meanings of ‘hålla’ (to hold) when it’s followed by different particles, Yassin translated the Swedish sentence, “Du håller en bok” (You are holding a book), as “You are hugging a book.” Christel’s initial approach was to try to help Yassin notice and correct his own error. First, she alerted him to another sentence on the board that contained the particle ‘om’ (around): “Jag håller om dig” (I am hugging you). She pointed to the ‘om’ in that sentence and then pointed out that there was no ‘om’ in the sentence about the book. However, Yassin seemed to miss her point, simply repeating his initial translation: “You are hugging a book.” In a second attempt to correct Yassin’s error in an inquiry oriented way, Christel picked a book up off the table and put her arms around it to hug it. Other students giggled, but Yassin did not seem to understand her point. Finally, Christel resorted to a more goal oriented method for correcting Yassin’s error. She called on a third student, Maddi, to come to the front of the room and demonstrate a correct translation. Maddi held the book in one hand emphatically, at which point Christel made eye contact with Yassin, smiled, and signed, “Right!” Still, Yassin’s facial expression remained largely unchanged; it was unclear whether he understood that he had been corrected.

On two other occasions, Christel corrected Yassin’s written Swedish. In the first writing example, Yassin was given a worksheet with the following instructions: Rita en glass innan och
efter att den har varit i solen. Skriv vad som hander. (Draw an ice cream before and after it has been in the sun. Write what happens.) Below the instructions, there were three boxes. The first box was labeled, “Before”; the second box was labeled, “After”; and the third box was labeled, “What happens?” Yassin had drawn appropriate pictures in the first two boxes but was struggling with what to write in the third box. He had written the word ‘smälter’ (melts) but was unsure of how to proceed. He raised his hand to get Christel’s help, and the following dialog transpired:

Christel: (pointing to the word ‘smälter’ that Yassin had written) What?
Yassin: The sun.
Christel: What is this? (pointing to the picture of the ice cream before it melted)
Which one melted? Which one melted?
Yassin: The sun. Summer.
Christel: (pointing to the word ‘glass’ (ice cream) in the instructions) What is this word?
Yassin: Ice cream.
Christel: You’re right: ‘smälter’ (melts). I’m asking you, which one melts? What melts? Which one melts?
Yassin: Ice cream.
Christel: Right.
Yassin: Smälter glass? (Melts ice cream?)
Christel: Switch the words to make a correct Swedish sentence. First noun, -
Yassin: (overlapping) Glass?
Christel: then verb. Yes.

Yassin proceeded to write a close approximation of the sentence that Christel was looking for: He wrote “Glass smälter” (Ice cream melts), rather than “Glassen smälter” (The ice cream melts). It seems probable that Yassin was trying to compose an alternative correct sentence—

Solen smälter glass (The sun melts the ice cream). My evidence for this claim is his response to Christel’s question, “Which one melted?” Yassin answered, “The sun. Summer.” This indicates that he perceived the sun to be an agent in the scenario of the melting ice cream. Regardless, Christel interpreted his word order as incorrect, and responded by correcting the error directly.

While it was clear that Christel wanted Yassin to produce the ergative form of the verb ‘smälter’ (to melt), in that the ice cream was a sentential subject undergoing the process of
melting, there was no evidence in the video or in the interview that she thought he might be trying to produce an alternative, correct, sentence: *Solen smälter glass* (The sun melts the ice cream). Given Yassin’s difficulty with Swedish writing, it is quite possible that Christel was helping Yassin to create a correct sentence using as few grammatical elements as possible; ‘*Solen smälter glass*’ (The sun melts the ice cream) is more complex than ‘*Glass smälter*’ (Ice cream melts). It is also possible, however, that Christel’s lack of confidence in how to teach Yassin led her to use more direct methods with him, which, in turn, limited her ability to recognize his contributions as socioculturally appropriate interpretations of the situation (see Luk & Wong, 2010).

In the second example, Yassin had composed a text about the life spans of many different animals, including humans. Each sentence included the Swedish verb ‘*bli*’ (to become), as in “*Katter blir 15 år*” (Cats become fifteen years old) and “*Anka blir 18 år*” (Ducks become 18 years old). In all but one sentence, Yassin used the simple present form of the verb, ‘*blir*.’ His use of the form was grammatically correct but semantically awkward, since not all cats actually become 15 years old and then die. His sentence about humans was more semantically accurate in that he used a modal of possibility, ‘*kan*’ (may), before the verb. The sentence was, however, grammatically incorrect because he failed to use the infinitive form of the verb after the modal. Instead, he followed the modal with the simple present form of the verb, producing, “*Man kan bli 80 år*” (‘A human can becomes 80 years old’). Reviewing the sentence, Christel responded, “In Swedish, *kan bli*. Take away the –r.” She wanted Yassin to produce the sentence ‘*Man kan bli 80 år*’ (‘A human can become 80 years old’). Yassin, looking confused, pointed to his other uses of ‘*blir*’ on the same page. “There, you don’t have *kan*,” Christel explained. “Here, you have *kan*.” Yassin returned to his seat and changed all instances of ‘*blir*’ on his paper to ‘*bli*’,
whether or not the verb was preceded by the modal ‘kan’ (may), thereby demonstrating his failure to understand Christel’s connection.

When I asked Christel about this interaction with Yassin, she explained that she felt the need to explain the grammar to him directly, much as she had felt the need to explain the use of the pronoun ‘de’ (they) to Joana and to correct Yassin’s misunderstanding of the preposition ‘ut ur’ (out from).

I think sometimes I need to explain to him directly: “It’s not ‘kan blir’, with an ‘-r’ in the end,” to make him understand. Some of my colleagues say, “Just let him be. He will understand in time.” Could be. Could be not. But I think sometimes I need to correct him instantly instead of just waiting, because he could get stuck with this. If he doesn’t know the differences between ‘kan bli’ without an ‘-r’ or with an ‘-r’ in the end. [...] I don’t want him to have too much red pen in the end, you know. I don’t want to have that. I would like to explain just here and now, the facts, so he will understand. Instead of when he’s doing something, then correcting him with a red pen. I would like to avoid that because that’s an old method. (SRI 2:37)

Input.

Overall, Christel seemed highly capable of mediating her own language output so that the students were able to understand. In fact, there was only one occasion—toward the end of her lesson on the different meanings of ‘hålla’ with different particles—when there was evidence to suggest that she was producing language output at a level too advanced for her students. She had already written a number of sentences using ‘hålla’ on the board:

*Du håller en bok.* (You are holding a book.)
*Jag håller om dig.* (I am hugging you.)
*Hur håller de sig varma?* (How do they hold their warmth (i.e. keep themselves warm)?)

She had asked the students to translate these sentences, and, as I class, they had been able to come up with adequate translations. Then, she wrote a fourth sentence on the board:

*Jag håller med dig om att det är roligt* (I agree with you about it being fun).
As discussed above, the students struggled. Unlike the other cases, in this case, the addition of the particle ‘med’ (with) actually changed the meaning of the verb ‘hålla’ (to hold). It no longer meant ‘to hold,’ but ‘to agree.’ Both Joana and Ross offered reasonable interpretations of ‘håller med’ (agree with) that were, nonetheless, wrong. In the moment, Christel made the decision to give the students the correct translation and move forward with the lesson. When I showed Christel the videotape of this episode, she independently confirmed that the level of the input was too high. After watching herself introduce ‘håller med’ (agree with), she stopped the tape to add this reflection:

‘Håller’. This is in another context. It means something else. I think this lesson was a little bit too much with the word ‘håller’. (laughs) It happens. Because now it’s actually a totally different meaning than the word ‘håller’. (laughs) Sometimes I have to stop myself. It comes too much sometimes. (laughs) (SRI 2:25)

**Explanation.**

When Christel addressed a grammar point—whether it was part of a planned lesson, part of an error correction, or in response to a student’s question—she almost always offered a clear explanation. With few exceptions, her explanations were also inquiry-based, in that students were given the opportunity to offer their own interpretations. As previously discussed in the sections on ‘Engagement style’ and ‘Error correction,’ however, Christel tended toward more goal oriented explanations when working with students she had identified as struggling language learners.

In many cases, only a few words of explanation were required. For example, in one guided reading lesson, Christel and her students came upon the word ‘loppan’ (the flea) in the text. Christel wanted to make sure that the students understood that the word ‘loppan’ was the definite form of a word they were likely already familiar with: ‘loppa’ (flea). First, she fingerspelled ‘L-
O-P-P-A (flea) and asked “What does this mean?” She then fingerspelled ‘L-O-P-P-A’ again, this time holding the final ‘-A’ on her right hand and simultaneously lowering her eyebrows, a non-manual marker used in Teckenspråk to ask a ‘wh-’ question. In this case, she was reiterating, “What is this word: ‘loppa’?” Joana responded by adding the ‘-N’ that she noticed in the text but that was not signed by Christel. Christel nodded her head in agreement. She then signed ‘L-O-P-P-A-N’, held the ‘N’ on her right hand, pointed to it with her left index finger, and looked directly at it, raising her eyebrows for emphasis. “It’s the definite form,” she signed. She then turned her shoulders slightly to the left and fingerspelled, “E-N L-O-P-P-A,” the indefinite form of ‘flea’. Following her fingerspelling of ‘en loppa’, Christel performed a quick head nod and turned her shoulders slightly to the right. In sign language, this head nod and shoulder shift are both non-manual markers with semantic significance: The head nod, in this case, indicated an emphatic break, and the shoulder shift indicated a shift in topic or focus. With her shoulders angled slightly to the right, Christel signed, “L-O-P-P-A-N. It’s the definite form. L-O-P-P-A-N means this one (pointing to the picture of the flea in the book). The definite form. This one.”

In her stimulated recall interview, Christel explained that it was important to fingerspell ‘loppa’ in both its definite and indefinite forms because there is no distinction between the two forms in Teckenspråk. “I have to tell them, ‘loppan,’” because in sign language we don’t have ‘loppan’. We just have ‘loppa’ on the mouth. That’s why I told them it also is ‘loppan’ in the definite form. And also, when we sign ‘loppan’, we don’t have the ‘-n’ on the mouth, just ‘loppa’, so that they will know that ‘-n’ will show up in the text. [...] And then they would remember what I told them about loppan. It’s the definite form” (SRI 2:3).

Similarly, when Christel wanted to remind her students about the difference in form between present tense and past tense verbs, she did so clearly and concisely, fingerspelling the different
forms as necessary for clarity. When the class encountered the verb ‘gick’ (‘went’) in a shared reading text, Christel asked what word they would use if it were happening ‘nu’ (now), the ‘nutid verb’ (present tense verb). Ross responded, ‘går’ (go). Christel responded, “Right. G-Å-R (go). I G-Å-R (go).” She then pointed to the word ‘gick’ (went) in the text and repeated. “This is in the past. G-I-C-K.”

Shortly following this interaction, Betty translated into Teckenspråk the entire sentence in which ‘gick’ occurred: ‘Loppan gick nedför vägen och sjöng’ (The flea walked down the path and sang). When she had finished, Christel explained: “Exactly. In the past. They are D-Å-T-I-D (past tense) verbs. D-Å (then). Not now. D-Å (then).” She then pointed to the word ‘sjöng’ (sang) in the text. Joana volunteered to respond and began translating the next sentence, but Christel quickly refocused her attention on the verb, pointing again to the word ‘sjöng’ (sang) in the text:

Christel: The question is, S-J-Ö-N-G. What’s the present form?
Joana: Sing. D-Å (then).
Christel: What’s the N-U-T-I-D (present tense) form?

As with the lesson on the definite and indefinite forms of ‘flea’, it was critically important here that Christel fingerspell the verb ‘sing’ in both its present tense and past tense forms—and insist that her students do the same—in order to make clear the difference between the two forms. In Teckenspråk, ‘sing’ is an uninflected verb; the context alone provides information about tense.

In a separate lesson, Christel wanted to explain the use of the plural pronoun ‘de’ (they) to refer to two previously named people in the text. Christel addressed the whole class: “I am going to ask you, who is ‘de’?” She then pointed to the word in context: “The pronoun—P-R-O-N-O-M-E-N—the pronoun refers to what?” Then, Christel asked Maddi, who was standing at the board with her, “Who is ‘de’?” Christel pointed at the word ‘de’ on the board, once again, and
repeated, “‘De’, who is it?” Maddi responded, “Both,” and then correctly identified the names ‘Pelle’ and ‘Maja’ in the previous sentence. “Yes,” Christel replied. “Pelle and Maja. With more than one person, you use ‘de’. Yes.”

In addition, I previously referred to an episode in which Joana asked Christel how she should spell the Swedish word ‘berätta’ (to tell), and Christel responded with a mini-lesson on the future (ska berätta), present (berättar) and past (berättade) forms of the verb, as they would be used in the context of a piece of writing. The lesson was clear and to the point. Christel wrote the following sentences on the board:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Jag berättar om en grön katt.} & \quad \text{(I am talking about a green cat.)} \\
\text{Jag ska berätta om en grön katt.} & \quad \text{(I will be talking about a green cat.)} \\
\text{Jag berättade om en grön katt igår.} & \quad \text{(I talked about a green cat yesterday.)}
\end{align*}
\]

She translated each sentence into Teckenspråk for Joana, making clear the differences in time-frame by adding emphasis to the words in each sentence that indicated time. She signed the present tense sentence, ‘I am talking about a green cat,’ without added emphasis. When she signed the future version of this sentence, however, she engaged her whole upper body while signing the word ‘ska’ (will), and held the sign a moment, in order to emphasize that the verb was in the future. Christel similarly emphasized the word ‘igår’ (yesterday) when she signed the past tense sentence. It was particularly important for Christel to emphasize these ‘time’ words because the verb itself, ‘berätta’ (to tell), does not get inflected in Teckenspråk. After translating the three sentences—present, future, and past—on the board, Christel proceeded to explain to Joana how to use the different tenses in her text. “You choose which tense you want to use. ‘Ska’ (will) can be used in your first sentence. Like, ‘I’m going to tell you about how people keep themselves warm.’ Period. Ska (will). Then, after that, you discuss the topic using the present
tense form. The present tense. You have to remember to use the correct ending: -ar, -er, -er; -de is past.”

Christel’s explanations regarding student error were also clear. Three such explanations are detailed in the section above on Christel’s approach to error correction. The first of these explanations occurred when Joana incorrectly used the pronoun ‘de’ (they) in the sentence, ‘Jag ska berätta om hur man håller de sig varma.’ This is an ungrammatical sentence, which translates into English as, ‘I am going to explain how people keep they themselves warm.” In her correction, Christel labeled Joana’s unnecessary use of the pronoun ‘de’ (they) in the sentence as “extra,” since the reflexive pronoun ‘sig’ (themselves) included the meaning of ‘they’ within it. It was clear from Joana’s expression that the word “extra” resonated immediately with her, and she quickly made the correction.

In contrast, in the two instances where Christel used explanations to correct Yassin’s errors, Yassin did not understand. Christel’s explanations seemed clear and straightforward, but there appeared to be a disconnect between Christel’s method of explaining and Yassin’s ability to understand. Christel acknowledged feeling at a loss for how to explain things to Yassin in a way that would make sense for him. “I actually don’t know how his mind works,” she said, “how he understands” (SRI 2:38). Christel’s explanations to Yassin were uncharacteristically direct, lacking the inquiry orientation that she adopted in so much of her other teaching. Christel explained that she felt the need to explain things to Yassin “directly,” to explain “the facts” (SRI 2:37) so that he would not continue to make the same mistakes. Her explanations to Yassin thus stood out as very direct and matter-of-fact in comparison with her explanations to other students.

For example, when Yassin suggested a verb-noun word order for his sentence about ice cream melting, ‘smälter glass’ (melt ice cream), Christel directly told him that to make a “correct
Swedish sentence,” you write “first noun, then verb.” Although Christel’s explanation was clear, Yassin did not understand, as evidenced by his follow up question, “Is ice cream the noun?”

Christel also offered Yassin a direct explanation of the difference between two different forms of the Swedish verb ‘bli’ (to become): the infinitive (‘bli’) and the simple present (‘blir’). She told Yassin that the word should be written as ‘bli’, without an ‘-r’, when it is preceded by the word ‘kan’ (may). Despite Christel’s direct explanation, however, Yassin did not understand. He returned to his seat and erased the ‘-r’ from all instances of ‘blir’ on his page, including those in the simple present where ‘blir’ was the correct form of the verb. Christel acknowledged that Yassin seemed confused. When I asked her if she thought he understood her explanation of the difference between ‘blir’ and ‘bli’, she responded this way: “I’m not so sure, actually. … If I compare with other students, I think they could understand this difference, or the meaning of it. But, I’m not so sure that actually he understands it. Without the ‘kan’, it will be ‘blir’ with an ‘-r’. I don’t know if he understands that” (SRI 2:38).

Finally, there was a single episode in which Christel’s explanation was likely somewhat confusing for all her students. Unfortunately, we ran out of time in the stimulated recall interview to discuss the episode, so I don’t have Christel’s commentary on it. It appeared, however, that she was introducing the concept of the passive voice. The context of the episode was that the students were going to be reading a new text entitled ‘Hur Landskapet Förändras’ (‘How the Landscape gets Transformed’). Christel called the students’ attention to the word ‘förändras’ (‘gets transformed’, the passive voice) and then wrote the word ‘förändrar’ (‘transform’, in the simple present) on the board. She pointed out that they were the same word, except for the final letter, and then explained the difference this way: “‘Förändrar’ means now.
It is transforming. It is in the process of transforming. Now. OK. But, ‘förändras’: What? How?
The landscape. It’s passive. Who? Who transformed it? It doesn’t say. OK? It doesn’t say who.”

Christel’s students did not make any overt signals that they understood the concept of the passive voice, and she did not do any kind of comprehension check. Instead, she opened the book and began reading. She did not mention the passive again during that lesson. It is possible that Christel only brought her students’ attention to the passive construction because the Kiwi (Körling, 2006) curriculum suggested she should and/or that she quickly realized her explanation would be insufficient and decided to tackle the construction at another time. Whatever the reason, Christel’s explanation of the passive stood out as unclear in comparison with her other explanations.

Knowledge of Learners

In this section, the evidence relevant to Christel’s knowledge of her students as learners is presented. The section is divided into the following five subsections: input enhancement strategies, selection of content, use of metalanguage, comprehension checks, and awareness of sociocultural issues.

Input enhancement strategies.

I observed Christel using four different strategies for enhancing grammar input for her students: 1) bringing students who were signing to the front of the room so that everyone could see them, 2) writing on the board, 3) fingerspelling, and 4) adding emphasis, often with non-manual markers, to signs she produced.

First, Christel insisted that students come to the front of the room whenever they made a contribution in class so that all the other students would notice them and have full access to their language output. In fact, while reviewing the tapes during her stimulated recall interview,
Christel expressed confusion and disappointment when she noticed that one student, Collin, was staying seated while signing. The other students could see him, but he was the only student not coming to the front of the room. I reminded Christel that his parent permission slip had not yet been signed so he was not allowed to appear on camera. “What a pity,” she replied.

Second, Christel used the board extensively to enhance the Swedish language input she made available for the students. She used either the Smart board or the white board in nearly every grammar lesson I observed, even when she was making corrections to individual students’ writing. Recall that Christel is deaf and does not use spoken Swedish at all with her students. Christel explained her extensive use of the board in her stimulated recall interview. “When I’m signing,” she said, “I would like them to see me signing and also, at the same time, see the text, so it will be double-visual. To see me, see the signing, and also because Swedish is the second language for deaf students. That’s why I need two visual things. So, how to explain: “This is how it looks in sign, and this is how it looks in text, Swedish text.” So I’m working with two languages, that are both visual at the same time” (SRI 2:32).

When the primary focus of the lesson was reading comprehension, however, Christel’s teaching style didn’t lend itself as well to using the board. During these lessons, she would invite the students to gather close around her. They knew the routine well. They would pull their chairs out from behind their desks, bring them to the front of the room, and arrange them in a small, intimate semi-circle around Christel, who sat with on her own chair with the book in her hands. During these lessons, Christel did not disrupt the intimate reading circle she had created to stand up and go to the board. Instead, she utilized two other methods of input enhancement: fingerspelling and adding emphasis to significant signs that she produced.
Christel’s demonstration of the definite and indefinite forms of the word ‘flea’ is a good example of Christel’s fingerspelling and adding emphasis in order to enhance grammar input. She first fingerspelled the indefinite form ‘L-O-P-A’. Then, when she signed the definite form, ‘L-O-P-A-N’, she produced the final ‘N’ more emphatically than the other letters and raised her eyebrows, looking directly at it, as she produced it. She also held the ‘N’ on her right hand, while pointing to it with her left index finger. “That’s the definite form,” she explained.

Similarly, when Christel was calling students’ attention to the difference between the present and past tense forms of the Swedish verb ‘gå’ (to go), she repeatedly fingerspelled both the past tense form (‘gick’) and the present tense form (‘går’) to focus students’ attention on the difference.

“G-I-C-K, G-I-C-K. That’s the past tense,” she said. Christel dramatically swept her right hand back over her right shoulder—producing the Teckenspråk sign for ‘past’—four times each time she signed the word ‘gick’ (went) in order to emphasize that the action had occurred in the past. Then, she asked, “What’s the present tense?” When Ross fingerspelled, “G-Å-R,” Christel repeated, “Right! G-Å-R. Jag G-Å-R.” She held the final ‘-R’ and paused to look directly at it for a moment, to emphasize that the ending of ‘går’ (go) differed from the ending of ‘gick’ (went).

“That’s the present tense,” she added. unofficial “G-I-C-K is the past tense.”

Recall that nouns in Teckenspråk are not inflected to show whether they are definite or indefinite, and verbs are not inflected to show whether they occur in the present or the past. Instead, both distinctions are made elsewhere in the sentence: Deictic signs are used to indicate definite nouns, and adverbs of time are used to indicate tense. So, it was critical that Christel use fingerspelling—or some other input enhancement strategy involving the printed form of Swedish—in order to call the students’ attention to how tense and definite articles are handled in Swedish.
Selection of content.

The evidence suggests that Christel carefully selected grammar content that she felt was at an appropriate level for her students and that would help them improve as readers and writers. She explained: “When it comes to the grammar, I don’t have so much focus on grammar in first or second grade. They just have a little bit, a little input about grammar, starting to awaken their awareness about grammar. But I don’t give them too much grammar in the beginning, when they’re so small. Because it’s too tough, and it’s too much. I need to focus on their curiosity more than to just put in so many facts in the beginning” (POI 6:40).

With her third grade class, Christel selected grammar content that she believed would help them to read age-appropriate content. She explained, for example, that she decided to focus their attention on the different meanings of the word ‘hålla’ (to hold) when it is followed by different particles because she knew it would be appearing often in their reading.

I’m thinking the Swedish word ‘håller’ (hold). It has different meanings, actually, depending on where you put it. And it demands some repetition, how to give them awareness about the word: ‘håller om’ (embrace) or ‘håller sig’, ‘keeping them warm’ or ‘håller om någon’ (embracing someone). It’s the same with ‘går’, ‘went’, or ‘walk’. The ‘klockan går’, ‘the clock is ticking’, ‘or you’re ‘walking’, ‘går’. ‘Går inte’, ‘not working’, ‘impossible’. […] I am trying to tell them about the word ‘håller’. It has so many meanings depending on where you put it. And sometimes it’s a little bit over the line. Sometimes it’s too much, so it would just confuse them. So, I try to keep—. I know, I know it’s sometimes too much, but I don’t actually care. So, I keep telling them again and again because I know that this word is actually going to appear several times. (SRI 2:19)

Christel also selected grammar content for which she felt it was reasonable to hold her students accountable in their writing. They were currently working, for example, on the differences between the present and past tense forms of verbs in their writing—like ‘går/gick’ (go/went) and ‘sjunger/sjöng’ (sing/sang)—so Christel focused on these forms in their reading. Similarly, Christel chose to teach pronouns because she felt it was an area where students could
be expected to improve in their writing. “In the second grade,” she explained, “they always repeat names: Maja, Pelle, Maja, Pelle, Maja, Pelle, Maja, Pelle. I would like them to understand, “OK, we have to change this one to a pronoun instead, so it will be much easier to read and more fun to write, more fun for other people to read.” Because otherwise it will be too much nagging about the same names all the time, repeating themselves all the time. So we have to have pronouns instead” (SRI 2:28).

Christel’s decision to teach Joana a mini-lesson on the different forms of the verb ‘berätta’ (to tell) was also motivated by what Christel saw as age-appropriate expectations for her students’ writing. When asked why she chose to focus on this grammar point with Joana, Christel explained that she saw the use of tense in their writing as an area where her students need more instruction. “I would like them to write well, a good text, a correct text, not confusing different tenses: present, past. I would like them to use good structure: how to begin a story, to begin with what? So I would like to make them aware about how to start a story. I think, quite often, they’re confused, they’re mixing in the text. They don’t understand: “Has it happened already? Or is it going to happen? Or?” So I would like them to be aware of the differences between these times” (SRI 2:31).

Beyond choosing grammar content appropriate to the level of her class, Christel also thoughtfully selected content at the level of the individual. I frequently saw students working independently in workbooks, for example, most often when they had finished a writing assignment in class. I also noticed that students sometimes brought these books home for homework and that Christel corrected these assignments and kept a detailed log of the pages each student had completed. The workbooks included reading comprehension, vocabulary, and grammar activities—often specifically linked to texts the students were reading together in
class—but, I never saw Christel teach a lesson from these books. When I asked her how she used them, she explained that they were a means for her to differentiate instruction. “Maybe I see something very special with the student,” she said. “It’s very individual, depending on what they need. So, maybe I see that this student needs a special explanation about this word or this area, so I can give them that to work with it by themselves. So, I don’t have to teach all the time. So I can spend my time on teaching Swedish. [...] So I give these special assignments depending on the individual” (SRI 2:33).

**Use of metalanguage.**

Christel used metalanguage, and chose not to use it, with intention. When asked how she made decisions about when to use metalanguage, she said this: “I don’t want to give them too many grammar words in the beginning. I would like to wait, just give them small pieces, and build up. It’s more important that they understand, are aware, about how the language works. So, it won’t be too heavy for them to learn how the grammar is working and also to understand all the words. We have to take care of the Swedish, see that Swedish actually is a *fun* language. Or language in general: English or Swedish or reading and writing. It should be fun. It shouldn’t be too much struggling” (SRI 2:29).

Referencing her teacher education program, Christel explained that some metalinguistic words might be harder for her students to understand than others. “‘Imperfect’ and ‘verb’ and ‘present’,” she said, “it could be too much for small children.” So, instead of using the formal Swedish word for the present (‘*presens*’), Christel would use ‘*nu*’ (now) or ‘*nutid*’ (present time). “Sometimes I say ‘*presens*’,” she clarified. “Sometimes, sometimes, I throw them the word ‘*presens*’ so they will have to understand: ‘OK, now that word showed up again. What does it mean?’” (SRI 2:29). Similarly, instead of fingerspelling the word for ‘pronoun’ (‘*pronomen*’), as
the word has no sign in Teckenspråk, Christel would often use a productive, or unofficial, sign to refer to this concept, a sign which involved the right index finger pointing backward over the left index finger. She pointed out that some metalinguistic terms, however—such as ‘noun’, ‘verb’, and ‘adjective’—are easier for her students, so she introduces them early. But others would come “in time”: “In time, they will understand the words ‘pronoun’ or the grammar words ‘nutid’ (present time) or ‘presens’ (present), so I have to build it slowly, to make it more interesting. They should be more interested in analyzing the text, the style, how the text is working. To understand the text and not to focus so much on the grammar words” (SRI 2:29).

I observed Christel using metalanguage to discuss nouns (substantiv), verbs (verb), present and past tense (nutid and dåtid, respectively), passive voice (passiv form), pronouns (pronomen), and the definite form of nouns (bestämt form). I did not see her use metalanguage to refer to the related topics of future time or the indefinite form, although she discussed both topics. Christel also instructed students on the use of modals (e.g., kan bli = may become), prepositions (e.g., ut ur = out from), and particles (e.g., håller om = embrace) without using metalanguage to discuss them.

Interestingly, I observed two interactions between Christel and Joana, a student she had identified as a struggling writer, in which Christel did not use metalanguage that she typically used with the whole class. One of these times was when Joana had misused the Swedish pronoun ‘de’ (they) in a sentence. In Christel’s explanation of Joana’s error, she did not use the word ‘pronoun’. Instead, she said only that the ‘de’ was “extra.” Also, when Christel taught Joana a spontaneous mini-lesson on the different forms of the verb ‘berätta’ (to tell), she used metalanguage only to refer to the present tense (nutid), and she used that word only once, most often using the word ‘nu’ (now), instead. When she referred to the past tense of the verb, she
used a Teckenspråk sign meaning “done already.” When she referred to the future, Christel used a Teckenspråk sign meaning “not yet.” Given that Christel saw Joana as a student struggling with written Swedish, Christel’s limited use of metalanguage with her makes sense. According to Christel’s stated point of view on metalanguage, using fewer “grammar words” with Joana would allow her to focus all her cognitive energy on understanding “how the text was working.”

Comprehension checks.

Christel expressed a sincere interest in her students’ comprehension of her instruction. At the close of her stimulated recall interview, when I asked Christel if there was anything she wanted to add, she said only that she found it very interesting to watch her students, “their perceptions, how they are actually understanding.” She added: “It’s very very interesting. Very good to know” (SRI 2:43).

I observed Christel using four methods for checking her students’ comprehension. First, she continually scanned their facial expressions and body language. Second, she regularly checked drafts of her students’ writing to see if they had incorporated grammar elements that she had focused on in class. Third, she often asked students to translate Swedish sentences into Teckenspråk so that she could see if they were understanding the meaning of Swedish grammatical constructions. Finally, she asked the students questions.

First, Christel watched her students closely for signs of comprehension. For example, when Christel was explaining to Joana that she had used an extra ‘de’ (they) in her writing, she clearly noticed how Joana’s face lit up in recognition at Christel’s use of the word “extra.” Also, Christel was keenly aware of Yassin’s failure to understand the meaning of ‘hålla en bok’ (hold a book), and continued trying to explain it in different ways until she finally allowed another student to provide a direct translation.
Second, Christel regularly asked her students to produce written texts—either short answers to specific questions or longer pieces—and her students were in the habit of coming to her for one-on-one feedback every time they finished a draft. In this way, Christel was able to continually assess her students’ use of the Swedish grammar that she had been teaching in class. Because these mini writing conferences were done on an individual level, Christel was also able to cater her expectations and her explanations to the abilities of each student. Examples of these kinds of conferences include Christel’s work with Joana on conjugating the Swedish verb ‘berätta’ (to tell) and the use of the pronoun ‘de’ (they), and her work with Yassin on conjugating the Swedish verb ‘bli’ (to become) and on the noun-verb word order of the sentence ‘glass smälter’ (ice cream melts). In another example, Ross needed help with the definite article and capital letters.

Third, Christel often asked her students to translate Swedish sentences into Teckenspråk so that they could demonstrate their understanding of Swedish grammatical constructions. One example of this was when she asked the students to translate to Teckenspråk Swedish sentences containing the word ‘hålla’ (to hold) with different particles: ‘hålla om’ (to embrace), ‘hålla sig’ (to keep oneself), ‘hålla med’ (to agree with). Asking the students to translate the sentences into Teckenspråk was an effective means of checking comprehension for Christel because, although the verbs look very similar in written Swedish, their translations are quite different in Teckenspråk.

The final method Christel used to check her students’ comprehension was to ask questions. For example, in her lesson on the appropriate boundaries of sentences, Christel had created a text with no periods in it and was asking students to place the periods and to explain their decisions. By insisting that students defend their choices, Christel was inviting them to reveal their
understanding of the content. In one instance, Betty explained that the pronoun ‘de’ (they) didn’t “feel good” coming right after ‘Pelle och Maja’ (Pelle and Maja) in the text. After viewing Betty’s explanation in the stimulated recall interview, Christel commented: “‘De’, it’s the pronoun, it’s instead of. Substitute. So that means that she understands that ‘de’ is actually heading to ‘Maja and Pelle’. She understands it” (SRI 2:27).

Christel also used questions to check students’ comprehension of the difference between the present and past tense forms of verbs. During the time that I was observing her, she was working on helping students to choose the appropriate tense of verbs in their writing. In order to reinforce the difference between present and past tense forms, Christel decided to call students’ attention to verb forms in their reading. When a student came upon a verb during a shared reading, for example, she would ask the student: “What time is that verb happening?” If the verb was in the past, she would follow up with this question: “What’s the present form of that verb?” Christel explained that she had a very specific goal in mind in asking these questions. “This is not normal for me to do this,” she said. “During this period, we have been talking about present and past tense. And when they’re writing, it’s important to choose the right form. Is it presens (present) or dätid (past tense)” (SRI 2:4).

**Awareness of sociocultural issues.**

Christel’s awareness of the sociocultural issues surrounding deafness and sign language was evidenced in three ways: 1) through her insistence that her students use proper Teckenspråk; 2) through her concern for the preservation of sign language in the face of increasing cochlear implantation; and 3) through the attention she paid to her students’ identities as deaf and hard of hearing people.
First, fluent use of sign language has traditionally been considered a prerequisite for membership in Deaf culture, and signed versions of the spoken language are frowned upon in the Deaf community. Christel felt acutely responsible for her role in the dissemination of proper Teckenspråk due to her native speaker skills and her specialized training. She explained that her “main purpose” at Nilskolan was to teach the students proper Teckenspråk. When the national Swedish curriculum changed in 1983 to include Teckenspråk instruction as a requirement at all schools for the deaf, Christel was hired to be responsible for that new curriculum and has remained deeply involved in the school’s approach to the teaching of Teckenspråk. “I feel that there are too few teachers in Nilskolan who know about sign language as a language,” she explained:

The ones who are working, I know that some of them have studied sign language at the University, but they don’t have the pedagogical abilities, they don’t know pedagogy, how to teach and how to explain. I think there’s a big lack when it comes to knowledge about sign language. But, there are a few actually in all of Sweden, when it comes to this area—about sign language, how to teach. And I will retire in a few years, maybe four or five years, so I’m thinking about the next group after me. We’re very few that have my knowledge. And lots of the teachers, when they’ve gone to teacher training, they’re hearing, and they’re being trained together with hearing students also. We need more teachers who are focused on Swedish as a second language. (SRI 6:43)

Furthermore, Christel expressed a concern for the survival of Teckenspråk as it currently exists. “The cochlear implants are increasing,” she explained, “and if we don’t use the right sign language, take the chance to teach them about correct sign language—maybe when they go to Nilskolan in the first grade, they’ve been to another day care or something, another school before, they don’t have good sign language—and I would like to take care of sign language, the proper care, so we don’t destroy sign language, the form of sign language” (SRI 2:9). In keeping with this view, Christel expressed a particular interest in her hard of hearing students using correct Teckenspråk. In one episode, Maddi produced an accurate Teckenspråk translation of a
Animals don’t have clothing. How do they keep themselves warm? Some animals have fur to keep themselves warm.” When Maddi completed the translation, Christel responded by explicitly pointing out that Maddi had not followed the Swedish word order. “Right!” she said. “You didn’t sign ‘/ANIMALS DON’T HAVE CLOTHES‘. You signed, ‘/ANIMALS CLOTHES HAVE-NOT/’. Perfect translation to Teckenspråk. Perfect!” (38:1). When I asked Christel about her thoughts on this episode, she said, “I’m very glad that she understands because she’s hard of hearing. And she’s not signing fully. But she’s aware, very much aware, about language and how to translate it to sign language” (SRI 2:18).

Finally, as I describe above in the section on Christel’s ‘model’ teacher characteristics, Christel made it an instructional priority to address her students’ identities as deaf and hard of hearing people. I observed her, for example, calling her students’ attention to the fact that they were multilingual because they already knew Swedish and Teckenspråk and would soon be learning English and American Sign Language (ASL). In another lesson, she discussed the importance of the students making their language accessible to everyone at Nilskolan—hearing or deaf—and she pointed out that they had an advantage over hearing people because they could communicate in noisy environments while hearing people could not.

Summary

Christel demonstrated at least some evidence of all nine of the descriptors of model teachers (see Table 6) outlined in Nilskolan’s “Pedagogical Guidelines” document (see Appendix A). Her attention to learning Swedish through print (Sw) and literacy (Li) were in strong evidence in both her reading and writing lessons. Her reading lesson was also rich in evidence of attention to Swedish vocabulary (VS) and expressive Teckenspråk (ET), while her writing lesson was rich in
evidence of attention to expressive Swedish (ES) and differentiated instruction (DI). Christel’s attention to her students’ identity as deaf and hard of hearing people (Id) was evidenced primarily in the field notes. Christel paid little attention, overall, to Teckenspråk vocabulary (VT) and to issues regarding speech and hearing (SH). That Christel devoted little instructional time to speech and hearing (SH) is not surprising given that she is a profoundly deaf woman who communicates with her students exclusively in sign language. I can only speculate that her lack of attention to Teckenspråk vocabulary (VT) was due to her perception that her students already had strong Teckenspråk vocabularies and/or that her approach to Teckenspråk vocabulary instruction was more communicative, and less explicit, than her approach to Swedish vocabulary instruction.

Turning, now, to Christel’s grammatical Teacher Language Awareness (TLA), Christel had strong ‘Beliefs and Feelings about Language and Language Teaching.’ Christel’s feelings about grammar were very positive. She was also generally confident in her knowledge of Swedish and Teckenspråk and in her ability to teach them. She felt less confident, however, in her ability to fully address the needs of students who struggled as language learners, as well as those who could access Swedish as a spoken language. Her perceptions of her students’ feelings about grammar were positive, as well, though she felt too heavy a grammar focus was inappropriate in the third grade as it might not be interesting for students. Christel saw three roles for grammar instruction: aiding students’ reading comprehension, improving students’ writing skills, and improving students’ expressive signed communication. Christel saw these three goals as being interdependent; she believed that the most effective way to help her students make sense of Swedish as a written language was to show them the ways in which grammatical constructions were used differently to convey meaning in Swedish and Teckenspråk. Christel perceived
Nilskolan’s curriculum and her students’ parents to be stakeholders with an influence on her work.

An independent rater testified to Christel’s native-like ‘Language Proficiency’ in both Swedish and Teckenspråk. Christel also believed herself to be proficient in both languages. She reported that she was an accurate and effective user of both Swedish and Teckenspråk. Though, as a Deaf woman, she acknowledged that she was not a native speaker of Swedish and that she did not know it as a ‘spoken’ language. There was also some evidence that she made use of the non-native speaker advantage in selecting grammar content that she believed would help her students avoid confusion in their reading of the Swedish language.

Christel demonstrated a high level of ‘Explicit Language Knowledge.’ She used an inquiry oriented engagement style the majority of the time, but tended toward a more goal oriented style when working with students who struggled as language learners. She used error correction sparingly because she did not want to discourage students, but she did think that direct correction was necessary at times, particularly with struggling language learners. With few exceptions, she offered students language input at their level and provided clear explanations of grammar points.

Finally, Christel demonstrated a deep ‘Knowledge of Learners.’ She effectively used four input enhancement strategies: asking students to sign at the front of the room, writing on the board, fingerspelling, and adding emphasis to significant signs. Christel selected content at her students’ level with the aim of improving their literacy. She also made thoughtful decisions about when to use metalanguage based on the developmental levels of her students. She had three methods for checking comprehension: checking drafts of her students’ written work, asking students to translate Swedish to Teckenspråk, and posing questions to her students. Christel demonstrated sociocultural awareness through her insistence on her students’ use of “correct”
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‘Model’ Teacher Characteristics

A numerical summary of Helena’s model teacher characteristics is presented in Table 11. The numbers in Table 11 were derived from my coding of a 20-minute reading lesson, a 10-minute writing lesson, and my field notes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>VS</th>
<th>VT</th>
<th>ES</th>
<th>ET</th>
<th>Sw</th>
<th>Li</th>
<th>SH</th>
<th>DI</th>
<th>Id</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading Lesson</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing Lesson</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Notes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. High frequency characteristics (N>15) are shaded gray. VS = Swedish vocabulary; VT = Teckenspråk vocabulary; ES = expressive Swedish; ET = expressive Teckenspråk; Sw = learning Swedish through print; Li = Literacy; SH = speech and hearing; DI = differentiated instruction; and Id = identity.

The coding matrix I used to analyze Helena’s model teacher characteristics is included as Appendix T. In the matrix, an ‘x’ indicates that evidence of the ‘model teacher characteristic’ heading that column is present in the lesson or field notes. The numbers in the bottom row indicate the total number of occurrences of each characteristic. For example, within Helena’s reading lesson, there were 32 examples of her addressing Swedish vocabulary (VS) and only 8 examples of her addressing Teckenspråk vocabulary (VT).

As is clear in Table 11, I saw evidence of all nine descriptors of model teachers at Nilskolan (see Table 6) in Helena’s teaching, though—as was the case with Christel—attention to Teckenspråk vocabulary (VT) and speech and hearing (SH) occurred much less frequently than
the others. The distribution of the characteristics across data sources is also similar to what I found in the analysis of Christel’s teaching. In the paragraphs that follow, I will first address the breakdown of the evidence across the three data sources: the reading lesson, the writing lesson, and my field notes. Second, I will discuss the low frequency characteristics: Teckenspråk vocabulary (VT) and speech and hearing (SH).

Beginning with the top row of Table 11, Helena’s reading lesson, it is clear that Helena focused primarily on four of the descriptors of model teachers at Nilskolan, the same four that Christel focused on in her reading lesson: Swedish vocabulary (VS), expressive Teckenspråk (ET), learning Swedish through print (Sw), and Literacy (Li). Given that the focus of her lesson was on reading a Swedish text, these results are not surprising. Throughout the lesson, Helena regularly called her students’ attention to elements of printed Swedish (Sw) that she thought might be challenging for them (e.g., the copula, the indefinite article, the first person singular pronoun, and a prefix meaning ‘dis-’), including potentially difficult Swedish vocabulary (VS) (e.g., text, illustrations, author, happy, busy, clever).

At the same time that she focused on these elements of Swedish text, Helena called her students’ attention to the expression of those elements in Teckenspråk (ET). For example, she explained to her students that they should sign the first person pronoun, ‘jag’, by pointing to themselves, even though the pronoun actually referred to the dog. She added that they could also use a phrase-final ‘jag’, with an associated head-nod, for emphasis. Helena explained to her students that they should not sign the copula in Teckenspråk, even though it appeared in the Swedish text. Finally, Helena emphasized the importance of keeping your face and hands visible to other people when you are signing. When Tim had his back to the class, she turned his shoulders so that he was facing toward them. Similarly, when Olle came to the front of the room
with the hood of his sweatshirt pulled almost over his eyes, she gently moved it back, explaining that people would be able to understand him better if they could see his face.

During this reading lesson, Helena also focused a large portion of her instructional time on helping her students develop literacy skills (Li). For example, at the start of the book, she called students’ attention to the author, illustrator, and translator of the text they were reading. This practice, which Helena repeated with every new text, encouraged students to see a connection between reading and writing—to understand that they were reading something that someone else had written. She also pointed out the role of punctuation, explaining that an exclamation point meant someone was speaking loudly. Finally, she encouraged her students to play with letters because, as she explained, it helped them to see how much they already knew about Swedish print. Kendra, for example, came to the front of the room and picked out every letter of her name in a sentence they were reading. Helena joyfully accepted this contribution, excitedly explaining to the other students what Kendra had just done. Similarly, Olle spontaneously pointed out that if you took the ‘r’ away from the word ‘ren’ (clean), you ended up with ‘en’, which is both ‘one’ and the indefinite article in Swedish. Again, Helena welcomed his contribution.

Like her reading lesson, Helena’s writing lesson contained substantial evidence of her focus on learning Swedish through print (Sw) and literacy (Li). In fact, the nature of the writing lesson Helena designed led to significant overlap between these two characteristics. After modeling a short monologue on her own weekend’s activities, Helena asked the students to think about what they had done over the weekend and write about it. In this way, Helena was inviting her students to use Swedish print (Sw) as a means of communicating their own ideas in writing (Li). Most of the students seemed eager to put their own stories into words.
Furthermore, because writing is a means of expressing Swedish, the evidence of Helena’s attention to expressive Swedish (ES) overlapped significantly with her attention to learning Swedish through print (Sw) and literacy (Li). Essentially, when she asked students to focus on elements of Swedish print (Sw) (e.g., adverbs of time), she also asked them to produce those elements (ES); likewise, when she focused on conventions in written text (Li) (e.g., spelling), she also asked students to write using those conventions (ES). In addition, Helena pushed one student to express himself more completely. Specifically, when she asked Dennis what he had done over the weekend, he replied, “Nothing.” She asked him for more details, and he replied, “/I SKARHOLMEN/,” meaning he had spent time in a suburb of the city. Helena pressed again, and Dennis responded, “/EAT DINNER/.” At this point, Helena had something to work with in helping Dennis to compose a Swedish text.

One-on-one interactions, like that between Helena and Dennis described in the previous paragraph, were typical during Helena’s writing lessons, as they were in Christel’s. Thus, this writing lesson was rich in evidence of differentiated instruction (DI). In the 10 minutes of tape that I analyzed, Helena worked individually with seven students. These were short teacher-student interactions, but they allowed Helena the opportunity to help each student on an individual level. Because Helena’s students were quite young (6-7 years old), and because many of them were learning Swedish as a second language, they needed help primarily with vocabulary and spelling. For this reason, Helena’s writing lesson, unlike Christel’s, was rich in evidence of attention to Swedish vocabulary (VS) (e.g., yesterday, at-home (hemma), weekend, went).

The last data source I used to assess the extent to which Helena displayed characteristics appropriate to a model teacher at Nilskolan were the field notes that I kept throughout data
collection and analysis. Noticing, as I had with Christel, that I had seen very little evidence of three model teacher characteristics in the reading and writing lessons—Teckenspråk vocabulary (VT), speech and hearing (SH), and identity (Id)—I reviewed my field notes for evidence of these characteristics. I was able to locate easily teaching episodes that reflected Helena’s attention to students’ identities as deaf and hard of hearing people (Id). I was also able to find good evidence for her attention to students’ speech and hearing (SH), though the total number of instances I observed remained small (N=4). There was not much research evidence, however, to support a focus on Teckenspråk vocabulary (VT). I will discuss, in turn, the evidence on Helena’s approach to the following three characteristics: students’ identity (Id), speech and hearing (SH) and Teckenspråk vocabulary (VT).

My field notes revealed two different teaching episodes in which Helena took up students’ identity as deaf and hard of hearing people (Id) as an area of focus. The first episode was related to the positive aspects of the students being multilingual, and the second was related to a class project in which students were creating their own alphabet books based on the handshapes in the Teckenspråk alphabet.

The first episode in which Helena focused on students’ identity (Id) began with Helena pointing out the name of a book’s translator during a guided reading. Helena followed up by showing her students that the book was published in New Zealand. “Do they speak Swedish in New Zealand?” she asked. “What language do they speak?” After coming to the conclusion that English is spoken in New Zealand, Helena explained that a “clever” person had to translate the book from English into Swedish so that the students in Sweden could enjoy it. “You are also clever!” Helena then told the students. “Just like the translator of this book. Because you read Swedish and are able to translate it to Teckenspråk!” Helena’s students got very excited about
this idea. Hera affirmed that she knew how to read Swedish. Helena asked her, “And then can you sign it in Teckenspråk? Then you are translating!” Angela joined in, as well: “I also know how to read Swedish and translate it to Teckenspråk. I CAN!” Helena concluded by reminding the students that they would all get to start learning English, as well, in the fourth grade. “Woo-eeel,” she signed. “Impressive!”

In the second episode, Helena addressed students’ identities (Id) more implicitly. She designed a creative project in which each student was constructing their own alphabet book with a picture corresponding to each letter. However, these alphabet books were different from those that hearing people typically create in which the object associated with each letter has a name that begins with that letter’s sound (e.g., ‘A’ is for apple; ‘B’ is for banana). In the alphabet books Helena’s students were creating, each letter was, instead, associated with an object whose sign incorporated that letter’s handshape. For example, one student wrote that ‘A’ was for ‘puss’ (kiss) because the Teckenspråk sign for ‘kiss’ involves two ‘A’ handshapes—which look like closed duck bills—coming together briefly and then separating again. By encouraging her students to think about the relationship between Teckenspråk letter handshapes and Teckenspråk signs as analogous to that between Swedish letters and Swedish words, Helena was implicitly telling them that Teckenspråk and Swedish share equal status as languages.

Turning to the evidence that Helena addressed students’ speech and hearing (SH), the four examples that I observed all involved Helena speaking—rather than signing—with a student when she knew that the student would be able to hear and understand her. I saw Helena do this with three different students: Hera, Van, and Elvin. Three of the examples, two with Hera and one with Van, were during reading conferences, and both students spoke Swedish back to Helena, opting not to sign. In the other example, Helena was explaining a procedure to Elvin,
who was hearing but had recently lost the ability to speak due to a tracheotomy. Elvin was only just beginning to learn Teckenspråk and often had a Swedish interpreter sitting next to him to help him follow Helena’s lessons. Thus, by speaking directly with him, she was making use of his first, more comfortable, language to ensure that he understood. Importantly, Helena always used speech to the exclusion of sign, and vice versa, thus modeling for her students that Teckenspråk and Swedish were different languages. Furthermore, she only used her voice during one-on-one interactions and never when doing so would exclude other students.

Finally, like Christel, Helena focused relatively little of her instructional time on Teckenspråk vocabulary (VT). In all three data sources combined, I only saw 11 examples of Helena focusing on Teckenspråk vocabulary. Perhaps Helena did not perceive Teckenspråk vocabulary as an area of great need for her students, as nearly half of them—five of the 11—came from homes with deaf of hard of hearing parents. Or, perhaps Helena’s approach to Teckenspråk vocabulary instruction was simply less explicit than her approach to Swedish vocabulary instruction because she was a constant model of Teckenspråk vocabulary and could introduce new signs in meaningful contexts. Again, I can only speculate as to why that is; because vocabulary instruction was not a research focus of this study, I do not have Helena’s thoughts on this issue.

**Beliefs and Feelings about Language and Language Teaching**

In this section, the evidence relevant to Helena’s beliefs and feelings about language and language teaching is presented. The section is divided into the following four subsections: feelings about grammar, perceptions of students’ feelings about grammar, understandings of the role of grammar instruction, and understandings of stakeholder expectations.
Feelings about grammar.

Andrews (2007) describes teachers’ feelings about grammar and grammar pedagogy as including both their interest in the subject and their confidence in their own knowledge of the subject and how to teach it. Previous research (Andrews & McNeill, 2005; Borg, 2005; Burns & Knox, 2005; Johnston & Goettsch, 2000) also indicates that teachers with a positive affect regarding grammar work toward self-improvement of their own knowledge of the subject. The evidence suggests that Helena was interested in grammar despite some very negative experiences learning grammar herself. Furthermore, although she lacked confidence in the depth of her own knowledge of the subject, she had a positive attitude toward reflection and self-improvement.

Helena’s experiences learning grammar as a child and young adult were quite negative. She enjoyed reading and writing at home with her mother and older brother, but she described the language learning she did in school as “boring” and unhelpful because there was too heavy a focus on grammar. “In my class,” she explained, “in my school, there were a lot of grammar lessons. You know, old-fashioned. You have to repeat, repeat, and repeat the same, the same, all the time” (POI 4:31). Helena had similarly negative experiences with grammar teaching later in life when she was studying French as a foreign language. She had had two different teachers, and she felt that she had learned more French from the one who focused more on communication than grammar.

The first teacher I had, she was very boring because she was very grammar, grammar, grammar. And I was (affects a yawn). I was so tired all the time. I don’t think I was speaking French very well then, but then I changed teachers. That teacher, she didn’t do much grammar. She was speaking, speaking. She was trying to figure out a subject. And we would try to speak some French, and then it was easier. And then you feel motivated. So, the second teacher, she was much better because then you feel a lot more motivated. So, that’s how I learned to speak some French. Communication instead of grammar, grammar, writing, writing. (POI 4:11)
Helena’s negative experiences learning grammar herself, however, did not lead her to the conclusion that she should not teach grammar. “I think you need to have both,” she argued, “but it needs to be a balance” (POI 4:11). Helena believed that grammar should be taught in the context of meaningful lessons. “We have grammar lessons,” she said, “but we have normal text, a normal book. But then, it was just grammar” (POI 4:31). The evidence suggests that Helena enjoyed the teaching of grammar when she felt she was successful at striking a balance between grammar and meaningful content. When I cued up a videotape of a lesson she taught on the Swedish possessive ‘-s’, for example, Helena smiled and leaned in closer. “Oh! I like this lesson,” she exclaimed.

In terms of confidence, Helena felt she knew Swedish and Teckenspråk well, but she felt less confident in her understanding of the grammar of the two languages. Helena openly discussed her lack of confidence in this area when I asked her about her weaknesses as a language teacher. “My weakest side,” she said, “sometimes I feel, if they ask me in grammar, ‘Why is it like that?’ It’s like, ‘OK, why?’ Because often you know it’s the right thing, but why? That’s a hard question, especially in the higher grade levels. You really have to know. So I was asking some other teachers, I said, ‘Why do you use this and not that?’ And they said, ‘We don’t know.’ I was like, ‘What?!’ (laughs) I think that’s my weakness, sometimes. I have to know more why is it in this way. And then I say to students, ‘Wait a minute! I’m gonna figure it out’” (POI 4:24).

Helena’s willingness to speak so candidly about her weakness in this area—with both me and her students—as well as her effort to seek out external resources to help her deepen her own knowledge, are both evidence of her positive attitudes toward reflection and self-improvement. “It’s good to look at yourself,” she said at one point during the stimulated recall interview, then laughing, “Maybe I’m not so smart” (SRI 5:40). Later, at the close of the interview, when I was
thanking Helena for the privilege of observing her class and talking with her about her teaching, she responded this way: “It’s very good for me, too. We should have more /FILM/, more often. We talk about that. We should take movies more often. And say, ‘Ah! What am I doing?’ I feel like, ‘Oh my gosh!’ But, I know, I’m a human. I’m human” (SRI 5:53).

Helena was particularly critical of two different lessons she taught on adjectives and verbs. After watching her lesson on adjectives, she commented that she could “hardly understand” herself. “I’m not very satisfied with myself” (SRI 5:13) she admitted, explaining that she had taught only a brief lesson on adjectives and then moved on too quickly. “Now, when I’m looking back,” she said, “I should have been doing something different or made up our own story because I think it was too fast. You shouldn’t be, like: ‘No, it’s ‘adjective’. You should only work with ‘adjective’, ‘adjective’.’ Because that’s boring. But, it was too fast, anyway. You should at least work two weeks with it” (SRI 5:16). Helena had a similar assessment of her lesson on verbs. “Uh,” she sighed, after watching the tape of this instructional episode. “I feel like more they were tasting at it, but they didn’t actually—. If you want them to know it, you have to practice more and do more different assignments” (SRI 5:43).

Helena reflected critically on her grammar teaching throughout the stimulated recall interview, always proffering ideas about how she might improve her teaching in the future. “I didn’t do it very well,” she said about a lesson she taught on the differences between ‘på’ (on) and ‘i’ (in). “Maybe I should have some more examples” (SRI 5:30). In response to another episode, she said, “If I was smart, which I wasn’t there, I should have pointed out, figured out, what’s difference between ‘titta’ (watch) and ‘såg’ (saw)” (SRI 5:38). Regarding her explanation of the morpheme ‘o-’ (dis-) and its use in the word ‘olydig’ (disobedient), Helena had this to say: “Looking back, actually, I should have brought up more examples, not only this one. […]"
Because *these* types of words show up more frequently later on. You can be wise after looking at it” (SRI 5:2). It was clear, then, that Helena was open to reflecting on and critiquing her own grammar teaching, always with an eye for how to improve it in the future.

**Perceptions of students’ feelings about grammar.**

Helena believed her students could be easily bored by grammar instruction. She explained that she tried to avoid what she considered excessive grammar instruction for this age group:

If you over-analyze a text, it starts to get boring. We have made that mistake, many of us. Even I. We have a book called ‘*Adams Bok*’ (‘Adam’s Book’). It’s both the text and sign language. And they have *so many* examples for what you can talk about with the text, and there’s *so many* examples. It’s a teachers’ guide. There’s so much to talk about. In the end, the students came out, ‘No! God! We don’t want it! Please! Please!’ It was too much, too much analysis. And especially when they’re that small. You want them to feel, ‘Hey! It’s fun! It’s cool! It’s fun.’ If you analyze it too much, it gets boring. It’s not fun with Swedish anymore. It’s all the balance. (SRI 5:36)

Helena said that, when she’s teaching a grammar lesson, she gets “scared that sometimes it’s too much,” that it’s “too long, too boring,…tiring because it’s too slow, too much of the same thing” (SRI 5:52). But, she admitted, this fear sometimes leads her to abandon a grammar topic before she’s given students enough time to learn it.

Helena also believed, however, that some students were more open to grammar instruction than others. Reflecting on her individual reading lessons with two different students—Samantha and Anna—Helena explained that she chose her language focus for each student based on what she perceived as the student’s tolerance for grammar instruction.

Samantha, she *hates* Swedish. She really hates it. Because she has such a hard time reading, such a hard time understanding. And you can see, she didn’t actually look at the text, really. She looked a little, and she forgot it. And I didn’t *point*. I didn’t want her to, ‘You have to memorize this. You have to memorize this.’ Because she’s already struggling with the homework. […] I’m not actually working that hard with her because that was too much for her. It’s enough for *her* just to see the word. Because she didn’t want to look at the text. You can see Anna. She was more like, (interested expression) ‘Uh-huh. What does *this* say?’
It’s different. Then you can talk about it. But I don’t want to take up too much. She just had a taste. That’s OK. (SRI 5:37)

**Understandings of the role of grammar instruction.**

Overall, Helena believed strongly that grammar instruction should be linked to communicative purposes. The evidence suggests that Helena had two main reasons for engaging her students in grammar instruction: to help them comprehend written Swedish and to help them produce proper Teckenspråk. She also expressed the belief that grammar instruction could aid the development of students’ written language skills—explaining that she began focusing on tense when students were young because deaf children tend to use only the present tense in their writing (5:46)—but I did not observe Helena teaching any grammar lessons around students’ writing. Like Christel, Helena believed that the goal of improving students’ Swedish literacy was interdependent with the goal of improving their expressive Teckenspråk. At a more basic level than Christel, likely because she was working with younger students, Helena worked continually to help her students notice the grammatical differences between Swedish and Teckenspråk, differences that were often related to the modality differences between written and signed languages.

In reflecting on her grammar lessons, Helena often explicitly stated that the purpose was to help students comprehend written Swedish. In reference to her lesson on the morpheme ‘-o’ (dis-) in ‘olydig’ (disobedient), for example, she explained that she focused on the particulars of this word because “you don’t use it very much” in Teckenspråk so the students were unlikely to understand what it meant. Helena felt that she should have provided even more examples “because these types of words show up more frequently later on” in texts the students would be reading (SRI 5:2). Similarly, her lesson on the possessive (-s) was explicitly motivated by her desire to help her students understand the text. “Whose stomach?” she asked them. “Oh! Fa-
Other’s,” she wanted them to understand (SRI 5:27). Helena made sure to call her students’ attention to the pronoun ‘jag’ (I) for the same reason: “Later, when they get older, often it says ‘he’ or ‘she’. They have problems [when reading] that: ‘Who? Oh.’ They don’t think about who it is” (5:1). Finally, in another lesson, Helena focused on the prepositions used with the word ‘skriva’ (to write) because she wanted to raise students’ awareness of how these “small words” could influence the signed expression of an idea. She explained: “Writing on a refrigerator, writing on a table. Actually, what is the text saying? Because in sign language, you don’t have to go ‘on’ (/ON/), ‘on’ (/ON/). You go, ‘write table’ (/WRITE(-on-a-horizontal-surface) TABLE/). So in the text, they must be aware of the prepositions, the ‘on’ (SRI 5:31).

With these last two lessons—pronouns and prepositions—Helena was not only hoping to improve students’ comprehension of written Swedish, but also to improve their production of proper Teckenspråk. With the lesson on prepositions, the connection to productive Teckenspråk is fairly obvious from the quote above: “In sign language, you don’t have to go ‘on’ (/ON/).” Here, Helena was focusing on prepositions precisely because they are handled differently in Swedish and Teckenspråk, and she wants her students to understand the implications in both languages. Regarding pronouns, Helena explained that the students sometimes have problems using pronouns in Teckenspråk: “Sometimes they point, ‘she’ (points to her left). They point only this way.” And the listener wonders, “Who’s that?” “That’s why you have to point out, ‘Who is ‘she’? Yeah, that’s the girl!’” (SRI 5:1). In a separate lesson, Helena took up a discussion of the use of the verb ‘åker’ (to ride) in sign language in order to help her students understand the general concept that, in sign language, they “don’t have to say all the words” that they see written in Swedish text (SRI 5:24). The verb ‘åker’ (to ride) is a good example of this concept because, in Teckenspråk, one would say, ‘/I SLED/,’ as opposed to ‘/I RIDE SLED/.’ The
concept of ‘riding’ is connoted by the sign ‘/SLED/,’ so inclusion of the sign ‘/RIDE/’ would be redundant.

Regarding her students’ expressive Teckenspråk skills, Helena explained that she is particularly interested in teaching grammar lessons that will help them improve formal presentations of their written work. She worries that other teachers focus too much on the production of the Swedish text itself and not enough on how students translate that text into Teckenspråk.

When they’re going up, standing in front of their classmates and doing a presentation, they don’t know how to present it, how to do it well in sign language. They just follow the text strictly. That makes it’s very difficult for the other kids in the classroom to understand what the presentation is about. Because they’re signing according to the Swedish text. So, [teachers] should put more emphasis on the presentation, also. […] That’s why I’m starting with this quite early because, in the future, they’re going to do more and more of this kind of work. But then they have to focus on what they actually are saying. (SRI 5:11)

Understandings of stakeholder expectations.

Helena discussed the influence of the following stakeholders on her work, listed in order of apparent influence: the Kiwi literacy curriculum (Körling, 2006), Nilskolan’s administration, the national Education agency, her colleagues, and her students’ parents.

Kiwi (Körling, 2006) is a general education literacy curriculum that was selected by Nilskolan’s administration and teachers for use in the early grades because it contains engaging books and emphasizes the importance of students understanding the meaning of text before they focus on form. The curriculum consists of 120 books divided into those for pre-readers, beginning readers, and more advanced readers. There is also a teacher’s guide, which includes grammar and vocabulary recommendations for each book, and a series of workbooks associated with the curriculum. Helena made it very clear that she was not required to follow the Kiwi curriculum (Körling, 2006) closely. Although the teacher’s guide offered suggestions regarding
specific language or literacy lessons that were associated with each book, Helena said that “nothing in the curriculum says we have to follow it that way” (SRI 5:18). During her pre-observation interview, Helena explained that it was generally the case in Sweden that teachers were not expected to use any particular book in their lessons:

In Sweden, you don’t have that at all. It’s up to the teacher what book to use. It’s both good, and also bad. Because then it’s different. Teachers use different books, and they give different grades, different expectations. […] But I think it’s good to not have the same book in Swedish. Because then you can use what they are interested in. But I think the Kiwi method is very good. In the beginning, anyway. But there are no special books at our school, no grammar books. There are grammar books, but every teacher can decide themselves what book to use while they’re teaching. (POI 4:19)

Despite her freedom to choose her own teaching materials, Helena drew heavily from Kiwi (Körling, 2006). “I use the Kiwi method,” she said, “where we talk about pictures. And when they’re totally clear about the meaning of the book, or the goal of it, then we talk about the text afterwards” (POI 4:18). Furthermore, when I asked Helena how she chose which grammar areas to focus on, she responded, “I follow Kiwi” (SRI 5:15). Helena joked that she was a “slave” to the curriculum in that she typically followed its teaching recommendations. She was referring to her choice, motivated by the curriculum, to focus on evidence of ‘movement’ in one book’s illustrations. “In the Kiwi method, in this book, they want you to talk about movements.” Helena smirked, “I’m a slave! I’m a slave to the book. (laughs) I thought that was OK. Sometimes you need to have a break. Whatever. You can talk about the pictures. Because sometimes I think we talk too little about the pictures. We talk about what we see. I thought it was a good point to talk about movements, too” (SRI 5:48).

After reviewing the tape of some of her grammar lessons that were motivated by the Kiwi (Körling, 2006) books, however, Helena adopted a somewhat critical stance toward the curriculum. Particularly around the subjects of adjectives and verbs, Helena felt that the material
moved too quickly from one grammar topic to another. “Looking back,” she said, “I think it’s too fast” (SRI 5:15). In reference to her lesson on adjectives, she said, “I’m a little surprised that Kiwi had it that fast” (SRI 5:17). In reference to her lesson on verbs, she had this to say: “If I follow Kiwi, that was too little. Too little to understand about this. Maybe they have a taste of it, but they will have forgotten about it in a week. Or two” (SRI 5:43). This specific criticism notwithstanding, Helena maintained that Kiwi was “often aligned with her own goals” (comments on transcript), and the curriculum had an influence on her selection of grammar content during guided reading lessons. In particular, the Kiwi curriculum motivated her decisions, at least in part, to focus on adjectives during her reading of En Hund (A Dog) and to focus on verbs in Min Stol (My Chair).

Nilskolan’s administration also influenced Helena’s teaching practices, though apparently to a lesser extent. During her pre-observation interview, Helena described some recent changes to the administration that were having an influence on how language teachers did their work. Helena referred specifically to changes that went into effect when Agneta became a Vice Principal at the school, roughly four years prior. Agneta, who was a former teacher at Nilskolan and was its professional development coordinator at the time of this study, is the same administrator who identified Helena and Christel as high quality, model teachers at Nilskolan. According to Helena, when Agneta became a Vice Principal, she said to the teachers: “You have to focus on how we’re teaching languages” (POI 4:28). Before that, Helena explained, “there weren’t any…special strategies, no special way to teach language. But when Agneta started to work, she said, ‘we have to have a good way of teaching language’ (POI 4:28).

Helena explained that the primary differences since Agneta joined the administration centered on the importance of language comparison and on the importance of focusing on the
visual components of text. Prior to Agneta’s influence, “lots of teachers were teaching Swedish as a first language,” Helena said. Now, teachers were becoming more aware that students “have to feel safe and comfortable in the first language. And when they’re comfortable in the first language, it’s much easier to study a second language because you can always compare, because you have the first language to lean on, go back to, all the time” (POI 4:28). Secondly, Helena explained that, previously, all of the language books were text-based, with “more or less no pictures.” Helena said that Agneta has helped teachers become “more aware of how to use layout” and pictures more “strategically” to help students grasp the meaning of texts, particularly at the lower levels (POI 4:28).

A third stakeholder that influenced Helena’s teaching, by way of Nilskolan’s administration, was Skolverket, or the Swedish National Agency for Education. A few years prior, Skolverket had issued more stringent guidelines for reporting student progress. “You have more demands,” Helena explained:

> You have to reach the goals much more now than we had to before. Today, they say that you have to reach all these goals. That’s a demand more today than it was before. Today we have special forms. We fill out special forms about the students, which say, ‘Well, you’re now on this level, and you need this to reach the goal.’ And before we didn’t have those type of forms to fill out. So, we’re more focused on how we are teaching for the students to reach the goals, different goals that we’re setting for the students. Because when we met the parents before, when I started, we could say, ‘Ah, he’s having a little bit of a hard time learning language.’ And that was it. But now you have to show what’s hard for him, and you have more paper. And that’s good because then you have to think more, ‘how do you teach?’ (POI 4:30)

Although Helena felt that the reforms were a good thing in principle, she was somewhat critical of the way in which Nilskolan had adopted them. She explained that individual schools were given the freedom to interpret the demands in keeping with their own philosophies. “Nilskolan has always been in the front line,” she said, “trying to teach in new ways, to listen to
the new directives from up above. And they’re always listening and trying to readjust all the time. […] Sometimes too much” (POI 4:30). As a result, in Helena’s opinion, the administration was requiring the teachers to fill out too many forms on behalf of each student. “With these papers, forms, we give them every Spring and every Autumn. We check the goals, if they’ve reached the goals. It’s too much at Nilskolan, too much goal-focused. Too much filling out forms. And when you’re sitting with the parents and going through the student, the child, it’s too much. Takes too much time” (POI 4:30). Helena compared what she considered to be the excessive paperwork at Nilskolan—”twenty-five or thirty papers”—to the “one paper” used by the teachers at her own children’s schools. But, she concluded that the reforms were, on the whole, a “good” thing. “We have to document because we’ll be more aware of how we teach than before. Before you could teach: ‘Oh! It wasn’t successful, but OK.’ But now you have to, ‘What am I doing?’” (POI 4:30).

Fourth, Helena perceived her colleagues to be influential stakeholders in her work. She explained that, when she first began working at Nilskolan, she was paired with teachers whose pedagogical approaches differed markedly from her own. “We didn’t get along always,” she explained. “We had different kinds of ideas. […] They didn’t think in the same way” (POI 4:26). Helena felt it was critically important to work harmoniously with her colleagues, regardless of their differences in opinion. Until she had developed a positive relationship with the other teachers, she did not feel she could focus on her students. “If you can’t work with your colleagues,” she said, “then it’s very hard to work with the students. Too much impact on the students if you don’t work together well with your colleagues. […] We don’t agree always, my colleague and me, who I’m working together with now. But I have to always find a new way, how to work well together for the sake of the students” (POI 4:26).
Finally, Helena recognized her students’ parents as stakeholders in her work, but there was no evidence that she allowed the parents to influence her teaching. Her only reference to the students’ parents came when Helena was watching the tape of herself explaining that ‘jag’ (I) is often repeated in Teckenspråk at the end of the phrase, as in ‘/I HAPPY DOG, I(head-nod)/.’ Pointing to the student at the front of the room, Helena said: “Her parents are deaf. They get mad at me after these lessons. They say I am over-acting. Because when she came home she was signing, ‘I dog I’ (/I DOG I(head-nod)/). And they said, ‘That’s too much over.’ And I said, ‘No it’s not.’ Because often you point in sign language, ‘I’ (/I(head-nod)/) again, in the end, when you want to emphasize” (SRI 5:9).

Language Proficiency

As I explained in the Limitations section of Chapter III, I was unable to personally assess the language proficiency of the teachers in either Swedish or Teckenspråk because my knowledge of the languages was insufficient to make such judgments. Instead, I received statements of the teachers’ native-like proficiency in both languages from independent raters. The Teckenspråk interpreter who interpreted the interviews and classroom video testified to Helena’s native-like proficiency in Teckenspråk (Appendix Q). Nilskolan’s professional development coordinator, a native speaker of Swedish who specializes in language education, testified to Helena’s native-like proficiency in Swedish (Appendix R). What is presented in the following sections is evidence regarding Helena’s own views on her language proficiency. The section is divided into two subsections: accurate and effective use of the target language and use of the non-native speaker advantage.
Accurate and effective use of the target language(s).

By her own account, Helena is proficient in and knowledgeable about both Swedish and Teckenspråk. She said that she knows “a lot about sign language” (POI 4:16), and she believes that her knowledge of Swedish, which she attributed to being an avid reader, is one of her strengths as a language teacher (POI 4:23). Furthermore, Helena made it a point always to differentiate between “real sign language” and signs produced in Swedish word order. Although Helena did not feel entirely confident in her ability to explain the grammatical differences between Swedish and Teckenspråk—as I explain in the section on Helena’s ‘Feelings about grammar’—the evidence strongly suggests that she used both languages accurately and effectively.

Use of the non-native speaker advantage.

Recall that the term ‘non-native speaker advantage’ is used to describe the language learning insights and strategies unique to those language teachers who have, themselves, learned the language they are teaching as a second language. Helena’s mother and grandmother were both deaf, and her father and brother were both hearing. As a hard of hearing woman born into this family, Helena was raised bilingually in Teckenspråk and Swedish. Thus, she cannot rightly be called a non-native speaker of either language, since she learned both languages as a native-speaker would. She was, however, in an ideal position to compare the two languages from a very young age, and she cited this as an advantage in her teaching:

I think that’s very positive for me as a Swedish teacher, that I’m teaching through—, that I also teach sign language and know a lot about sign language. Because, I think, learning language is very good when you can compare your first language and the second language, and you can compare, and you can talk about it: ‘Hey! What’s different with this? What’s the same?’ Because many teachers are only teaching Swedish, but they don’t know anything about sign language. They can sign, but don’t know much about sign language. So, I think it’s very
positive that I’m teaching both of them. I can compare because that makes the language much more interesting. (POI 4:16)

Explicit Language Knowledge

In this section, the evidence relevant to Helena’s explicit language knowledge is presented. The section is divided into the following four subsections: engagement style, error correction, input, and explanation.

Engagement style.

Helena expressed a preference for instruction that engaged her students actively in their own learning. During the pre-observation interview, Helena shared what she considered a valuable lesson learned in her teacher education program regarding student engagement. One of her teachers had said it was very important for the students to have “lust” (desire). “If they don’t,” Helena explained:

You can stay there and try to teach, but they won’t learn that much. And I think that’s a good way to be. […] You have to have lust (desire), lust att lära (desire to learn). […] They have a hard time reading, so I can’t give them books and grammar and “do this, do that.” They are like (mimics refusing to pay attention). They don’t want to do it. So I have to be careful. I have to do something they’re interested in. […] And give them something to talk about. I mean, you can’t teach grammar. Like “tch, tch, tch,” (gestures methodical motion) if they don’t have desire. It doesn’t give them anything. You have to find a text that’s very good, get them interested. (POI 4:15)

In keeping with her belief that students should be excited about language learning, Helena put great effort into being an engaging public speaker, most notably through using dramatic body language. “Maybe some think I am over-acting,” she said. “I don’t care” (SRI 5:54). Helena commented on her body language at the close of her stimulated recall interview, suggesting that it was even a little more dramatic than she had realized. “But I remember I had a lecturer,” she explained:
She told me, when you’re in front of an audience, ninety percent is body language. And ten percent is only what’s coming out (gestures from mouth). […] So, I think I’m very, very aware of that. That’s why I have (gestures widely and dramatically). Children today need more action to pay attention, that’s, you know, from TV. They want to have action. Because if you don’t—if you only stay there (/SIGN/ dryly)—they won’t listen. […] Even if it’s sign, you can be very tiring if you stand there (/SIGN/ dryly). Especially when they’re kids. You have to, (claps) “Wow!” Actually. Then, they’re like, (mimics coming to) “What?” (SRI 5:54)

Using dramatic body language was one way in which Helena tried to engender enthusiasm for language learning. Inviting students to engage with language on terms that were interesting to them was another. Helena encouraged her students to play with language even if their games had little connection to her lesson objectives. On one occasion, for instance, a student named Kendra approached the Smart board during a shared reading lesson. Instead of signing the sentence on the board as expected, however, she proceeded to point out that the six letters of her first name each appeared in that five-word sentence. Helena did not understand what Kendra was doing at first, but once she figured it out, she enthusiastically shared Kendra’s discovery with the rest of the students. When I asked Helena what she saw as the value in Kendra’s word play, Helena explained that it gave students confidence in their own knowledge of the written language. “Sometimes they don’t understand actually that they know a lot of words. So, by playing with letters and words, they can actually see, and have more confidence in knowing, “I do know many words.” That’s why I think it’s valuable to play with words” (SRI 5:12).

I observed a similar episode in which a student named Karlos initiated a game where he would write a word on the board and the other students would guess at its meaning. The students all enjoyed the game, and Helena encouraged them to take turns writing words on the board. Helena explained that she sometimes initiated games like this herself. “Sometimes I just put up one word,” she said, “a long word, and from that word, I would like them to,—‘How many words can you take out and make new words from these letters?’ […] Two months ago, it was
impossible. They didn’t have words enough to play with. Today they are more rich in words. They have more words. I think it’s a big value to be aware of, ‘Ah! I can understand words. I’m trying to read! I know what the word means’” (SRI 5:12).

Helena’s commitment to engaging her students in their own language learning was evident in the way she approached most, but not all, of her grammar instruction. In the following paragraphs, I present evidence of Helena’s inquiry oriented lessons first and her more goal oriented lessons second. Specifically, she was inquiry oriented in her lessons on ‘verbs’ and ‘adjectives’ as word categories, and in her lessons on the use of pronouns and the meaning of the possessive ‘–s’. She was more goal oriented, however, in her lessons on the grammatical differences between Swedish and Teckenspråk in the use of verbs and prepositions. The ways in which Helena’s engagement style seemed to be affected by her level of confidence in different instructional contexts recalls not only the findings of Borg (2001b) and Shulman (1987)—which are discussed in Chapter II in the section headed, ‘Feelings about grammar’—but also my own findings on Christel’s ‘Engagement style.’

Helena introduced her students to the concept of verbs through a text in the Kiwi curriculum (Körling, 2006) entitled Min Stol (My Chair). The Kiwi teacher’s guide suggested verbs as a potential grammar focus for work on this text. Min stol (My chair) highlighted all of the things a wheelchair can do that other chairs cannot with repetitions of the sentence structure, ‘Min stol kan...’ (My chair can…), as in ‘Min stol kan rulla’ (My chair can roll), and ‘Min stol kan dansa’ (My chair can dance). Helena first read the text aloud while the students viewed the illustrations on the Smart board. Then, the students generated a list of words describing what the wheelchair could do: spin, roll, dance, etc. Finally, Helena explained that each of these words belongs to the
category of words describing movement, which she labeled ‘verbs’. This was an inquiry based lesson for which the students generated most of the content.

Helena’s introduction of adjectives was similarly motivated and similarly structured. Helena introduced her students to the concept of adjectives through a text in the *Kiwi* curriculum (Körling, 2006) entitled *En Hund* (A Dog). The *Kiwi* teacher’s guide suggested adjectives as a potential grammar focus for work in this text. *En Hund* (A Dog) described the characteristics of a particular dog with repetitions of the sentence structure, ‘*Jag är en ____ hund*’ (I am a ____ dog), as in ‘*Jag är en glad hund*’ (I am a happy dog), and ‘*Jag är en smutsig hund*’ (I am a dirty dog). Helena first read the book aloud for the students while they viewed the illustrations on the Smart board. She was particularly expressive when producing the signs that described the characteristics of a dog (e.g., happy, disobedient, dirty, etc.), making exaggerated facial expressions and body movements. Following this reading, Helena introduced the word ‘adjective’, verbally listed some of the adjectives from *En Hund*, and explained that adjectives often “describe how something looks.” She then gave her students a worksheet that asked them to examine a series of images and match the appropriate adjectives to those images, focusing the students’ attention on how the images “look”.

Helena also adopted an inquiry oriented approach in a brief lesson she taught on the use of the Swedish pronoun ‘*jag*’ (I). She and the class were engaged in a shared reading of the book, *En Hund* (A Dog). In order to prompt her students’ thinking about the pronoun ‘*jag*’, Helena called their attention to the sentence, “*Jag är en glad hund*” (I am a happy dog). The image below the text depicted a dog with his tongue hanging out, about to chew on a bone. After asking a student, Olle, to sign the sentence, Helena posed the question: “Who is ‘*jag*’ (I)? Is it Olle? Is it Kendra?” Olle appeared confused by the question, as did many of the students. After a few
moments, though, one of the students volunteered ‘hund’ (dog) as the answer. “Right! Dog!”

‘Helena replied, pointing emphatically to the picture of the dog on the Smart board. “‘I’ is
himself, the dog. ‘I,’ myself, the dog, ‘I’ am happy.”

Helena used a similar approach to teach her students about the use of the possessive ‘-s’ in Swedish. During a shared reading of a text on the Smart board, a student named Hera encountered the following sentence: ‘Jag åker på pappas mage!’ (I ride on daddy’s stomach!). “I
ride on…,” she began, and then looked puzzled. “What’s this word?” Helena asked, pointing to
the word ‘pappas.’ “Daddy,” Hera answered. “Right, daddy. What does the ‘-s’ mean?” asked Helena. Seeing Hera’s uncertainty, Helena explained that the ‘-s’ indicated possession.

“/DADDY HIS/,” Helena said, emphasizing the Teckenspråk sign indicating possession, which involves a flat palm, fingers together and pointing upward, aimed in the direction of the possessor. This sign can mean ‘my’, ‘your’, ‘his’, or ‘her’ depending on who is in the direction of the open palm. This sign is also used to represent the possessive ‘-s’, such that, to communicate the notion of ‘Daddy’s stomach’, for example, one would sign, ‘/DADDY HIS
STOMACH/’. Helena then asked Hera, “/DADDY HIS WHAT/?” Helena pointed to the word
‘mage’ (stomach) and then fingerspelled it for Hera. “Stomach!” Hera replied. “Right!”
answered Helena. “/I RIDE DADDY HIS STOMACH/.”

Helena continued this lesson by inviting each student to consider the use of the possessive
‘-s’ as it applied to them and their own possessions. She began with Anna. “If we want to say,
“Anna’s sash,” Helena inquired, “how do we say that?” She then fingerspelled Anna’s name, and asked, “What do we put at the end?” Anna correctly responded that an ‘-s’ should go after Anna. Helena continued around the room with this line of inquiry, asking each student what they should
put after their name in order to indicate their possession of a particular object: Mikel’s watch, Angela’s hair, Olle’s jacket, etc.

A further opportunity for inquiry arose when Helena got to Karlos. “K-A-R-L-O-S,” Helena began, and then she made a dramatic expression of surprise, looking around the room to make eye contact with the other students. “His name is K-A-R-L-O-S,” she said. “What do we do in that case?” She went to the white board and wrote the following:

\[
\text{Angela + s} \rightarrow \text{Angelas} \\
\text{Karlos}
\]

She pointed to the name ‘Karlos’ on the board. “\textit{How? How?}” she asked the students? Helena then wrote the following: ‘Karlos + s \rightarrow Karloss.’ She pointed to ‘Karloss’ and made a disapproving face, shaking her head emphatically. “\textit{No! That’s strange!}” Anna suggested that they should cut the final ‘s’ in half. Helena erased the top of the ‘s’ leaving what looked like a small, backwards ‘c’ in its place. She smiled and shook her head ‘no.’ “What do we do in this case?” she asked again. Anna came to the board, then, and wrote: ‘Karlo + s.’ “His name is Karlos,” Helena responded. “His name isn’t Karlo. His name is Karlos.” At this point, Helena explained to the students that the name Karlos remains unchanged in the possessive form. “You sign, Karlos \textit{his},” she said, “but you write it the same way.” She went back to the board and erased ‘Karlos +s \rightarrow Karloss,’ replacing it with: ‘Karlos \rightarrow Karlos.’ “It’s the \textit{same},” she said again.

In contrast to the inquiry oriented style of teaching described above, Helena also used a more goal oriented approach at times. The three goal oriented lessons I observed all involved the grammatical differences between Swedish and Teckenspråk. Two lessons were on the use of verbs in the two languages, and the other was on the use of prepositions.
In the first example, Helena was focusing on the Swedish verb ‘åka’ (to ride). The following sentence appeared in a shared reading text: ‘Jag åker pulka’ (I ride a sled). Angela came to the board and signed the sentence as, ‘/I RIDE SLED/.’ “Right,” Helena replied. “But, if you follow Teckenspråk, you don’t sign it word for word. I have to think to myself, ‘How do I sign this is good Teckenspråk?’ /I RIDE SLED/? No. /I SLED/. /I SLED/. You don’t sign ‘/RIDE/’. /I SLED/.” Later, in the same lesson, the following sentence appeared in the text: ‘Jag åker tefat.’ This sentence translates literally as ‘I ride a saucer,’ but it means, ‘I ride a circular sled.’ Olle signed the sentence as “/I RIDE SAUCER/.” “Right,” Helena replied, and then she made sure she had all the students’ attention. “I told you before,” she explained, “that ‘Jag åker pulka’ should be signed ‘/I SLED/.’ But not here. You can’t sign ‘/I SAUCER/.’ You say ‘/RIDE SAUCER/.’ ‘/I RIDE SAUCER/.’” Helena did not offer her students any explanation for why the sign /RIDE/ is included in one case but not in the other. She later speculated about the difference, however, in her stimulated recall interview. She concluded that ‘/RIDE/’ is not necessary with ‘/SLED/’ because ‘/SLED/’ is a base sign that can only mean ‘/SLED/’, but that ‘/RIDE/’ is necessary with ‘/SAUCER/’ because ‘/SAUCER/’ can mean a wide variety of circular-shaped objects. I discuss this difference more completely in the section on Helena’s use of ‘Explanation.’

Helena used a similarly direct approach when she focused her students’ attention on the differences in word order between Teckenspråk and Swedish in regard to the auxiliary verb ‘kan’ (can). During a shared reading, Helena and her students came across this sentence in the text: ‘Min stol kan stanna’ (My chair can stay still). Angela, who was reading at the front of the room, signed the sentence exactly as it appeared in the Swedish word order, ‘/MY CHAIR CAN STAY/.’ “Right,” replied Helena. “But, if I think about Teckenspråk, ‘Min stol kan stanna,’ how
do I translate that into Teckenspråk? I can say ‘/MY CHAIR CAN STAY/’ or ‘/MY CHAIR STAY CAN(head-nod)/.’ It varies.” Note that in the second sentence, Helena performed a head-nod simultaneously with the sign ‘/CAN/’, a non-manual marker used here, along with the modal-last word order, to emphasize the chair’s special ability.

Finally, Helena used a goal oriented approach when she talked to her students about how the prepositions ‘på’ (on) and ‘i’ (in) are used differently in Swedish and Teckenspråk. Instead of inviting her students to inquire about the use of the two prepositions—as she had invited them to inquire about the use of the possessive ‘-s’, she simply told them when to use and not use the prepositions in both languages.

In the first example, the class was reading a book about writing on various surfaces, such as on the road with chalk, on the window with your finger, or in the dark with a flashlight. Olle was at the front of the room reading this sentence: ‘Jag kan skriva på fönstret’ (I can write on the window). He signed it following the Swedish word order, exactly: ‘/I CAN WRITE ON WINDOW/.’ Helena responded, “If I think about Teckenspråk, translating to Teckenspråk, how do I sign this sentence? ‘/I CAN WRITE(-on) WINDOW/.’ You don’t add the ‘på’. Not in Teckenspråk.” The notation ‘/WRITE(-on)/’ indicates that Helena inflected the sign ‘/WRITE/’ to show the position of the surface being written on. Helena held her hand upright, as on a window, while producing the sign ‘/WRITE/.’ She did not, however, produce a separate sign to indicate the preposition ‘on’. Helena continued with her explanation: “In Swedish,” she said, “you must put the ‘på’ (on). Can I put ‘i’ (in), ‘i fönstret’ (in the window)? No, I have to put ‘på’.”

Later in the same lesson, Helena discussed an appropriate use of the pronoun ‘i’ (in). The sentence in the text was as follows: ‘Jag kan skriva i mörkret’ (I can write in the dark). Helena
called the students’ attention to the ‘i’, noting that all of the previous sentences had contained ‘på’ (on). “It doesn’t say ‘skriva på mörkret’ (write on the dark),” she explained. “It says ‘skriva i mörkret’ (write in the dark).” Helena continued: “In Teckenspråk, I say ‘/I WRITE(-on) STREET/’ and ‘/I WRITE(-on) WINDOW/.’ But, here (pointing to sentence), I say, ‘/I WRITE IN DARK/.’ I sign ‘/IN/.’ Helena did not offer further explanation regarding why ‘i’ (in) was used, as opposed to ‘på’ (on), or why ‘/IN/’ should be signed while ‘/ON/’ is not signed.

Error correction.

Helena preferred not to correct her students’ grammar. Instead, she used what she referred to as “gentle reminders” about grammar. “I want to /REMIND/, so they’ll be aware,” she explained, “but, when they come down [to the front of the classroom], they’re standing, they follow the Swedish. That’s OK. That’s OK. They’re still very young. As long as you as the teacher are aware about it. You can talk about it all the time, and then finally, the students will understand this point. But you can’t be like (makes scolding gesture with her index finger), “Agh, don’t sign like that!” You just /REMIND(-gently)/. You point it out” (SRI 5:4).

When I asked Helena what she saw as the problem with correcting the students’ grammar, she said that correcting them could cause them to get “stuck.” In the first grade, Helena is more concerned with reading comprehension than grammar, so she doesn’t want to discourage her students from talking about the text with her. She recalled teachers she had observed during her practicum experience who had corrected their students so much that the students no longer wanted to participate in class. “You can see,” she explained:

When they’re sitting beside me, they’ll follow the text, and that’s OK. At that point, I just want to see that they understand the words. That’s most important at that time. […] Because when they’re standing there, if you’re just pointing out that, “You are wrong. You should not do it like this,” it will actually keep them from opening up. You’ll probably make them more careful with what they’re saying. They will probably be scared of raising their hands, asking questions,
saying anything, because they’re afraid of having, “No, you’re wrong.” So I have to be very careful, just pointing out, making them aware. Not to just correct them saying, “You are wrong.” That’s why I’m doing this. You have to be thinking of balance. Because you want them to come and tell you what they are thinking about. (SRI 5:6)

I never saw Helena correct a student’s error directly. Instead, if a student made an error, she would either ignore it, or handle it in one of two ways. One way was to restate the grammar rule relevant to the error. The second way was to ask students questions to see if they could correct themselves.

As an example of the first type, a student name Dennis had come to the board and incorrectly signed the sentence, ‘Jag är en flitig hund’ (I am a busy dog), by strictly following the Swedish word order. In response, Helena nodded her head ‘yes’ while signing /FOLLOW/, to indicate that Dennis had followed the Swedish word order. “In Teckenspråk,” she added, “you sign ‘/I BUSY DOG, I(head-nod)/’.” The notation ‘/I(head-nod)/’ represents Helena’s use of a non-manual marker, the head-nod, to add emphasis to a phrase-final subject. Later in the same lesson, Dennis came to the board again to sign the sentence ‘Jag är en smutsig hund’ (I am a dirty dog). Again, he followed the Swedish word order exactly. This time, Helena used her second approach for addressing error: She asked Dennis a question to see if he could correct himself. “Can you translate it to Teckenspråk?” she asked, pointing at the sentence. “/DIRTY/,” he responded. Helena then provided the correct translation: “/I DIRTY DOG, I(head-nod)/.”

An example of Helena ignoring student error occurred in her lesson on the use of ‘på’ (on) in Teckenspråk. Earlier in the lesson, she had explained to the students that they should not sign ‘/ON/’ when they were referring to the surface on which something was being written. Instead, they should inflect the verb ‘/WRITE/’ to indicate the position of the surface. In this example, Olle was at the board, and he incorrectly signed the sentence ‘Jag kan skriva på vägen’ (I can
write on the road) by following the Swedish word order exactly: ‘/I CAN WRITE ON ROAD/.’

Helena responded, “Right. /WRITE ON ROAD/.” Helena then turned the page to reveal the sentence, ‘Jag kan skriva på kylskåpet’ (I can write on the refrigerator). Anna came to the board and performed the correct translation to Teckenspråk. Olle raised his hand after Anna’s translation and came to the board to translate the sentence himself. Again, he incorrectly included the sign for ‘/ON/’ in his translation. “Right!” Helena responded, ignoring the error a second time.

“Maybe I should have brought it up,” Helena commented, after watching these episodes during the stimulated recall interview. She explained her decision to ignore Olle’s errors this way: “I have to keep a balance. I’ve been nagging so much about it before (laughs), so I thought we have to move on. We have to go to the next step. And maybe we can go back later on” (SRI 5:35).

**Input.**

On the whole, Helena seemed able to mediate her own language output so that students were able to understand. There were only two occasions when there was evidence to suggest that she was producing language output at a level too advanced for her students. When she was presented with the video clips of these episodes, she recognized that the input was at too high a level.

In the first example, Helena was teaching a lesson on adjectives. She had given the students a worksheet that asked them to choose the appropriate adjectives to match a set of pictures. The students seemed to struggle with the worksheet, which included the following adjectives: ‘arg’ (angry), ‘trött’ (tired), ‘prickig’ (polka-dotted), ‘stor’ (large), ‘söt’ (sweet), and ‘liten’ (small).

When Helena reviewed the tape of this lesson during the stimulated recall interview, she said, “I don’t think it was a very good lesson because they weren’t aware of these words, just a few of
them. So I should have taken that up before I started to give this out. I should have been talking about those because they were very new for them” (SRI 5:14).

In the second example, Helena had actually designed the lesson so that the students would be generating the input. The problem arose, however, when Helena translated one student’s Teckenspråk output into Swedish input. Helena was asking students what they had done over the weekend and then translating their Teckenspråk constructions into Swedish on the white board. Olle told Helena that he had watched TV and seen the movie, *The Fox and the Hound*. Helena translated what Olle said as follows:

*I lördags tittade jag på TV.* (On Saturday, I watched TV.)
*Jag såg “Micke och Molle.”* (I saw *The Fox and the Hound*.)

Upon seeing what she had written on the board, Helena interrupted the tape to say, “Now, actually, if I was smart, which I wasn’t there, I should have pointed out, what’s the difference between ‘*titta*’ (watch) and ‘*såg*’ (saw)” (SRI 5:38). After watching the full interaction, however, she modified her thinking slightly. Instead of explaining the difference, she said, she should have altered the input from the beginning. “I should have used the same—’*tittade*’ and ’*tittade*’—two times, so as not to confuse them. They’re in first grade. It’s too much for them. Maybe if they were older, we could use the difference between the two words, and we could also have a discussion about *when* you use ’*tittade*’ (watched) and when you use the word ’*såg*’ (saw). But, in the first grade, I think it’s a little bit too early” (SRI 5:39).

**Explanation.**

Helena’s explanations of grammar points were very clear at times, but at other times, they had the potential to cause some confusion for her students. There seemed to be a relationship between the clarity of Helena’s explanations and the engagement style she was using during a given lesson. Specifically, her clear explanations tended to occur during her inquiry oriented
lessons, while her less clear explanations tended to occur during her goal oriented lessons. Recall that Helena tended toward a more goal oriented style when she was addressing the grammatical differences between Swedish and Teckenspråk, as opposed to when she was focusing on a structure that was handled similarly in the two languages. Thus, her explanations of the grammatical differences between Swedish and Teckenspråk tended to be less clear than her grammatical explanations of structures handled similarly in both languages.

As I described in the section on Helena’s engagement style, she was inquiry oriented in her lessons on ‘verbs’ and in her lessons on the use of pronouns and the meaning of the possessive ‘-s’. In all of these lessons, she also offered clear explanations of grammar concepts. In her lesson introducing the concept of verbs, for example, she had the students generate a list of verbs from their reading, wrote those words on the Smart board, and then wrote the word ‘verb’ next to them. “A ‘verb’ is a word about action and movement,” she explained, and then proceeded to act out all of the verbs written on the board. While “a word about action and movement” is not a complete definition of ‘verb’, it seemed a clear and sufficient one for introducing the concept of verbs at the first grade level.

Helena’s explanation of the use of the pronoun ‘jag’ (I) was also clear and straight-forward. As described above in the section on Helena’s engagement style, she grounded her explanation in a shared reading text about a dog in which the word ‘jag’ appeared repeatedly. “Who is ‘jag’?” Helena queried her students. When they answered correctly, she replied, “Right!,,” and then pointed emphatically at the picture of the dog on the Smart board. “‘I’ is _himself_, the dog. ‘I,’ myself, the dog, ‘I’ am happy.” She also used a non-manual head-nod to emphasize that the pronoun ‘jag’ refers to oneself, or—in this case—to the ‘self’ who is speaking in the first person narrative.
Helena’s explanation of the use of the possessive ‘-s’ in Swedish was similarly clear and grounded in content familiar to the students, namely themselves and their personal effects. I describe this lesson at length in the section on Helena’s engagement style. It began with Helena calling her students’ attention to the sentence, ‘Jag åker på pappas mage!’ (I ride on daddy’s stomach!). “What does the ‘-s’ mean?” Helena asked, and then proceeded to explain that it meant that the stomach belonged to the daddy. The lesson continued by Helena prompting the students to add an ‘-s’ to their own names in order to indicate that various objects (e.g., hair, belt, watch) belonged to them. Finally, Helena explained that when a word ends in ‘s’, it remains unchanged in the possessive form. The entire lesson was clearly presented and seemed easily accessed by the students. They readily volunteered correct answers when she asked them to sign expressions about their own and others’ belongings.

I observed two further examples of Helena offering clear explanations of grammar points. The first example arose in response to a student question. In the episode referred to previously—in which Helena wrote two sentences on the board about Olle’s weekend spent watching TV and seeing a movie—Olle asked Helena the meaning of the word ‘såg’ (saw). Helena responded by writing the word ‘ser’ (see) on the board near the word ‘såg’ (saw). She pointed to the word ‘ser’ and signed “/NOW, SEE/.” She then pointed to the word ‘såg’ and signed “/SEE BEFORE/.” It was a clear and concise explanation, and Olle nodded his head to indicate understanding.

The second example involved the indefinite article ‘en’ (a) and, it occurred when Helena was introducing a new book entitled, *En Hund* (A Dog). Helena was reviewing the class agenda at the white board, which read as follows:

1 – Bild Promenad: Hund (Picture Walk: Dogs)
2 – Text Promenad: En Hund (Text Walk: A Dog)
They had just completed the “picture walk,” which involved looking at various images of dogs on the Smart board and discussing the dogs’ characteristics, and they were about to read—or do a “text walk”—through the book. Helena pointed out the difference between ‘Hund’ and ‘En Hund’ on the white board and made an exaggerated, puzzled expression. She also kept her eyebrows down, a non-manual marker indicating a ‘wh-’ question in Teckenspråk. “What’s the difference?” she asked. She pointed at ‘Hund’ and signed ‘/DOGS/’, then she pointed at ‘En Hund’ and signed, “/WHAT? E-N/.” A couple of students answered “/ONE/” simultaneously, and Helena responded affirmatively. In Swedish, ‘en’ signifies both the number one and the indefinite article. “En hund,” Helena said, emphasizing the sign ‘/ONE/’. “You’re going to read a book titled ‘En Hund’.” Given the fact that the students had just spent about twenty minutes looking at pictures of many different dogs, Helena’s explanation that they were now going to read a book about one dog was very clear. Helena did not explain the difference between the number one and the indefinite article, but she did call their attention to the meaning of the indefinite article in a clear way.

There was one exception to the rule that Helena’s explanations were more clear in her inquiry oriented lessons, and this occurred during Helena’s lesson on ‘adjectives’ as a word category. Helena wrote the word ‘adjektiv’ (adjective) on the board, told her students that adjectives describe “how something appears,” and then named a few examples of adjectives without writing them down. “I hardly understand myself,” Helena commented as she watched the video of this lesson during the stimulated recall interview (SRI 5:13).

Helena’s explanations were also less clear in the context of her more goal oriented lessons on the grammatical differences between Swedish and Teckenspråk, specifically on the rules governing the use of verbs and prepositions.
In one lesson, Helena was doing a shared reading with her students of a book about the many different ways to slide down a snowy hillside (e.g., sled, toboggan, ski). Helena told her students that they should not include the Swedish verb ‘åker’ (ride) in their Teckenspråk translations of the sentences, ‘Jag åker pulka’ (I ride a sled) and ‘Jag åker skidor’ (I ride skis). Instead, they should sign, ‘/I SLED/’ and ‘/I SKI/’. One student posed the question, “Why are there all these words in Swedish?” Helena offered the following explanation: “They’re different languages. It’s strange.”

After watching this episode in the stimulated review interview, Helena responded, “I think that’s enough to tell them. It’s two languages. When they get older, though, you have to explain some differences about the grammar. ‘Why must these words be here in Swedish?’ But they are too small” (SRI 5:24). She explained that the use of ‘åker’ is a “high level” grammar point, and she estimated that “only two or three students” understood what she was talking about (SRI 5:22). When I asked Helena how she would explain this difference between Swedish and Teckenspråk with older students, she said that the difference was related to “hjälpverb” (auxiliary verbs), and that she would need to explain to the students about “subjects and predicates” (SRI 5:25).

Later in the same lesson, Helena and her students came across this sentence in their shared reading: ‘Jag åker tefat’ (I ride a saucer-shaped sled). This sentence, Helena told her students, was different from the earlier sentences they had read—‘Jag åker pulka’ (I ride a sled) and ‘Jag åker skidor’ (I ride skis)—because in the case of ‘Jag åker tefat’ (I ride a saucer-shaped sled), the verb ‘åker’ (to ride) actually should appear in the Teckenspråk translation: ‘/I RIDE TEFAT/.’ Helena did not offer her students any explanation, however, of why this sentence worked differently in Teckenspråk than the other sentences. She said only, “Strange.”
In her stimulated recall interview, Helena remained unsure about why the sign for ‘åker’ (/RIDE/) was used in some Teckenspråk translations of Swedish sentences, but not in others. “I have this feeling,” Helena said, “but it’s very hard to say, ‘This is OK, but this is not.’ So that’s very hard, actually, because it’s hard to explain why. It’s a feeling you have” (SRI 5:23). At this point, Helena turned to the interpreter and asked her if she could explain why ‘åker’ gets translated in some constructions but not in others. The interpreter responded that she could not, but Helena remained puzzled by the problem and continued to think about it. Helena’s curiosity about this grammar point that she did not fully understand—and her motivation to figure it out—was characteristic of her reflective nature and drive for self-improvement. She proceeded to think aloud: “I can’t say, ‘Jag-’ (/I SAUCER/). That’s because it means tallrik (dinner plate) (/SAUCER/). That [same sign] means something is round (/SAUCER/). This (/SLED/) is the base sign (/BASE SIGN/). We use pulka (/SLED/). But this (/SAUCER/) can be everywhere. That’s why you have to /RIDE/. […] So, actually, maybe I should point out that /SAUCER/ can mean everything, a lot of things” (SRI 5:23).

Essentially, Helena had come to the conclusion that the sign for ‘pulka’ (/SLED/) could appear without the sign for ‘åker’ (/RIDE/) because ‘/SLED/’ is an unambiguous sign that can only mean ‘sled’. The sign for ‘tefat’ (/SAUCER/), however, is more like a classifier, used to represent an infinite array of round objects. So, the sign for ‘åker’ (/RIDE/) is necessary in order to demonstrate which meaning of ‘tefat’ (/SAUCER/) is being used. Whether this is the whole explanation for why ‘åker’ is signed in some instances and not in others, I am not sure. It is, however, a much clearer and more satisfying explanation than Helena had offered her students in class. Helena acknowledged that her initial explanation was unsatisfactory in her concluding
remark on the topic: “Maybe I should point out that ‘/SAUCER/’ can mean everything, a lot of things” (SRI 5:23).

I discussed two other goal oriented episodes in the section on Helena’s engagement style: the translation of ‘kan stanna’ (can stay) into Teckenspråk and the uses of the prepositions ‘på’ (on) and ‘i’ (in) in Swedish and Teckenspråk. In both of these cases, Helena did not offer her students any explanation for the differences between the two languages, but she commented on her lack of explanation in her stimulated recall interview.

In the first case—with ‘kan stanna’ (can stay)—after watching the episode in which she told her students that the order of ‘kan’ (can) and ‘stanna’ (stay) is often reversed in Teckenspråk, Helena interrupted the video to make this comment: “I think most are generally like, “K!” (absent expression). But, I think they will understand. You know, I just want them to be aware: Sign language, Swedish, are different languages. If they really understand what’s different right here? Maybe they won’t. But I think, in the end, they’re going to understand the difference. So, right now it’s not that important, ‘You have to know the difference.’ Just let them be aware” (SRI 5:50).

In contrast, after reviewing the video of herself telling the students about the uses of ‘på’ (on) and ‘i’ (in) in Swedish and Teckenspråk—and then reviewing tape of them continuing to use the sign for ‘på’ incorrectly—Helena offered a slightly negative assessment of her own performance. “I didn’t do it very well, the difference between ‘på’ and ‘i’,” she said. “Maybe I should have some more examples. ‘When do you use på? When do you use i?’ (SRI 5:29).” Helena further explained that her goal was “to use real sign language” with the students, but that she finds it very difficult because they are often confused. “It’s too confusing,” she speculated. “Maybe I’m not good at explaining” (SRI 5:10). Regardless, Helena felt that the most important
thing was to keep reminding her students of the differences between Swedish and Teckenspråk so that they wouldn’t think that Teckenspråk was simply a signed version of Swedish.

“Sometimes the students—when I say you’re going to have to sign—they try to look at the text, you know, memorize the text (mimics staring at the text and then looking away), and “tch- tch-tch-” (mimics signing methodically), follow what the text said. And they think that’s sign language. (laughs) […] I haven’t seen it with these students. But I’ve seen it other students that I’ve had. So, you have to explain, be aware, it’s coming” (SRI 5:10).

Helena was also dissatisfied with her own explanation when she watched the tape of herself explaining the word ‘olydig’ (disobedient) to her students. In Swedish, ‘o-’ is a prefix meaning ‘not’, so its addition to the word ‘lydig’ (obedient) results in ‘olydig’ (disobedient). The dog in the book they were reading was described as ‘olydig’ (disobedient), and Helena’s students didn’t know how to sign the word. “It’s a hard word,” Helena explained in her stimulated recall interview. “Looking back, actually, I should have brought up more examples, not only this one. Because this (/O/), the ‘-o’ is small, is connected to ‘not’. It’s something that’s not allowed. So when I see this one, I say, “OK, I should actually have more examples. Not only this one. Because these kind of, these types of words show up more frequently later on” (SRI 5:2).

Knowledge of Learners

In this section, the evidence relevant to Helena’s knowledge of her students as learners is presented. The section is divided into the following five subsections: input enhancement strategies, selection of content, use of metalanguage, comprehension checks, and awareness of sociocultural issues.
**Input enhancement strategies.**

I observed Helena using three different strategies for enhancing grammar input for her students: 1) bringing students who were signing to the front of the room so that everyone could see them, 2) writing on the board, and 3) adding emphasis, often with non-manual markers, to significant signs she produced.

First, Helena asked her students to come to the front of the room whenever they wanted to make a contribution in class so that all the other students would have visual access to their signed input. Recall that she turned Tim’s shoulders so that his signing was directed toward the class, and gently pulled back the hood of Olle’s sweatshirt so that his classmates could see the upper part of his face. Furthermore, when students made brief contributions from their seats, such as single-word answers, Helena would repeat their answers for the benefit of the other students.

Second, Helena used the Smart board and the white board as means of input enhancement. In her lessons on adjectives and verbs, for example, she wrote the words ‘adjective’ and ‘verb’ on the board to call attention to their significance. In the case of verbs, she also used the Smart board to record all the examples of verbs generated by the students and then drew a bracket around those words and labeled the category ‘verb’. Similarly, when she was teaching the students about the possessive ‘-s’ in Swedish, she used the white board to illustrate the special case of nouns that end in ‘s’. As described in the section on Helena’s engagement style, she used the board to emphasize the difference between the possessive forms of Angela and Karlos by writing the following:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Angela + s} & \rightarrow \text{Angelas} \\
\text{Karlos + s} & \rightarrow \text{Karloss} \\
\text{Karlos} & \rightarrow \text{Karlos}
\end{align*}
\]
Finally, on one occasion, Helena used the white board to clarify the difference between the present and past tense forms of a verb. She had written the verb ‘såg’ (saw) on the board, and in response to a student’s question about its meaning, she wrote the word ‘ser’ (see)—a word he already knew—and explained the difference.

Helena’s third, and most prominent, input enhancement strategy was her use of exaggerated facial expressions and body movements to call students’ attention to significant grammar points. I discussed Helena’s dramatic presentation style in the section on ‘Engagement style.’ While she regularly used larger-than-life expressions and movements to keep her students’ attention, Helena was particularly dramatic when she wanted to call students’ attention to significant grammar points. Helena used this input enhancement strategy extensively in her lesson on the possessive ‘-s’, for example. Throughout this lesson, Helena’s production of the sign indicating possession was particularly emphatic, as was her production of the finger-spelled letter ‘-s’, which she used to demonstrate the Swedish spelling of the possessive form. As she produced each of these signs, she would lean forward as though the momentum of the sign was pulling on her body, shape her hand firmly into the sign, and then hold it there for a moment or two longer than was typical. In this way, it is likely that even someone completely unfamiliar with Teckenspråk would have been able to watch this lesson and identify the most important signs Helena was producing.

Helena regularly used this technique to emphasize the points she was making about Swedish and Teckenspråk grammar. In her lesson on the Swedish pronoun ‘jag’ (I), for example, she exaggerated her production of the sign ‘/DOG/’, the noun to whom the pronoun ‘jag’ was referring, and then engaged her whole body to point at the picture of the dog on the Smart board in order to further emphasize the point. She similarly exaggerated the sign for ‘en’ (one/a) when
she was calling her students’ attention to the indefinite article, and the signs ‘på’ (on), and ‘i’ (in) when she wanted them to notice the use of these Swedish prepositions. In her lesson on adjectives, Helena used exaggerated facial expressions and body movements to produce each adjective that she offered as an example. She made a disgusted face while producing the sign for ‘smutsig’ (dirty); she made a sympathetic face while producing the sign for ‘snäll’ (kind); and she extended her hands away from her body more than is typical in her creation of the sign ‘fin’ (beautiful). She also leaned dramatically from side to side, bending at the knees, between the production of each new adjective, thereby using her body as a non-manual marker to indicate a break between each word in the list. Helena’s presentation of words in the ‘verb’ category was even more dramatic. In this lesson, she not only produced the signs for each verb, but literally acted them out, moving around the front of the room, becoming the rolling, twirling, dancing, stopping wheelchair she was describing. Again, it would have been difficult for a visitor unfamiliar with Teckenspråk to miss the point that Helena was focusing on ‘action’ words.

**Selection of content.**

The evidence suggests that Helena put great effort into choosing content that was both interesting to her students and at their current language levels.

Above all, Helena believed strongly that content should be interesting to students. During her pre-observation interview, she shared a story of a powerful early teaching experience that influenced how she thought about the selection of content. The colleagues she was working with at the time had encouraged her to work with the book they were using to teach language. Helena found the book “boring” because it was so repetitive. “It didn’t feel OK for me,” she remembered, “but I was a beginner. I trusted them” (POI 4:17). After teaching with the book for a while, however, Helena noticed that her first grade students did not want to read it: “They were
like, ‘Oh my gosh! We don’t want to read, to have this book anymore.’” Helena said she learned
the following lesson from that experience: “The book is a very important, what kind of a book,
what kind of students you have. So, I’ve changed because I have a book that is not repeating all
the time. If the student needs it, yeah, then I have that kind of a book. But if they’re learning in
the normal way, you have to have a book that they can identify with” (POI 4:17).

Helena applied this knowledge later in her teaching career when she encountered a fifth
grade class who had learned to dislike Swedish. “Many of them,” she recalled, “were like ‘Don’t
teach me Swedish!’” Helena speculated that their previous teachers had not found content that
motivated the students to read. “You should not destroy the happiness,” she explained:

They should feel the joy of studying. Because I have made mistakes myself,
especially in the beginning. I was like, “No, you have to read.” […] And they
were dying every time. They were bored. But now I’ve learned, as fast as you see
that they are (mimics refusing to pay attention), then you have to change the book.
That’s what I did with the boys in the small class. They were (mimics refusing).
‘We’ll take another book. That’s OK! That’s fine.’ They said, ‘This is boring.’
‘Fine! We’ll take another book. That’s OK.’ Then you find another book, and then
it was, ‘Ah!’ Reading. You have to bryta (break) (mimics breaking something,
like a stick, between her hands). You have to dare not to walk in the same steps
all the time. You have to think in new ways. […] Sometimes teachers are like,
‘The goal is here. You want to go this way. You go this way’ (signs /GOAL/
repeatedly). And they stop listening to the students. Because you really want them
to read this thing, but you need to be flexible. (POI 4:22)

In accordance with her view that students should be interested in what they are studying,
Helena worked to ensure that the students understood the meaning of what they were reading
before she focused their attention on form. She explained that when they read a new book, they
always talk about the pictures first, deriving the meaning of the book from its illustrations.

“When they’re totally clear about the meaning of the book, or the goal of it,” she explained,
“then we talk about the text afterwards. […] It’s too much to have both at the same time, to have
context and the text at the same time. So you try to focus first to understand what it’s all about
and then, afterwards, focus on the text” (POI 4:18). Helena criticized her own lesson on adjectives because the worksheet she had given students included unfamiliar vocabulary. “I don’t think it was a very good lesson,” she reflected, “because they weren’t aware of these words, just a few of them. So I should have taken that up before I started to give this out. I should have been talking about those [words] because they were very new for them” (SRI 5:14).

Second, Helena chose content based on her assessment of the students’ needs and abilities. Her choice to focus on the pronoun ‘jag’ (I), for example, was motivated by her observation that many of her students had difficulty interpreting pronouns in their reading. “I’ve found there are problems sometimes,” she said, “especially when they’re small: It’s ‘me’, ‘her’, and ‘he’. And then often they think about, ‘Me’, ‘me’, I am a dog.’ So, that’s why I want to, ‘Who is ‘me’?’ That’s why I want to point it out, so they will think, ‘All right, it’s not me.’ Because often you sign ‘/ME/’. But it’s not me. ‘I’m the dog.’ […] When they get older, often it says ‘he’ or ‘she’. They have problems that: ‘Who? Oh.’ They don’t think about who it is” (SRI 5:1).

Similarly, Helena was planning to introduce verb tense to her first graders based on her perception of what they were able to handle at that time. At their current level, she believed that students were only ready to identify verbs in familiar text, but she believed they would be ready to talk more in depth about tense soon. “Not right now,” she said, “but very very soon” (SRI 5:45). She speculated that her colleague, who also teaches the first grade, would think that it was too soon. “She always wants me to wait,” she explained. “I’m more like, ‘Yeah, Come on! They can do this. They can do that.’ […] I think it’s important to start early” (SRI 5:46).

In another example, Helena wanted to teach her students about the use of the word ‘skriva’ (to write) in Swedish and Teckenspråk, but she recognized that this would be a complex topic because the word itself was new to most of her students. In Swedish, as in English, the word
'skriva' (to write) is complex at the semantic level, since it can mean many different things. One can ‘write’ on paper with a pen, for example, but one can also ‘write’ in the air with a finger, or ‘write’ in the dark with a flashlight, or ‘write’ on the refrigerator with letter-shaped magnets.

Furthermore, when students are translating between Swedish and Teckenspråk, the word ‘skriva’ becomes complex at the syntactic level. In Swedish, the word ‘skriva’ is often coupled with a preposition, such as ‘på’ (on) or ‘i’ (in), to indicate the surface or medium being affected by the writing. As previously discussed, prepositions are handled differently in Teckenspråk and Swedish because, in Teckenspråk, the signer has the ability to inflect the verb itself in order to indicate the surface or medium involved. To indicate ‘writing on the wall’ in Teckenspråk, for example, the signer would adjust her hand position while producing the sign ‘/WRITE/’ in order to indicate that the writing was being done on a vertical plane. Production of the sign ‘/ON/’ would be unnecessary and incorrect in this case. Recognizing the layered complexity associated with the word ‘skriva’, Helena chose to focus students’ attention on the different meanings of ‘skriva’ in Swedish before she focused on its translation to Teckenspråk.

I wanted them to practice at home on the word ‘write’. [...] If they understood the word ‘write’, doing homework and doing the text at home, it would be much easier to discuss going more in depth afterward. Because if I’m just putting in everything in the same time, it would be too confusing. So it’s much better, then, to do the homework first. Let it sink in. And then, afterwards, I can put more effort into going more in depth about ‘writing on what.’ And also talk about the sign language, the homework they’ve been doing, to make them understand that ‘writing’ is not only ‘writing’ like this (/WRITE(-on-a-horizontal-plane)/), but ‘writing’ is in different ways. (SRI 5:31)

In other grammar areas, Helena did not feel her students were ready for the content at all. The use of the Swedish definite article (-en, -et) was one such area. In a shared reading, Helena and the students had come upon the sentence, ‘Jag kan skriva på vägen’ (I can write on the road). Olle, who was signing the sentence for the class, got stuck on the word ‘vägen’. “/V-Ä-
G/,” Helena responded. “What does ‘/V-Ä-G/’ mean?” Dennis responded by signing ‘/ROAD/’, and Olle was able to complete his translation of the sentence into Teckenspråk. After watching this exchange during the stimulated recall interview, Helena stopped the tape to make this comment: “If you want, you can use ‘vägen’, ‘the road’. I was fingerspelling ‘road’. I didn’t say ‘the road’. I just said ‘väg’, ‘road’. I didn’t explain it was actually, especially, this road. I think it was too much information. I just said ‘road’. Enough. I was not pointing out a special road. If they asked me about ‘-en’, ‘vägen’, ‘the road’, then I would explain to them. But as long as they don’t ask about the ‘-en’, it’s enough for me to just tell them now, “It’s ‘road’” (SRI 5:34).

Finally, in regard to other grammatical content, Helena felt it was important to expose her students to the concepts, but not to “nag” them too much or insist that they produce the constructions correctly. She felt this way about the Swedish word ‘åka’ (to ride) and its grammatical translation in Teckenspråk. She chose to raise this fairly complex issue with her first graders largely because one student, Anna, had demonstrated a readiness for it. “She’s talking a lot about this…because her mom is deaf. So she’s always saying, ‘Why do you say ‘åker’?’ So I am very, very aware that she would point at this. So, that’s why I’m taking it up. It’s kind of high level, anyway, for them to understand” (SRI 5:22). Helena named three other students who might also be ready to think about the difference between Swedish and Teckenspråk regarding the verb ‘åker’, but, generally, she felt this content was beyond the conceptual reach of her first graders and did not expect them to produce accurate translations of the verb.

Helena took a similar approach to the word order difference between Swedish and Teckenspråk regarding the modal ‘kan’ (can). While ‘stolen kan stanna’ (the chair can stay), for example, is the only acceptable word order in Swedish, a more common production of this idea
in Teckenspråk would be ‘/CHAIR STAY CAN(head-nod)/,’ with the head-nod and modal-last word order used to emphasize the chair’s special ability. Helena chose to call the students’ attention to this difference, but she did not speak at any length about it or expect her students to produce the construction in Teckenspråk themselves. “I just want them to be aware,” she said (SRI 5:50). Helena also wanted her students to be “aware” of the use of prepositions, specifically ‘på’ (on) and ‘i’ (in), in Swedish and Teckenspråk, but she did not expect them to produce accurate translations to Teckenspråk of Swedish sentences containing these words. “They’re still very young,” she explained (SRI 5:4).

**Use of metalanguage.**

In my observations, Helena rarely used metalanguage. She used the terms ‘verb’ (verb) and ‘adjektiv’ (adjective) to describe the set of words in those categories, but she did not use metalanguage in her discussions of any of the following grammar areas: tense, pronouns, prepositions, auxiliary verbs, articles, or the possessive form.

Helena did not comment extensively on her decisions about when to use and when not to use metalanguage. In her stimulated recall interview, she did explain that she felt it was important to ground any grammatical discussions in meaningful texts. Otherwise, she said, “it doesn’t give you the feeling. It’s just terms” (SRI 5:46). She also repeatedly expressed the sentiment that her first graders were “too young” or “too small” for in depth grammatical explanations. For example, when Helena addressed the Teckenspråk translation of the Swedish verb ‘åka’ (to ride) with her students, she felt it was “enough” to tell them that Swedish and Teckenspråk are “different languages.” With older students, though, she said she would explain the concept of ‘hjälpverb’ (auxiliary verbs), as well as ‘subject’ and ‘predicate’.
Comprehension checks.

I observed Helena using two methods to assess her students’ comprehension of grammar points. First, she continually scanned their facial expressions and body language. Second, she would pose very specific questions.

Helena watched her students closely for signs of comprehension. This was most obvious when Helena saw evidence that the students did not understand, such as blank or confused expressions. After she had explained that the Swedish phrase ‘kan stanna’ (can stay) should be translated as ‘/STAY CAN/’ in Teckenspråk, Helena commented on her students’ reactions: “I think most is generally like, ‘K!’ (absent expression),” (SRI 5:50). Helena also watched her students’ facial expressions and body language closely while they were signing in order to ensure that they were not mindlessly copying signs she had just produced. Helena mimicked for me what it looked like when her students copied her signs mindlessly: “If they’re only doing this, like a parrot,” she said, “they don’t understand the text” (SRI 5:8).

In these cases, Helena would use her second strategy to assess their level of comprehension more directly: posing very specific questions. Helena would push her students to identify and sign particular words in the text in order to confirm that they understood what they were reading. She did this during whole class shared readings and during one-on-one reading practice with individual students. Helena explained one such comprehension check in the stimulated recall interview: “When they were signing like this [copying signs]…, I said, ‘OK, the word you were signing,’ like ‘duktig’ (clever), ‘can you find the word here in the text?’ And then they’d point at the word” (SRI 5:8). This strategy primarily helped Helena ascertain her students’ comprehension of vocabulary, but it also forced her students to focus on the elements of sentences in Swedish and the order in which those elements occurred. Helena also asked
questions to assess her students’ understanding when she taught the lesson on possessive ‘-s’. In this lesson, she asked each individual student to tell her what they needed to add to their names in order to indicate possession. Each student answered correctly. After watching this lesson on tape, Helena commented, “It seems like they really understand in the end” (SRI 5:27).

**Awareness of sociocultural issues.**

Helena’s awareness of the sociocultural issues surrounding deafness and sign language was evidenced in two ways: 1) through her insistence on the status of Swedish and Teckenspråk as different languages, and 2) through the attention she paid to her students’ identities as deaf and hard of hearing people.

First, Helena was determined to make her students aware that Swedish and Teckenspråk are different languages, even if she did not expect them to understand the particular grammar constructs that composed that difference. “I just want them to be aware,” she explained, “sign language, Swedish, are different languages. If they really understand what’s different right here? Maybe they won’t. But I think, in the end, they’re gonna understand the difference” (SRI 5:50).

Helena repeatedly emphasized the importance of her students seeing the difference between signed Swedish and “real sign language” (SRI 5:10). Recall that fluent sign language has traditionally been considered a prerequisite for membership in Deaf culture, and signed versions of the spoken language are frowned upon in the Deaf community.

Second, as I describe above in the section on Helena’s ‘model’ teacher characteristics, Helena made it an instructional priority to address her students’ identities as deaf and hard of hearing people. I observed her, for example, telling her students how “clever” they were because they knew how to translate between two languages—Swedish and Teckenspråk—just like the person who had translated their *Kiwi* (Körling, 2006) book from English to Swedish. Later, I
observed a class devoted to the creation of ‘A-B-C’ books, in which the pictures used to represent each letter were based not on the initial sound of the word in Swedish, but on the handshape of the word’s sign in Teckenspråk. By engaging her students in this activity, Helena was implicitly communicating the point that Teckenspråk and Swedish share equal status as languages.

**Summary**

Helena demonstrated at least some evidence of all nine descriptors of model teachers (see Table 6) outlined in Nilskolan’s “Pedagogical Guidelines” document (see Appendix A). Her attention to Swedish vocabulary (VS), learning Swedish through print (Sw), and literacy (Li) were in strong evidence in both her reading and writing lessons. Her reading lesson was also rich in evidence of attention to expressive Teckenspråk (ET), while her writing lesson was rich in evidence of attention to expressive Swedish (ES) and differentiated instruction (DI). Helena’s attention to her students’ identities as deaf and hard of hearing people (Id) was evidenced primarily in the field notes, and her attention to speech and hearing (SH) was evidenced only in the field notes. Although the episodes in which Helena focused on speech and hearing (SH) were few, there was strong evidence that she took the opportunity to encourage individual students to use their speech and hearing when it was pedagogically and philosophically appropriate. Finally, Helena paid little attention, overall, to Teckenspråk vocabulary (VT). I can only speculate that her lack of attention to Teckenspråk vocabulary (VT) was due to her perception that her students already had strong Teckenspråk vocabularies and/or that her approach to Teckenspråk vocabulary instruction was more communicative, and less explicit, than her approach to Swedish vocabulary instruction.
Turning now to Helena’s grammatical Teacher Language Awareness (TLA), Helena held strong ‘Beliefs and Feelings about Language and Language Teaching.’ Her experiences learning grammar herself were negative, but her feelings about grammar and its role in language learning remained positive, as long as a balance could be maintained between the grammatical and communicative aspects of language. Helena was also generally confident in her knowledge of Swedish and Teckenspråk and her ability to teach them, though she felt less confident in her ability to explain the grammatical differences between the two languages. Helena perceived her students’ feelings about grammar to be somewhat negative; she avoided too much grammar instruction for fear of boring her students. Helena saw two roles for grammar instruction: helping her students understand written Swedish and helping them produce proper Teckenspråk. For Helena, these two goals were interdependent; she worked continually to help her students compare the grammars of Swedish and Teckenspråk with the aim of improving their knowledge of both languages. Helena felt the influence of five stakeholders on her work: the Kiwi literacy curriculum (Körling, 2006), Nilskolan’s administration, the national Education agency, her colleagues, and her students’ parents.

An independent rater testified to Helena’s native-like ‘Language Proficiency’ in both Swedish and Teckenspråk. Helena also believed herself to be proficient in both languages. She reported that she was an accurate and effective user of both Swedish and Teckenspråk. As a hard of hearing woman who was raised bilingually in Swedish and Teckenspråk, Helena could not rightly be said to have the non-native speaker advantage, but she made extensive use of her bilingualism in comparing the two languages for the benefit of her students.

Helena demonstrated a high level of ‘Explicit Language Knowledge.’ She tended to use an inquiry oriented engagement style the majority of the time, but she used a more goal oriented
Helena’s approach to grammar instruction was characterized by her general opposition to error correction with first graders, as she believed it could discourage students. With few exceptions, she provided students with language input at their level. Regarding explanations of grammar points, she tended to offer clearer explanations during inquiry-oriented lessons and less clear explanations during goal-oriented lessons, most of which focused on the grammatical differences between Swedish and Teckenspråk.

Helena demonstrated a deep ‘Knowledge of Learners.’ She effectively used three **input enhancement** strategies: asking students to sign at the front of the room, writing on the board, and adding emphasis to significant signs. The evidence suggested that Helena selected content that was interesting to students and at their current language levels. Helena rarely used **metalanguage**, believing her students to be too young for a heavy focus on terminology. She had two methods for **checking comprehension**: watching students’ facial expressions and body language and posing specific questions. Helena demonstrated **sociocultural awareness** through her commitment to making students aware that Swedish and Teckenspråk are different languages and through the attention she paid to her students’ identities as deaf and hard of hearing people.

**Grammatical TLA in the Context of Bilingual Deaf Education**

Taken together, the portraits of Christel and Helena presented in this chapter offer insight into a previously unexplored construct: grammatical Teacher Language Awareness (TLA) in the context of bilingual deaf education. While the TLA of teachers of the deaf has much in common with the TLA of other L2 teachers, there are some characteristics of Christel’s and Helena’s TLA that seem unique to the context of bilingual deaf education. These characteristics can be categorized under five different components of TLA: 1) the role of grammar instruction, 2)
selection of content, 3) input enhancement strategies, 4) comprehension checks, and 5) awareness of sociocultural issues.

First, consider the role of grammar instruction. Christel’s and Helena’s overall goals for teaching grammar—to improve their students’ literacy and face-to-face communication—are similar to those of many L2 teachers of hearing children. Furthermore, these goals can be seen as interdependent in both hearing and deaf language learning contexts, in that helping students improve their literacy can help them become more skilled language users, and vice versa. Where the difference arises is in the fact that—for most of the students Christel and Helena teach—literacy is the sole instructional goal in one language (Swedish) and face-to-face communication is the sole instructional goal in the other (Teckenspråk). This is because Teckenspråk has no written form, and—for deaf students—Swedish has no ‘spoken’ form. Therefore, for Christel’s and Helena’s students, the act of writing, as well as the act of reading aloud, are also always acts of translation. This adds a level of complexity and abstraction to the language and literacy learning experience for which the teacher’s grammatical TLA must compensate. Christel’s and Helena’s consistent but patient focus on form in the elementary grades was an important way in which they bridged the gap between Swedish literacy and Teckenspråk face-to-face communication. This gap is simply not present in hearing L2 contexts, where it is possible to teach children to read and write without also teaching them a new language, and—conversely—it is possible to teach students a new language without also teaching them to read and write.

Second, Christel’s and Helena’s decisions regarding the selection of content were often motivated by the modality differences between signed and spoken languages, a concern absent in hearing L2 contexts. Both teachers focused on prepositions and the copula, and Christel additionally focused on articles, particles, and tense. These grammatical forms tend to function
very differently in signed and spoken languages, and they are thus particularly challenging for deaf learners.

Third, the *input enhancement strategies* used by Christel and Helena differed in some fairly obvious ways from those typically used in L2 contexts with hearing children. When students are only able to access language in a visual form, for example, it is an absolute necessity both that the students be able to see each other when they are signing and that all of the students be able to see the text when they are reading. Thus, the requirement that each student who wishes to contribute to the conversation come to the front of the room—which would be odd in a hearing L2 setting—is quite natural in the deaf education context. Similarly, it makes sense that Christel and Helena chose to do a shared reading of each new book, either with a large print edition or on the Smart board, so that each student could see the text and follow along with the instruction. Furthermore, while writing on the board is a strategy used by many L2 teachers, it is often entirely necessary in deaf education, where most students are only able to access the spoken language via print. Finally, Christel’s and Helena’s extensive and dramatic use of facial expressions and body movements to highlight important information was simply the visual equivalent of changes in intonation in a hearing L2 context.

Fourth, regarding *comprehension checks*, Christel and Helena both made use of two techniques that—although not unique to deaf education—were unique in their degree of usefulness in deaf education context: 1) checking their students’ written work in Swedish, and 2) asking their students to translate Swedish text into Teckenspråk. In fact, because their students, by and large, could not speak or hear Swedish, these were the only two techniques Christel and Helena had at their disposal for assessing their students’ knowledge of the Swedish language. Students’ written work was the only window Christel and Helena had on their students’
expressive Swedish, and students’ signed translations were the only window on their receptive Swedish. Additionally, the very nature of spoken-to-signed translations is another way in which the deaf bilingual context differs from L2 contexts with hearing children. Specifically, because signed languages contain many iconic elements, the ability to assess a student’s comprehension is increased when they are translating from a written language to a signed one. In many cases, it is as though the student is painting a picture of their understanding of the text, and it is thus literally possible to see the extent of their understanding.

Finally, with respect to the teachers’ awareness of sociocultural issues, there were two ways in which Christel’s and Helena’s TLA seemed distinct from that of L2 teachers in hearing contexts. First, both teachers made it an instructional priority to address their students’ identities as deaf and hard of hearing people. Second, Christel expressed an explicit concern for the preservation of sign language. Both of these differences stem from the fact that deafness represents not only a linguistic and cultural difference, but also a difference in physical ability. Teachers of the deaf, unlike L2 language teachers, are faced with the challenge of helping their students develop strong identities as multilingual members of Deaf culture, when many people will see them as merely disabled. It is for this reason that Christel and Helena emphasized the advantages of knowing sign language and devoted instructional time to encouraging their students to see themselves as multilingual. Similarly, Christel’s concern with the preservation of sign language is grounded in her philosophical stance that deafness is primarily a linguistic and cultural difference, rather than a disability. Sign language is only worth preserving if it is viewed as a legitimate language associated with a strong, cultural identity, rather than as an instructional crutch meant only to help hearing impaired children learn the spoken language.
Mine is the first study explicitly concerned with describing grammatical TLA in the context of bilingual deaf education, so this work is necessarily exploratory in nature. While much more research is needed to fully explicate the nature of TLA in deaf education, the portraits presented in this chapter are a starting point from which to consider means of improving language teacher education for pre-service and in-service teachers of the deaf. In Chapter V, I suggest pedagogical applications for these portraits in teacher education programs.
In Chapter I, I presented the basic argument for the use of portraiture in language teacher education. Essentially, the argument goes like this: 1) Language teacher education programs do not adequately prepare teachers for the complex realities of classroom teaching; 2) teacher portraits of high quality teachers are valuable because they authentically represent classroom practice; 3) such portraits can prompt teacher learners to critically examine, and thus improve, their own practice.

In this chapter, I will unpack the above argument by addressing the following questions: 1) In what ways do language teacher educator programs fail to prepare teachers for the complex realities of classroom teaching?; 2) In what ways is the representation of classroom practice found in teacher portraits valuable?; and 3) In what ways can such portraits prompt teacher learners to examine and improve their practice? Question 1 will be addressed in the first section:
The Problem of Transfer; question 2 will be addressed in the second session: The Unique Value of Portraiture; and question 3 will be addressed in the third section: The Use of Portraiture. In the final section, Questions that Remain, I discuss important questions for future work in this area.

The Problem of Transfer

In 1988, Julian Edge wrote the following introduction to his article, ‘Applying Linguistics in English Language Teacher Training for Speakers of Other Languages’:

Most of all, this article is addressed to colleagues in EFL/ESL teacher training who have had unhappy experiences either as trainees or trainers with the Linguistics or Applied Linguistics components of pre-service training courses. In my experience, the waste involved in these courses can be prodigious: the wasted time and effort of the lecturers, who complain of the apathy or stupidity of their students; the wasted time and effort of the students, who complain of the irrelevance and jargonized complexity of the subject, as well as the indifference to language teaching of their lecturers. Worst of all is the waste of potential—the continuing alienation of generations of language teachers from an area of knowledge which should be a source of constant support to them. (Edge, 1988, p. 9)

Edge wrote the above statement nearly 25 years ago, but it still rings true. There is substantial evidence, in the literature reviewed for this paper alone, that teachers still struggle to apply the grammar content taught in their teacher preparation programs to their language teaching (Andrews, 1997b; Bigelow & Ranney, 2005; Burns & Knox, 2005; Popko, 2005). The fact that the disconnect between language teacher education and grammar teaching persists is testimony to the difficulty of the undertaking: Teaching teachers how to teach grammar is hard on a number of levels. First, many students preparing to be language teachers do not understand grammar well themselves. Second, as the portraits presented in Chapter IV demonstrate, the process of grammar teaching requires far more than an understanding of how grammar works and the ability to explain it; it also involves an integrated understanding of language assessment, language learning, and the goals and methods appropriate to a given group of learners in a
particular context. Last, and perhaps most dauntingly, the contexts in which teachers learn about how to teach language do not look like the contexts in which they will be expected to teach it, so there is the problem of transfer.

Bartels (2005a) explores the problem of transfer with respect to teachers’ language knowledge. He reviews the research on teachers’ use of their knowledge about language (KAL) through a cognitive lens, focusing specifically on the construct of knowledge transfer. The fact that language teachers struggle to transfer their KAL into their classrooms concerns him, but it does not surprise. “Research on knowledge transfer has shown,” he explains, “that we humans are remarkably poor in transferring knowledge” (p. 407). Furthermore, our ability to transfer knowledge is influenced greatly by the similarity, or dissimilarity, between the “practice tasks (i.e. what is done in the university setting)” and the “target tasks (i.e. what L2 teachers do in schools)” (p. 408). The similarity between these two types of tasks is relevant at both the surface level, or what the task looks like, and at a deeper level, the invisible processes one engages in while performing the task. The research also shows that novices are even more dependent on the surface level similarities that facilitate transfer than those with experience, meaning that “it may be especially important for novice teachers to have educational experiences in their teacher education programs which are clearly similar to the experiences they will have as teachers” (p. 408).

Bartels (2005a) details the characteristics of teacher education experiences that will best facilitate teachers’ transfer of language knowledge to the target tasks involved in teaching language. Overall, Bartels argues, teacher education students should engage in practice tasks that are highly similar to the target tasks: They “should work on solving the kind of problems of procedure and understanding that language teachers regularly face in their practice” (p. 417). In
so doing, he argues, they can begin to “develop schemata of language learners and language
teaching,” which they will need to draw on in their work as teachers. Finally, Bartels argues, the
responsibility of preparing students to transfer their language knowledge to the classroom falls
not only on the Applied Linguistics instructor, but on the entire teacher education program:
“Cohesion” among the courses in the program will help teachers to integrate the various kinds of
knowledge (e.g., language acquisition, assessment, methods) that they will need to draw on in
order to teach language effectively (p. 417).

Essentially, Bartels (2005a) is encouraging teacher education programs to acknowledge and
address the two features of the knowledge base of language teaching that Johnston and Goettsch
(2000) argue are often overlooked: “the process-oriented nature of the knowledge base and the
interconnectedness of the various categories of knowledge” (“The Knowledge Base,” para. 1).
According to Johnston and Goettsch, the process-oriented nature of the knowledge base—a
notion that “runs counter to the usual image of a ‘knowledge base’ as a repository of inert
facts”—means that teacher education programs should “emphasize processes in a whole range of
areas from learning about language itself (in the mode of discovery learning), to the formulation
of rules for students, the production of examples, on-the-spot adjudication of students’ own
sentences, and so on” (“The Knowledge Base,” para. 3). The interconnectedness of the
knowledge base means that we need to rethink the traditional design of language teacher
education programs, in which Methods, Linguistics, Second Language Acquisition, and
Assessment courses are taught separately. “Language teaching methods do not, or should not,
exist in isolation from how language learners learn,” they argue, and “this, in turn, should not be
considered apart from the structure of the language that they are seeking to learn” (“The
Knowledge Base,” para. 7).
Many of the researchers whose work is reviewed in Chapter II are in agreement with Johnston and Goettsch (2000) that the design of language teacher education programs needs to be rethought in a way that better acknowledges the interconnected and process-oriented nature of the knowledge base of language teaching. Bigelow and Ranney (2005), for example, explain that, prior to conducting their research, they believed that the linguistics courses in their program “built KAL [knowledge about language] that would be applied to instructional planning in the pedagogy courses, not the reverse” (p. 198). What they found, however, was that “pedagogical skills and KAL develop together and may benefit from being kept together” (p. 198), meaning that teacher learners should not be made to wait until their practicum experiences to start thinking about how language knowledge is realized in the practice of teaching.

Popko (2005) found that most of the novice teachers he observed were “undisciplined” about applying their knowledge about language (KAL), and they also felt that the linguistics courses in their teacher education program had not been helpful. “A major problem,” Popko argues, “was the lack of overt connection between declarative and procedural knowledge, between KAL and the classroom. […] Perhaps teaching about language in linguistics courses and grammar courses, with separate methodology courses, is not the best way to approach ESL teacher preparation. Language knowledge itself seems to be helpful, but no knowledge is helpful without application” (p. 402).

Haim et al. (2004) also argue for a better integration of knowledge and practice in teacher education programs. In their study, teachers’ language knowledge was shown to have “a pervasive influence on all aspects of instruction” (p. 872). Thus, the researchers argued, it is important not only that teacher education programs be “designed in such a way as to help student teachers acquire deep well-organized knowledge of various aspects and domains of their subject
matter” but that they also “be made aware of the *instructional dimensions* [emphasis added] in which these aspects manifest themselves” (p. 872). Burns and Knox (2005) have added their voices to the chorus, as well:

One of the main lessons we have absorbed from our research is that it cannot be assumed that teaching Masters courses in SFL [systemic functional linguistics] will lead to teachers using it in their classrooms. […] We now feel strongly that teacher educators teaching SFL (and probably any other forms of grammatical KAL [knowledge about language]), need to provide their students with explicit tools for pedagogy, in combination with the grammatical tools themselves. […] We are suggesting that students could be apprenticed into practical applications through grounded and contextualized action and problem-based activities alongside their theoretical developments in KAL. (p. 257)

Essentially, what each of these researchers is arguing is that it is simply not enough for language teacher educators to help their students develop the *knowledge* they will need to teach language; they also need to help their students develop an *awareness*, in the words of Andrews (2007), of how to integrate and use that knowledge in the practice of teaching. This is Teacher Language Awareness (TLA). It is the ‘knowledge-in-action’ that the portraits presented in Chapter IV are meant to represent.

At present, many teachers are left to painstakingly develop this awareness in the act of teaching. This is problematic because they are novices at every aspect of language teaching: They are new at thinking about curriculum design, new at trying out teaching methods, new at assessing their students’ abilities, new at understanding the processes involved in language learning, and new at explaining grammar. Expecting new teachers to make sense, on their own, of how to apply all that they have learned in their teacher education programs can thus easily lead to what Bartels (2005a) describes as “cognitive overload”—a result of teachers’ lacking the schemata necessary for using their language knowledge in the classroom, and thus causing them to do an unrealistic amount of explicit processing (p. 416).
Thus, Bartels (2005b) argues, teacher education programs must do a better job of “tak[ing] into account what kind of knowledge language teachers need (as opposed to using what knowledge we can offer as a starting point) and what kinds of learning experiences will help them acquire such knowledge” (p. 1). I would like to argue that portraits of teachers’ Teacher Language Awareness (TLA) have significant value to add to teacher education programs in providing data for the target-like practice tasks that Bartels (2005a) and Johnston and Goettsch (2000) argue are necessary to enable teachers to transfer their language knowledge to the classroom. Such portraits present a process-oriented and interconnected view of the knowledge base of language teaching (“The Knowledge Base,” para. 1). They can thus be used to present teacher learners with the “kind of problems of procedure and understanding that language teachers regularly face in their practice” (Bartels, 2005a, p. 417). Furthermore, when teacher learners analyze such tasks, they must necessarily draw on the knowledge of various subject domains (e.g., language acquisition, assessment, methods). In so doing, they bring “cohesion” to the various elements of their teacher education experience (p. 417).

In the next section, I will expound on the nature of the value of teacher portraits. In the section that follows after, I will detail the kinds of learning experiences that can help teacher learners acquire the knowledge and skills they will need as language teachers.

The Unique Value of Portraiture

In this section, I will explain how portraits of teachers’ Teacher Language Awareness (TLA) have unique value to add to teacher education programs in providing data for the target-like practice tasks necessary for knowledge transfer. First, I will explain the window onto teaching offered by portraits differs importantly from that offered either by classroom observations or student teacher practica. Then, I will argue that detailed portraits of teachers’ TLA are uniquely
situated to help teachers develop the skills of reflective practitioners, skills that will likely have even more influence on their professional growth than the knowledge gained in their teacher education programs.

First, I want to express my belief that observations of experienced teachers—particularly high quality teachers—have an extremely important role to play in teacher education programs. Nothing can substitute for physically being in the room with a teacher and her students, experiencing the ebb and flow of classroom life, noticing how a teacher structures her lessons and responds to her students, and noticing, too, how the students respond to her. Classroom observations, like teacher portraits, can also offer teacher learners a view of the knowledge base of teaching that is both interconnected and process-oriented. They differ from teacher portraits, however, in that they are both fleeting and undistilled.

The permanent nature of teacher portraits allows teacher learners to revisit them again and again, providing the opportunity for them to develop deeper insights about the ways in which language knowledge is used in the classroom. Second, and perhaps more importantly, teacher portraits are distilled presentations of teachers’ practice, coherently organized around the construct of Teacher Language Awareness (TLA)—a construct that highlights both the interconnected and process-oriented components of the knowledge base of language teaching. Bartels (2005a) argues that helping teachers to organize their knowledge of language around the purposes for which it will be used in the classroom is an essential component of teacher education that will enable teachers to transfer their knowledge. Practice tasks, he explains, “should focus on helping novice teachers organize their knowledge so that relevant information triggers and is triggered by each schemata” (p. 417). Through the analysis of these theoretically-derived portraits, then, teacher learners are given the opportunity to develop their knowledge
base for language teaching in a way that both reflects the realities of classroom work and is
presented in categories around which they can begin to organize their knowledge.

Second, I would like to acknowledge the essential role that practicum experiences play in
language teacher education. Student teaching practica offer teacher learners the invaluable
opportunity to try out what they are learning with real students. Indeed, no ‘practice task’ can
come closer to the ‘target task’ than the process of actually teaching. In fact, important work is
being done to try to make this connection even more explicit for teacher learners (Porter &
Taylor, 2003; Zeichner, 2010).

The unique value of teacher portraits, however, is that they offer teacher learners the
opportunity to go into their practica experiences—as well as into their own classrooms—without
experiencing the same “cognitive overload” that they otherwise would (Bartels, 2005a, p. 416).
The problem with practica experiences, as they are typically designed, is that they are the first
opportunity teacher education students are given to use their language knowledge in an
interconnected and process-oriented way. Thus, as I describe above, teacher learners are being
asked to develop an awareness of how language knowledge is used in the act of teaching at the
same time that they are being asked to perform all the roles of classroom teaching—lesson
execution, classroom management, assessment, grammatical explanation, etc.—for the very first
time. Analysis of, and interaction with, teacher portraits can allow teacher learners the
opportunity to begin using—and thinking about—their language knowledge in an interconnected
and process-oriented way before they are asked to do so within an actual classroom.

Finally, I believe that one of the most valuable aspects of teacher portraits is the way in
which they are uniquely situated to help teachers develop the skills of reflective practitioners.
Tsui (2003) has documented the role of reflection in the professional development of teachers. In
her longitudinal study of four ESL teachers with varying levels of expertise, she found that teachers’ ability to reflect was more critical to their development of expertise than their years of experience. The findings of Andrews (2006) offer unsettling evidence in support of Tsui’s conclusion. Andrews studied the TLA of three teachers early in their teaching careers and again ten years later. What he found was an “uneven and rather limited evolution of [the] teachers’ subject-matter cognitions,” which he attributed to their failure to critically examine their own teaching and seek out knowledge (p. 16).

As Borg (1998a) explains, the process of self-reflection can be facilitated by “experience of critically examining the work of others” (p. 279). Simply put, these portraits offer teacher learners data on which they can practice the skill of reflection before they begin teaching in their own classrooms. I emphasize the word ‘before’ because of the issues of cognitive overload explained by Bartels (2005a). Just as it is unrealistic to expect teachers to develop their Teacher Language Awareness (TLA) at the same time that they are trying to acquire the myriad other skills involved in teaching, it is unrealistic to expect them to learn to become reflective practitioners in that context.

Borg (1998a) argues strongly for the use of portraits in developing teacher learners’ reflective skills. “While effective reflection implies an ability to ask incisive questions about our own teaching,” he argues, “experience of asking such questions about the work of other teachers may be necessary before we can ask them about ourselves” (p. 273). While I am not sure that I agree with Borg that reflecting on the work of others is a necessary prerequisite for reflecting on our own work, I do believe that reflecting on the work of teachers presented in portraits offers benefits that reflecting on one’s own work does not. First, assuming that the data in the portraits has come from the classrooms of high quality teachers, then the data portrays higher quality
teaching than data from the novice teacher’s classroom. Even the most reflective of novice teachers typically has only the data of a novice teacher—*herself*—to analyze in the development of teaching practice. While analyzing one’s own work is certainly critical to one’s professional development, analyzing the work of others who are more experienced may also have its own value, in offering novice teachers a window not only on themselves, but on the possible. Second, other teachers’ data are less emotionally-charged than data drawn from one’s own work, which may make learning the process of reflection easier on teacher learners just acquiring the skill.

In this section, I have explained the value of teacher portraits: They provide permanent, theoretically-grounded, and emotionally-detached data on high quality teaching that can be used in the design of the target-like practice tasks necessary for knowledge transfer and the development of reflective skills. In the section that follows, I will explain what those target-like practice tasks might look like.

**The Use of Portraiture**

**Language Awareness as Methodology**

Up until now, I have used the words ‘language awareness’ to refer, almost exclusively, to Teacher Language Awareness (TLA), or teachers’ knowledge-in-action about language and language teaching. As I discuss in Chapter II, however, the term ‘language awareness’ has its roots in the language awareness movement of the 1970s, which initially aimed to improve the language knowledge of British children. In this context, the term ‘language awareness’ was used to refer both to the *goal* of language instruction and also to the *methods* used to reach that goal (i.e. ‘language awareness activities’). Both uses of the term remain. While this double use of the term is somewhat confusing, it has the benefit of reminding us that the teaching methods we use should be closely linked to our desired outcomes. If we want language teachers to become
language aware, then we need to design teacher education methods that will prepare them to do just that.

Before beginning a discussion of methods, then, I should state plainly the goal of those methods: Teacher Language Awareness (TLA), defined as teachers’ knowledge-in-action about language and language teaching, which consists of their explicit language knowledge, knowledge of learners, language proficiency, and beliefs and feelings about language and language teaching. Importantly, the goal of language awareness instruction is not knowledge, but knowledge-in-action. Thus, the goal is not content, but process. As Wright and Bolitho (1993) explain, content—such as grammar, phonology, and semantics—are “essential…components [that] feed into a teachers’ basic knowledge about language.” They should not be, however, “where language work stops” (p. 299). Bartels (2005a) refers to the content knowledge associated with language teaching as “background knowledge,” opposed to “clinical knowledge,” which is “the principle knowledge [teachers] use in their practice” (p. 418).

Edge (1988) offers a beautifully simple description of the implications of adopting a process as the goal of language teacher education: “One is not attempting here to teach vast areas of linguistic knowledge, but rather awareness of when linguistic knowledge is what is needed, and the ability to locate, interpret, and apply that knowledge. In this sense, linguistics in the context of [teacher] training should be regarded less as a content area than as a skill area; trainees’ awareness and knowledge of the content of linguistics develop as they become more skilled in the location, interpretation, and application of the information that is available” (p. 11). In line with his beliefs, Edge chooses the term ‘applying’ linguistics, rather than ‘applied,’ because, he argues, “this emphasizes the idea of an activity rather than a content area” (p. 13).
Wright and Bolitho (1993) have embraced the notion that the goal of language teacher education is a process—namely, language awareness—and they have set themselves to the task of developing an instructional methodology to help teachers learn that process: “Language awareness, both in a broad sense (as a goal of language teacher education) and in a narrow sense (as a method), is a way of...bringing about a closer relationship between content knowledge and classroom methodology in LTE [language teacher education] courses. Language teachers are involved, not in language and teaching (separately) but in ‘language teaching’ (or teaching language) and language learning. An approach based on language awareness offers ways of enabling teachers to focus on language learning in the classroom” (p. 114). Wright (2002) points out that—despite the vast amount of research on procedures to develop the language awareness of language learners—there has been very little attention paid to the role of language awareness in language teacher education. The previous work he sites (Edge, 1988; Bolitho, 1988; Wright & Bolitho, 1993)—as well as relevant work by Borg (1994; 1998a; 1999b; 2003a)—are the foundation for the suggested methods described in this section.

**The Key Design Features of Language Awareness Methods**

Wright (2002), Wright and Bolitho (1993), and Borg (1998a; 1999b; 2003a) have described the nature of teacher education methods that make use of a language awareness methodology. The methods they describe are applicable to both pre-service and in-service teacher education contexts.

The researchers agree that all language awareness activities require two essential elements: *data* and *tasks*. “The data,” Borg (2003a) explains, constitute the text(s) that teacher learners will analyze and discuss and that will illustrate some aspect of grammar and grammar teaching” (p. 83). Though many different kinds of material qualify as data (e.g., learner language, samples of
teaching materials), portraits of teachers’ Teacher Language Awareness (TLA) will be the focus of my discussion. “The tasks,” Borg continues, “are the actual questions that first guide and then follow up on the analysis of the data” (p. 83). The researchers also agree that these data and tasks should be chosen based on several “key design features.” Although there is some variation in these features across the five articles, they converge on four central themes: 1) the use of authentic data, 2) the necessity of inductive analysis, 3) a focus on grammar knowledge-in-action, and 4) a focus on reflection. I will expound on each of these features in the sections that follow.

**Use of authentic data.**

The materials used in language awareness activities, Borg (2003a) argues, should be “extracts of grammar teaching from real grammar classrooms.” For in-service teachers, Borg explains, the use of authentic data adds “credibility” to the activities, in contrast to “classroom scenarios that have been purposefully created for the basis of teacher education activities and that experienced teachers often see within minutes as being detached from the reality of the language teaching classroom” (p. 274). Although pre-service teachers may not be so savvy at detecting contrived data, it is still essential that the data used in teacher education programs by authentic. The more realistic the data, the more similar the practice task will be to the target task of classroom teaching, and the greater the likelihood of knowledge transfer.

Borg argues further that authentic data have the added benefit of “illustrat[ing] the inherent messiness of grammar” in a way that can help “dispel misconceptions” novice teacher learners might have about the simplicity of grammar (p. 83). “Teachers’ awareness of grammatical realities,” Borg (2003a) explains, “will enable them to make more informed pedagogical decisions and to respond more helpfully when students encounter examples of language that do
not fit the simplified grammar rules they have learned” (p. 83). Finally, Borg (1998a) argues that the inclusion of data on teachers’ rationales for particular instructional decisions is particularly valuable in language awareness work because it “sensitizes” teacher learners to the central role of beliefs in teaching and “prompts them to explore how their own work is shaped by their beliefs about [language teaching]” (p. 274).

**Necessity of inductive analysis.**

A second key design feature of language awareness activities is that they are “participant-centered” (Borg, 1998a) and encourage teachers to “ask questions” of the data (Wright & Bolitho, 1993, p. 299). The appropriate role of teacher learners in these activities is that of ‘data analysts,’ such that “salient issues emerge inductively through [participants’] analysis of the data” (Borg, 1998a, p. 279). Borg describes the inductive analysis that teacher learners engage in as a two-step process. First, the participants are asked to describe the data in a way that should help them understand it. “Before teacher [learners] can examine the rationale behind specific teaching behaviors, they need to understand what those behaviors are,” he argues (p. 278). Second, the participants respond to the data in some way that engages their analytic faculties. Wright and Bolitho (1993) suggest that talk is an important means of doing so. “Talking about language is not only OK,” suggest Wright and Bolitho (1993), “it is valuable” (p. 299). “Language awareness work needs talk,” Wright (2002) explains. Participants should be encouraged to express their own ideas through talk, and to converse with each other, because “articulating initial and more refined perceptions about linguistic data with colleagues is a means of enabling real learning to take place” (p. 278).

Borg (1998a) adds that it is also important for teacher learners to be open-minded when approaching the data, so that they might consider “ideas and options” that they “dismissed
previously without adequate consideration” (p. 279). In order to enable participants to approach
the data with an open mind, Borg suggests encouraging the teachers to consider the data—a
lesson extract, for example—from “multiple perspectives: their own reactions, those of the other
participants in the teacher development course, and those of the teacher whose practice is
portrayed” (p. 279). Teachers might also be asked, he suggests, to point out both positive and
negative aspects of the data, so that they are encouraged to think beyond the dichotomous
categories of ‘good’ and ‘bad’ grammar lessons.

Finally, Wright and Bolitho (1993) and Borg (1998a) both make a special point of
emphasizing the critical importance of giving teachers the time to adequately process language
awareness activities. By allowing teacher learners plenty of time to analyze the data and work
through its implications, Wright and Bolitho argue, “the centrality of the process of awareness-raising is maintained and positively enhanced” (p. 301). The researchers argue further that
teacher learners are actually “unlikely to develop their awareness unless this happens,” since
conditions must be created that enable “trainees’ awareness to be raised and for their expertise to
be developed” (p. 302).

**Focus on grammar knowledge-in-action.**

Data should also be selected, Borg (2003a) argues, that “allow for pedagogically motivated
grammatical awareness raising in teacher learners” (p. 83). That is a loaded sentence, but what
Borg means is that the inductive analysis described in the previous section should begin with an
analysis of pedagogy and proceed to an analysis of grammar. Therefore, the data themselves
need to be rich in material for pedagogical analysis, just as they are rich in material for
grammatical analysis. As such, they should invite analysis of teachers’ knowledge-in-action.

“Education is a practical undertaking,” Borg points out. “Thus, teacher knowledge will be most
useful when it has a practical dimension.” Teachers may begin a task by noticing, for example, “the kinds of questions the students [ask], the difficulties they [experience], and the strategies the teacher [adopts] in responding to these situations” (p. 81). When the exploration of grammar is grounded in pedagogical analysis, Borg argues, “teacher learners are first engaged in the pedagogical discussion of a teaching episode or case and subsequently move on to consider grammatical issues emerging from this initial pedagogical analysis. This is in contrast to a linguistically oriented analysis of grammar in which a pedagogical context is not necessary” (p. 81).

Interestingly, Wright (2002) appears to disagree with Borg (2003a) on this point. Whereas all of Borg’s (1998a; 1999b; 2003a) language awareness activities are designed to begin with an analysis of the pedagogical situation and proceed to an analysis of the grammar points, Wright’s sequence of language tasks is explicitly “organized to take participants from the consideration of language to classroom teaching” (p. 124). Wright’s justification for this order is that teacher development work should always end with classroom applications, in order to encourage the transfer of teachers’ knowledge into the classroom. I find this difference in direction between the two researchers particularly interesting given Bigelow and Ranney’s (2005a) findings regarding the ability of teacher learners to transfer their knowledge of pedagogy to their grammar activities, but not in the opposite direction. Bigelow and Ranney’s data supports Borg’s order, rather than Wright’s. Of course, Borg and Wright are in full agreement that language awareness activities must include both grammatical and pedagogical content for analysis. As Wright argues, “A Language Awareness approach to LTE [language teacher education] takes it as axiomatic that links between language awareness and knowledge and the classroom will be made” (p. 124).
Focus on reflection.

Finally, language awareness activities should be designed in such a way that teacher learners move gradually from analyzing the teaching work of others to reflecting on themselves as language teachers. Borg (2003a) explains that inviting teacher learners to study a lesson transcript—“to notice key issues, ask questions about them, and speculate about factors underlying the decisions the teacher makes”—gives them the opportunity to try their hands at analyzing teaching events (p. 82). “Engaging learners in these processes,” he continues, “models for them the reflective attitude that will enhance their efforts to inquire in the same way into their own teaching” (p. 82).

I have already discussed the critical importance of self-reflection for teachers’ professional growth, citing the work of Tsui (2003) on the ways in which reflection, not experience, develops teacher expertise. Acknowledging the importance of reflection, Borg (1998a; 2003a) and Wright (2002; Wright & Bolitho, 1993) argue that, in the design of language awareness activities, it is important that teacher educators encourage teacher learners to reflect on both the cognitive and affective aspects of their work.

Reflection on the cognitive aspects of their work can help teacher learners become more aware of their own language knowledge, as well as its limits. Borg (2003a) argues that such awareness is vital if language teachers are to be successful. The findings from Borg’s (2001b) study reveal clear relationships between teachers’ perceptions of their own language knowledge, teachers’ confidence, and teachers’ willingness to consider approaches to grammar instruction outside their comfort zones. Thus, the more teachers can be helped to feel confident in their own knowledge, the more open they will likely be to ongoing professional development. Language awareness activities, Borg (2003a) explains, “that provide teacher learners with opportunities to
assess their current understanding of grammar and provide support in enabling them to enhance it can therefore have positive pedagogical consequences” (p. 82). I have emphasized the word ‘support’ in Borg’s statement because I believe it is critical that teacher educators help novice teachers learn the skills they will need to improve their own knowledge. Helena, from my own study, for example, showed a strong willingness to improve her language knowledge, but was sometimes uncertain about how to do so.

Second, the affective aspects of language awareness, though often overlooked, can have a significant influence on teachers’ practices, as illustrated by the findings of studies reviewed for this paper (Borg, 1998b and Pahissa & Tragant, 2009) as well as the findings from my own data. “Teacher [education] will have a lasting impact on teachers’ practice,” Borg argues, “only when it addresses their existing belief systems” (p. 29). Teacher educators need to remember that “language awareness has an affective element,” Wright and Bolitho (1993) explain, and by engaging the affective dimension of their language awareness, teachers’ attitudes and values can be helped to “evolve” (p. 299).

Furthermore, Wright and Bolitho (1993) and Borg (2003a) both make powerful arguments for the value of self-reflection on teachers’ lifetime professional development. “Through involvement in language awareness work,” Wright and Bolitho explain, “we would hope to enable teachers/trainees to become autonomous and robust explorers of language, capable of maintaining a spirit of honest and open inquiry long after the course ends” (p. 299). In order to encourage teacher learners to continue their learning after having been engaged in language awareness activities, Borg recommends always concluding such activities with a selection of “follow-up tasks” for the teacher learners to choose from, such as reading a practice-oriented article on a particular language feature, consulting a reference grammar for further clarity on a
form, or participating in an internet forum in which language teachers are tackling a given structure (p. 83).

Edge (1988) agrees fervently with Borg (2003a) and Wright and Bolitho (1993) on this point, and he makes an even larger, but related, point about the appropriate goals of language teacher education. Not only, he argues, should we be preparing teachers to engage in the processes of teaching language, we should also be preparing them to notice pedagogical grammar problems in their own work and to diagnose and ameliorate those problems through language study. “The amount of linguistic theory that can be covered in any course is limited,” Edge explains, “and application can be made only to a limited number of problems. [...] Teachers will continually come up against language or methodological problems in their careers, and the possibility for theoretical study extends infinitely. For this reason, it seems preferable to orient one’s mode of operation towards ‘reference out’ to theory, rather than ‘application in’ to practice. [...] The essential point is to prepare the way for future, independent professional behavior” (p. 11).

Practice Tasks: Application of the Portraits

In the following two sections, I present example practice tasks that use the teacher portraits of Christel’s and Helena’s grammatical Teacher Language Awareness (TLA) as data. I use the term ‘practice tasks,’ as opposed to ‘language awareness activities,’ because I want to emphasize the role such tasks play in helping teachers’ prepare for the target tasks involved in classroom teaching. The target audience for the tasks are students in a deaf education teacher preparation program. I have designed two tasks: the first using an entire teacher portrait—either Christel’s or Helena’s—as data, and the second focusing more narrowly on a single vignette drawn from Christel’s data. I intentionally designed these tasks to work off of two different sized chunks of the data in order to demonstrate the ways in which parts of the data can be queried differently for
different purposes. When processed in their whole form, teacher portraits present a holistic view of language teacher knowledge and can be queried for insights regarding teachers’ overarching beliefs and approaches to the teaching of language. When parsed and presented as vignettes, the portraits can engage teacher learners with particular pedagogical problems around specific grammatical forms.

**Practice task 1: Analysis of a portrait.**

The first practice task takes an entire portrait as its data source and prompts teacher learners to analyze the grammatical Teacher Language Awareness (TLA) of the teacher whose work is profiled in the portrait. One of the primary purposes of this task is to present teacher learners with a realistic portrayal of the process-oriented and interconnected nature of the knowledge base of language teaching. The other purpose is to help teacher learners develop the analytic skills they will eventually need to reflect constructively on their own TLA. The design of this practice task is based largely on that designed by Borg (1999b) to prompt teachers to “examine the theories underlying their own work in teaching grammar” (p. 157). Recall that Borg defines ‘teachers’ theories’ as “the implicit personal understandings of teaching and learning which teachers develop through educational and professional experiences in their lives” (p. 157). As Figure 1 shows, Borg’s construct of teachers’ theories is similar in scope to Andrews’ (2007) construct of Teacher Language Awareness (TLA), the main difference being that teachers’ theories incorporate teachers’ beliefs and feelings about all aspects of teaching, whereas TLA only incorporates beliefs and feelings about language and language teaching. Thus, a task designed to elicit the characteristics of teachers’ theories would also be suitable for eliciting the characteristics of teachers’ TLA.
The teaching strategy employed by Borg (1999b) to prompt teacher learners’ analysis of teachers’ theories consists of three stages: “(a) describing classroom practices, (b) making explicit the rationales for these practices, and (c) evaluating these rationales” (p. 161). As described in the preceding section, a key feature of Borg’s task is that it is inductive: teachers’ theories, Borg explains, “cannot be examined without reference to what actually goes on in the classroom” (p. 161). Therefore, the first stage of the practice task is descriptive in nature, simply inviting teacher learners to engage with the data on a factual level. The second stage is the questioning stage: “The basic question here is why?” explains Borg: “Why do my grammar lessons always follow the same format? Why do I regularly tell students not to worry about their grammar errors? Why did I provide plenty of practice in one lesson, but very little in another? Such questions encourage teachers to consider the influence on their decisions in grammar work of a wide range of factors” (pp.161-162). The last stage is the evaluative stage, in which teacher learners are asked to consider the merits of the reasons they have offered in support of their own practices. Are my reasons clear, for example? Are there inconsistencies in my arguments? What influences have informed my view on language teaching? Are there alternative views I can consider? (p. 167). I have designed practice task 1 according to the same sequence of stages. A description of practice task 1 follows:

**Stage 1: Describe classroom practices**

[Reading – outside of class] Read the teacher’s portrait in its entirety. Underline anything you find interesting. Record any questions or ideas the portrait raises for you in the margins or on a separate sheet of paper.

[Post-reading – outside of class] Consider one of the following questions, and write your answer in 1-2 pages. (The instructor will assign questions to pairs of students so that all, or most, of the questions are addressed.)

1. What language points did the teacher focus on in her grammar work?
2. What grammar materials did she use?
3. Were the teacher’s grammar teaching activities sequenced in any particular way?
4. What kinds of metalanguage, if any, did she use?
5. To what extent did she explain grammar?
6. Did the teacher encourage her students to discover things about grammar on their own?
7. Did the teacher provide opportunities for her students to use grammar?
8. Did the teacher check students’ understanding of the grammar she taught?
9. What kinds of questions, if any, did the teacher ask her students about grammar?
10. How did the teacher respond to students’ questions about grammar?
11. How did the teacher deal with students’ grammatical errors?

[Post-writing] Pair up with a partner who answered the same question you did, and discuss your answers. Present your findings to the class. The instructor will take notes so that the class has a shared reference on the teachers’ approach to grammar instruction.

Stage 2: Making explicit the rationales for these practices

You will now consider the following question: Why does the teacher approach grammar the way she does? All teachers have beliefs and feelings about language and language teaching that influence their teaching practices. Sometimes these beliefs and feelings are made explicit; sometimes they are not. Some of the aspects of language teaching that teachers have beliefs and feelings about are listed below:

(a) their role in the classroom
(b) the nature of learning
(c) their own knowledge of grammar
(d) the nature of language
(e) constraints on their work
(f) how languages are learned
(g) students’ feelings about grammar
(h) useful grammar teaching activities
(i) students’ characteristics (i.e. expectations, preferences)

With a new partner, analyze the data we have collected about the teacher’s grammar teaching practices, and consider the reasons she provides for her approach to grammar. Where she does not provide reasons, try to ascertain what her reasons might be. In addition, examine the beliefs and feelings about teaching and learning that seem to underlie her views. Use the issues listed above as a starting point for your analysis. We will discuss our insights as a class.

Stage 3: Evaluating the teacher’s views

[Independent work] Evaluating the teacher’s reasons for her approach to teaching grammar does not mean deciding whether these are right or wrong. Rather, it asks you to consider issues such as the following. Write your answers to these questions and prepare to discuss them in class.

- Has the teacher articulated clear reasons for her instructional decisions? Are there any aspects of the teacher’s work in teaching grammar that she does not explain well? If so, why do you think these explanations are less well formed?
- Are there any inconsistencies in the teacher’s views about grammar teaching? If so, to what do you attribute these inconsistencies?
What influences seem to have promoted the development of the teacher’s views about grammar teaching? Any particular educational or professional experiences?
- Are there alternative positions that you think it would be valuable for the teacher to consider? Are there instructional strategies she should consider that are not currently part of her repertoire?

**Practice task 2: Analysis of a vignette.**

Practice task 2, in contrast to task 1, narrowly focuses the attention of teacher learners on a vignette drawn from Christel’s portrait. The purpose of the task is to engage students with an authentic pedagogical grammar problem, similar at both the surface and deeper levels to the kinds of problems they will likely encounter in their own classrooms. Through engaging in practice task 2, teacher learners are given an opportunity to practice the kinds of analytical work and language study that reflective practitioners engage in, but they are invited to do so in a less stressful and cognitively demanding environment than their own classrooms. It is assumed that, before engaging in practice task 2, the students have been given ample opportunity to familiarize themselves with Christel’s portrait in its entirety—engaging in tasks like that presented in practice task 1—so that they bring to this task an understanding of Christel’s overall approach to grammar teaching. The fact that teacher portraits allow teacher learners to engage in whole-to-part analysis distinguishes them from isolated excerpts of classroom teaching, and, I believe, affords them greater potential for helping teacher learners develop organized schemata for grammar teaching.

The design of this practice task is based largely on that designed by Borg (2003a) “to promote the active exploration and review by teacher learners of their own grammatical knowledge and grammar teaching practices” (p. 84). Borg’s task design includes five stages, beginning with what he describes as “free-response tasks”—in which participants are given the opportunity to respond to authentic data on grammar teaching—and proceeding to language
study tasks—in which participants are encouraged to engage in further independent exploration of the focal grammar point. The five stages are as follows:

1) Introductory, free-response tasks
2) Factual, awareness-raising tasks (e.g., list the stages in the lesson)
3) Pedagogical analysis tasks (e.g., the dis/advantages of certain strategies)
4) Grammatical analysis tasks (e.g., evaluate the teacher’s grammatical explanation)
5) Language study tasks (e.g., how does your course book address this feature?)

Wright (2002) presents a similar procedure for encouraging teachers’ to reflect on their grammar teaching practices, but, as I discussed above, Wright’s procedure moves in the opposite direction from Borg’s: beginning with the analysis of a grammar point and proceeding toward classroom applications. I am in agreement with Borg and Edge (1988), however, that it is important for teacher learners to analyze the pedagogical context of grammar teaching practices before analyzing the grammatical form itself, since this progression is in closer alignment with the actual problems that will arise in their grammar teaching work. Thus, I have modeled practice task 2 on Borg’s (2003a), rather than Wright’s, suggested procedure. A description of practice task 2 follows:

Stage 1: Free-response

[Instructions] The extract below comes from the work of Christel, a teacher of the deaf, who is working with third graders in a Swedish bilingual school for the deaf. Read the extract, and underline anything you find interesting. Record any questions or ideas the extract raises for you in the margins or on a separate sheet of paper.

In this extract, Christel (C) is working one-on-one with one of the boys in her class: Yassin (Y). Yassin has just composed the following short text about the life spans of many different animals (an ‘*’ indicates a grammatically incorrect sentence):

- En tupp blir 8 år gammal. (A rooster becomes 8 years old.)
- En hund blir 13 år gammal. (A dog becomes 13 years old.)
- En katt blir 15 år gammal. (A cat becomes 15 years old.)
- En anka blir 18 år gammal. (A duck becomes 18 years old.)
- *Man kan blir 80 år gammal. (*People can becomes 80 years old.)

After Christel read Yassin’s text, she and Yassin had the following interaction:
C: [pointing to the final sentence] In Swedish, ‘kan bli’ (can become). Take away the –r.
Y: [points to the other four instances of the word ‘blir’ (becomes) on the same page and then looks at Christel with his eye brows lowered, questioningly].
C: There, you don’t have ‘kan’ (can). Here [pointing to the final sentence], you have ‘kan’ (can).

Following this exchange, Yassin returned to his seat and erased the ‘-r’ from all five instances of the word ‘blir’ on his page.

[Post-reading] What aspects of this vignette do you find interesting? Discuss anything you underlined or commented on with your partner.

Stage 2: Awareness-raising

Assign a number (1-5) to each of the following events, indicating the order in which the events actually occurred.

___Christel showed Yassin that the word ‘kan’ (can) was in one sentence but not others.
___Christel corrected Yassin.
___Yassin wrote a grammatically incorrect sentence.
___Yassin edited his work.
___Yassin looked at Christel questioningly.

Stage 3: Pedagogical analysis

What strategy did Christel use to draw Yassin’s attention to his error? What advantages and disadvantages do you see in Christel’s approach to handling Yassin’s error?

Consider the following comments Christel made about her approach to working with Yassin. What beliefs seem to underlie the approach she adopted in this excerpt? How do you feel about them?

(a) “If I compare with other students, I think they could understand this difference, or the meaning of it. But, I’m not so sure that actually he understands it. Without the ‘kan’, it will be ‘blir’ with an ‘-r’. I don’t know if he understands that.”

(b) “I think sometimes I need to explain to him directly: “It’s not ‘kan bli’, with an ‘-r’ in the end,” to make him understand. Some of my colleagues say, “Just let him be. He will understand in time.” Could be. Could be not. But I think sometimes I need to correct him instantly instead of just waiting, because he could get stuck with this. If he doesn’t know the differences between ‘kan bli’ without an ‘-r’ or with an ‘-r’ in the end. […] I don’t want him to have too much red pen in the end, you know. I don’t want to have that. I would like to explain just here and now, the facts, so he will understand. Instead of when he’s doing something, then correcting him with a red pen. I would like to avoid that because that’s an old method.”

Consider what you know about Christel’s approach to grammar teaching, more generally, from having read a portrait of her Teacher Language Awareness (TLA)? In what ways is the above
vignette representative of Christel’s general approach to grammar teaching? It what ways is it not representative?

Stage 4: Grammatical analysis

What grammatical point was Christel drawing Yassin’s attention to in this extract? What information about the grammar point did Yassin seem to get from this exchange?

Stage 5: Language study

Follow up your discussion of this extract by doing one or more of the following:
(a) Read the article, “10 Tricks That Will Help You Teach Modal Verbs,” at www.busyteacher.org.
(b) Read the section on modals in The Grammar Book (Celce-Murcia & Larsen-Freeman, 1998).
(c) Look at your own course book and identify where modals are dealt with. What approach to teaching modals is adopted? What kinds of activities are provided? What information about modals do students get?
(d) Consult a grammar reference book and review the information it provides about modals in English. If you have read any of the readings listed above, evaluate the information in the reference book in light of the reading you have done.
(e) Locate a web-based discussion group for language teachers to see if there are any current or past discussions on modals that you can access. What kinds of issues are discussed? If no such discussions exist, consider starting a discussion yourself.

Write a short reflection on your experience with one of the above activities. How valuable was the resource you consulted? What did you learn about modals?

Questions that Remain

The explaining of grammar...casts light on the unfamiliar pathways and the arbitrary obstacles through which [the student] must eventually be able to run back and forth with his eyes shut. It can thus save him a certain amount of time, energy, and barked shins. It is for this same reason, of course, that the teacher needs to know these same pathways and obstacles—not only to run back and forth in them for herself, but also to see them as they look to a new comer. On top of this are the skills of knowing when to turn on the spotlight of explanation and when to turn it off, and knowing just how to aim it so that it will help the students instead of blinding them. (Stevick, 1980, p. 251)

I did this research because I have witnessed first-hand the trauma relived by teacher education students at the very mention of the word ‘grammar’. Some of them literally recoil.

Others harden their faces in defiance, taking up mental arms against the notion that the teaching
of grammar could ever be a useful thing. A few students, of course—always a tiny minority—sit a little more upright in their chairs and widen their eyes in anticipation, pencils ready to begin diagramming, minds hungry for the order and predictability of syntax. With this second group of students, those pre-disposed to like grammar, part of our job as teacher educators is already done. But, far from all of it—that is, if we aim to decrease the likelihood that our students will recreate in their students the same trauma around grammar that they experienced as learners.

I know this, because even I—a lifetime devotee to the study of languages and their structures—was at a loss for where to begin and how to proceed when I first stepped into my own classroom of deaf eighth graders. I find grammar fascinating, I understand it well, and I believe firmly in its value to the language learner. But those attributes alone could not prepare me to teach grammar to deaf children, nor to any language learners for that matter. What I was missing, I believe, was a more integrated perspective on the role of grammar in language education. Where does it fit? With what topics should I start? With which students? With what materials? For what, specific, purposes?

In this way, the above quote from Stevick is not only relevant to the “explaining of grammar,” but also to the explaining of grammar pedagogy, so that future language teachers may be saved “a certain amount of time, energy, and barked shins.” It should be the responsibility of teacher educators to help teacher learners navigate the landscape of grammar pedagogy before they find themselves responsible for their own classrooms. By this I mean that teacher educators should not only help their students understand grammar, but should also help them understand how their knowledge of grammar will actually be put to use in helping their students learn language. Teacher educators can help their students try out some “unfamiliar pathways,” help
them predict some of the “arbitrary obstacles” they might encounter, and help them learn the
skills necessary to wield the “spotlight of explanation.”

But will the language awareness methodology I have lain out in this chapter work? That is
an important—and an empirical—question. “There is a crying need,” Bartels (2005a) argues,
“for in depth studies of teachers’ acquisition of KAL [knowledge about language] in teacher
education contexts and their subsequent use (or non-use) in later teaching contexts” (p. 418).

Furthermore, assuming teachers do transfer the pedagogical grammar knowledge gained in
teacher education programs to their language classrooms, does it work? Are the teaching
practices associated with highly developed Teacher Language Awareness (TLA) more likely to
result in students’ language learning than other practices? Again, this is an extremely important,
empirical, and under-addressed question. “Research on teacher cognition in grammar teaching,”
Borg (2006) argues, “is characterized by one particular gap (and this applies to language teacher
cognition research generally): the relationships among teacher cognition, classroom practice and
learning have not been studied. Addressing this issue calls for the merging of hitherto separate
lines of inquiry” (pp.133-134). Borg suggests that teacher cognition researchers combine forces
with second language acquisition (SLA) researchers in order to develop new methodologies for
addressing the question of student outcomes.

While such a partnership would surely be fruitful, I would like to suggest that we consider
using language awareness methodologies to assess the outcomes of both teacher learners and
their students. Since it seems that the willingness and ability to reflect on language, and to
engage in ongoing language study, are the true predictors of expertise for both groups, it seems
that a study designed to assess the language awareness of both a teacher and her students would
offer insight into the influence of a teacher’s TLA on her students’ language learning outcomes.
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To develop in two languages – Swedish Sign Language and Swedish

A few basic thoughts on the school’s language policy
- We see students’ language development as the most important factor in a good education.
- To understand and be understood leads to security and harmony.
- Both languages, Swedish Sign Language and Swedish, strengthen each other and are used by all of our students and all our staff to complement each other.

For a language to develop into a rich and expressive language, it must be used in different contexts and with different people. At the school, our students learn two languages - Swedish and Swedish Sign Language. As a bilingual school, we especially focused on finding ways for students to develop in both languages. We make sure that, during school hours, students are able to use both languages in different school subjects and with different people.

Swedish Sign Language

Our students interact with each other a great deal - They learn from each other, play and socialize with each other and, during their time at school together, they learn important social rules. Therefore, it is important that all students have a common language, a language everyone can learn and feel connected with – Swedish Sign Language. To feel safe, involved and able to influence one’s own situation are essential to a good childhood and a good learning environment. Therefore, we are careful to use Swedish Sign Language in all cases where people who need it are nearby.

Swedish Sign Language, just like any other language, requires time to develop. We make sure that students are introduced to it in different contexts and with different people. In order for it to be a language that the student can comfortably use, today and in the future, it must be developed into a rich and expressive language.

Some of our students come to school with spoken Swedish as their first language, but they need to improve their Swedish Sign Language. In those cases, we make sure to provide the best conditions for these students to develop Swedish Sign Language.

Swedish

Some of our students have spoken Swedish as their first language and attain knowledge best in that language. These students therefore have some of their lessons in spoken Swedish. Other students have sign language as their first language but have the ability to acquire spoken Swedish. Opportunities for speech instruction are therefore also relevant for them. Our teachers are particularly concerned with students’ knowledge acquisition, and so they ensure that no student misses knowledge on account of not understanding what is said.

Our teachers have extensive experience of the special difficulties that hard of hearing and deaf students may encounter in their development of the Swedish language. The school also has good hearing equipment, so that conditions for learning are optimum.
Some of the students have the potential to absorb knowledge through spoken Swedish and to develop good speech, but they come from a family that has sign language as their first language. In such cases, we consider it our responsibility to create conditions for student speech development here at the school.

Identity
Growing up is not just about language, but to a large extent is also about identity. Who am I? What opportunities and constraints do I have? It can be difficult for deaf and hard of hearing students to find their place. To not be alone in such situations gives one strength. Support makes it easier to tackle any obstacle one faces in situations where one may fall short. To use a hearing aid or CI, to use an interpreter and sign language – these are things that all of us at the school are proud of, and they are basic securities that mean a great deal in life.

Two languages and two cultures
Swedish Sign Language and Swedish are two different languages. Therefore, the two languages should not be used simultaneously. Assigning a sign to each spoken word cannot work without doing damage to both languages. We make sure to use correct Swedish Sign Language and correct Swedish. However, sometimes a visual aid can make communication easier for someone who has difficulty hearing speech. In these cases, we borrow signs from Swedish Sign Language in order to make visual spoken communication. This should not be confused with Swedish Sign Language, which has its own grammar and a different word order from Swedish. Students who are made aware early on of the differences between Swedish Sign Language and the use of signs to support spoken Swedish will be able to switch between languages based on the situation and the interlocutor.

At the school, we focus on students’ language development, especially in the early school years from preschool through the sixth grade. Therefore, we dedicate teaching time to Language Choice. During this time, each student works intensively with the language he or she needs to focus on in order not only to reach the school’s general educational goals, but also to achieve the targets that are set for each child individually.

Language and culture go hand in hand. So we work not only with two languages but also with two cultures. The school is a school in Sweden, and thus part of the Swedish culture and Swedish traditions. The school is also a sign language school, and therefore, the sign language culture is as important as Swedish Sign Language. In accordance with our views about language and culture, we devote much time to playing with and experimenting with language. Rhymes, fairy tales, poetry and song are important for all.

Respect, confidence and optimism
At the school, respect is the most important concern when we talk about language development. Our students are at various stages in their development of two different languages. At our school, people are respected for who they are, and our staff are always working to support students at their current language level. The goal for all students is that they, upon leaving the school, will be fully bilingual. In Swedish, spoken and/or written, and in Swedish Sign Language.
At The school, all students have the opportunity to develop both their Swedish Sign Language and their Swedish, and they let the situation and interlocutors decide which language is best suited.

To achieve these goals, we work in the following ways:

Students are introduced to Swedish Sign Language in many different contexts and across different subjects to obtain a rich vocabulary and expressive language skills.

Students meet with Swedish, spoken and/or written, in many different contexts and across different subjects to obtain a rich vocabulary and expressive language skills.

When the teaching and instruction are in spoken Swedish, there is quality hearing equipment so that listening conditions are optimum.

Our teachers have extensive experience regarding what it means to the deaf to learn Swedish through print, as well as the special difficulties a deaf student may encounter in their literacy learning, where print is based on spoken language.

Our teachers work with the school’s speech therapists and hearing technicians around each individual student.

In conversations with parents and students, we discuss each student’s needs and possibilities. These conversations lead to decisions on how we can create the best conditions for the student’s fullest possible development in both Swedish Sign Language and Swedish.

We work with students’ identities, hard of hearing or deaf, with or without technical aids. And an important part of this work is to make students aware of different strategies that can be helpful in everyday life.

Our sign language environment is unique in that the language used by about half of our staff is their first language.

In order to maintain the skills of our staff, we work continuously to develop their skills in areas that benefit our students’ language development.
Appendix B

Statement of Teacher Quality

2012-10-30

Amanda Howerton Fox

Rektor

Statement of Teacher Quality

As the principal of Nilskolan, I regard both Christel and Helena as high quality teachers.

At Nilskolan, we do not use students’ standardized test scores as a measure of teacher quality. Instead, we evaluate teacher quality based on observations of the teachers.

In our teacher observations, we are looking for evidence of teaching skills, communication skills; teacher-student and teacher-parent, ability to cooperate with colleagues, and ability to solve problems that might occur in the classroom. Christel and Helena have always received excellent observation reports.

Stockholm, October 30, 2012

[Signature]

Specialpedagogiska skolmyndigheten
Principal, Nilskolan
Appendix C

Pre-observation Semi-structured Interview Questions
(based on Borg, 1998b)

Section 1: Experiences as a Language Learner
1) *LP, BEL* What do you remember about your own experiences learning Swedish and/or Teckenspråk in school?
   a. What approaches were used?
   b. Was there any formal analysis of language?
2) *BEL* Have you studied any foreign languages? What do you recall about those experiences?
   a. What approaches were used?
   b. Was there any formal analysis of language?
3) *ELK, KOL, BEL* Do you feel that your own education has had an influence on the way you teach?

Section 2: Teacher Training and Experience
1) *(Background)* How long have you been a teacher of the deaf?
   a. What grades/subjects have you taught?
2) *ELK, KOL, BEL* Why did you decide to become a teacher of the deaf?
3) *ELK, KOL, BEL* Tell me about your formal teacher training experiences?
   a. Did they promote a particular way of teaching?
   b. Did they encourage you to approach grammar in any particular way?
4) *ELK, KOL, BEL* How have your teaching practices changed since you first began teaching?
   a. Why?

Section 3: Reflections on Teaching
1) *ELK, KOL, LP, BEL* What is the most satisfying part of teaching language to deaf children? What is the hardest part?
2) *ELK, KOL, LP, BEL* What are your strengths as a language teacher? What are your weaknesses?
3) *ELK, KOL, BEL* Tell me about a great lesson you’ve taught. What made it great?
4) *ELK, KOL, LP, BEL* Tell me about a lesson that didn’t go well. What went wrong?
5) *KOL, BEL* Do your students have preferences about the kind of work they like to do in their lessons?

Section 4: The School
1) *ELK, KOL, BEL* Why have you chosen to work at Nilskolan?
   a. Does Nilskolan promote any particular style of teaching?
   b. Are there restrictions on the materials you use or the content of your lessons?
### Appendix D

Stimulated Recall Segment Matrix, Christel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KEY EPISODE</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>ELK</th>
<th>KOL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>En</td>
<td>Er</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1: Jag ar kungen på berget</td>
<td>v2 2:05</td>
<td>v4 9:30</td>
<td>0:40:00</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IND/DEF: loppa-n</td>
<td>v2 7:00</td>
<td>v2 7:45</td>
<td>0:00:45</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TENSE: gick, sjöng</td>
<td>v2 9:10</td>
<td>v2 11:14</td>
<td>0:02:04</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TENSE: speech in present</td>
<td>v2 11:15</td>
<td>v2 13:20</td>
<td>0:02:05</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSP: title (again)</td>
<td>v2 13:20</td>
<td>v2 14:10</td>
<td>0:00:50</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREP/TSP: ut ur, längs, utför</td>
<td>v4 4:05</td>
<td>v4 7:25</td>
<td>0:03:20</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2: Hug hallar de sig varma?</td>
<td>v1 10:12</td>
<td>v4 17:30</td>
<td>0:40:00</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSP: (M) wants to, “perfekt”</td>
<td>v1 16:20</td>
<td>v1 17:23</td>
<td>0:01:03</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PART: håller om/med, etc.</td>
<td>v1 18:40</td>
<td>v2 3:20</td>
<td>0:05:40</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5: Pelle och Maja</td>
<td>v1 12:51</td>
<td>v3 12:00</td>
<td>0:30:00</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SY: (B) puts period</td>
<td>v1 15:33</td>
<td>v1 16:30</td>
<td>0:00:55</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRO: (M) explains “de”</td>
<td>v1 16:30</td>
<td>v1 17:20</td>
<td>0:00:50</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C6: Hur Landskapet Forandras</td>
<td>v1 11:14</td>
<td>v3 17:15</td>
<td>0:05:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASS: förändras - förändrar</td>
<td>v1 11:14</td>
<td>v1 12:05</td>
<td>0:00:50</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SY: (Y) subj - verb</td>
<td>v3 15:20</td>
<td>v3 15:55</td>
<td>0:00:35</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C10: Sockerbok II</td>
<td>v2 6:00</td>
<td>v3 9:55</td>
<td>0:04:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TENSE: berättar (+ use)</td>
<td>v3 6:30</td>
<td>v3 9:55</td>
<td>0:03:25</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C11: Sockerbok III</td>
<td>v2 14:27</td>
<td>v3 8:30</td>
<td>0:10:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TENSE: kan bli (Y)</td>
<td>v2 18:05</td>
<td>v2 18:30</td>
<td>0:00:25</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C12: Sockerbok IV</td>
<td>v1 14:33</td>
<td>v3 6:10</td>
<td>0:14:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRO-W: ‘de’ is “extra” (J)</td>
<td>v1 20:54</td>
<td>v2 0:05</td>
<td>0:00:10</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong> to be used in <strong>SR Int</strong></td>
<td>0:22:57</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** TSP = Teckenspråk; ELK = Explicit Language Knowledge; En = Engagement Style; Er = Error Correction; In = Input; Ex = Explanation; KOL = Knowledge of Learners; IE = Input Enhancement; CS = Content Selection; ML = Use of Metalanguage; CC = Comprehension Checks; SC = Sociocultural Awareness
Appendix E

Stimulated Recall Segment Matrix, Helena

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KEY EPISODE</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>ELK</th>
<th>KOL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2: En hund - bild walk</td>
<td>v1 3:15</td>
<td>v1 13:25</td>
<td>0:10:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART: hund - en hund</td>
<td>v1 4:00</td>
<td>v1 4:25</td>
<td>0:00:25</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3: En hund - text walk</td>
<td>v2 1:50</td>
<td>v2 12:40</td>
<td>0:20:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRO: who is “Jag”</td>
<td>v2 4:47</td>
<td>v2 5:55</td>
<td>0:01:08</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSP: “jag” (no är) - flytig</td>
<td>v2 7:40</td>
<td>v2 8:45</td>
<td>0:01:05</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MORP: lydlig - olydlig</td>
<td>v2 9:35</td>
<td>v2 11:48</td>
<td>0:02:13</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLAY: k-e-n-d-r-a</td>
<td>v2 11:56</td>
<td>v2 12:40</td>
<td>0:00:44</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSP: “jag” (no är) - smutsig</td>
<td>v2 13:50</td>
<td>v2 14:40</td>
<td>0:00:50</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADJ: “hur ser ut,” worksheet</td>
<td>v3 8:13</td>
<td>v3 9:30</td>
<td>0:01:17</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4: FF book</td>
<td>v2 15:15</td>
<td>v2 20:05</td>
<td>0:05:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSP: flyer i en cyrkel, se på</td>
<td>v2 15:15</td>
<td>v2 16:25</td>
<td>0:01:10</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5: Vinterkul</td>
<td>v2 5:40</td>
<td>v3 4:55</td>
<td>0:20:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSP: åker is optional (pulka)</td>
<td>v2 6:50</td>
<td>v2 8:12</td>
<td>0:01:22</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSP: use åker (tetat)</td>
<td>v2 10:10</td>
<td>v2 10:59</td>
<td>0:00:49</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSP: “olika språk, konstigt”</td>
<td>v2 12:30</td>
<td>v2 13:20</td>
<td>0:00:50</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSS :S: papas mage</td>
<td>v2 19:15</td>
<td>v2 19:40</td>
<td>0:00:25</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSS :S: S eks, Karlos’s</td>
<td>v3 0:13</td>
<td>v3 3:40</td>
<td>0:03:27</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H7: Jag Kan Skriva</td>
<td>v1 14:38</td>
<td>v2 4:15</td>
<td>0:07:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREP: no på, på vs. i</td>
<td>v1 14:38</td>
<td>v1 15:25</td>
<td>0:00:47</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREP: Ss don’t translate</td>
<td>v1 15:25</td>
<td>v1 17:44</td>
<td>0:02:19</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREP: på vs. i</td>
<td>v1 20:30</td>
<td>v1 21:20</td>
<td>0:00:50</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H8: Dd book</td>
<td>v1 15:50</td>
<td>v1 16:50</td>
<td>0:01:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLAY: flyga - fly, inte - in</td>
<td>v1 15:50</td>
<td>v1 16:50</td>
<td>0:01:00</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H9: A-B-C books</td>
<td>v1 13:00</td>
<td>v3 5:00</td>
<td>0:15:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TENSE-W: O såg en film</td>
<td>v2 12:05</td>
<td>v2 13:40</td>
<td>0:01:25</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H10: Min Stol</td>
<td>v1 19:20</td>
<td>v2 21:50</td>
<td>0:09:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W-O: kan stanna</td>
<td>v2 14:50</td>
<td>v2 16:12</td>
<td>0:01:22</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H11: Min Stol - conferences</td>
<td>v1 2:00</td>
<td>v3 21:00</td>
<td>0:58:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERB: vad kan stolen göra?</td>
<td>v1 3:00</td>
<td>v1 4:00</td>
<td>0:01:00</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERB: IDs and defines</td>
<td>v1 6:30</td>
<td>v1 7:40</td>
<td>0:01:10</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H12: A-B-C books</td>
<td>v2 11:25</td>
<td>v2 12:00</td>
<td>0:00:35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POS: flyga kan inte flyga</td>
<td>v2 11:25</td>
<td>v2 12:00</td>
<td>0:00:35</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL to be used in SR int</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>0:26:13</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** TSP = Teckenspråk; ELK = Explicit Language Knowledge; En = Engagement Style; Er = Error Correction; In = Input; Ex = Explanation; KOL = Knowledge of Learners; IE = Input Enhancement; CS = Content Selection; ML = Use of Metalanguage; CC = Comprehension Checks; SC = Sociocultural Awareness
Appendix F
Transcription Rules for Interim Texts 1 and 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-verbal behavior</th>
<th>Indicate non-verbal behavior in parentheses.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E.g., (coughs).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interruptions</th>
<th>Indicate interruptions with a hyphen (-) at the point where the interruption occurs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E.g., What do you-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overlapping speech</th>
<th>Insert ‘(overlapping)’ before the overlapping speech.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E.g., (overlapping) Hello.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Garbled speech</th>
<th>Enclose best-guesses in brackets, followed by a question mark. Use ‘xxxx’ to indicate a missed word.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E.g., [hello?].</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.g., [xxxx xxxx xxxx].</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emphasis</th>
<th>Capitalize emphasized speech.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E.g., HELLO.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paraphrasing others</th>
<th>Enclose paraphrases of other people—or of the speaker herself in cases of reported speech or self-talk—in double quotes.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E.g., I said, “Hello.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pauses</th>
<th>Use ellipses to indicate a pause of less than a second. Use (pause) to indicate a pause of 2-3 seconds and (long pause) to indicate a pause of &gt;4 seconds.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E.g., I said…I mean (pause), I said (long pause), “Hello.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>False starts, changes in direction of thought</th>
<th>Use a backslash to indicate a false start or an abrupt change in the direction of thought of the speaker.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E.g., I want / I don’t want to do that.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Swedish words</th>
<th>Use italics to indicate a Swedish word.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E.g., gå.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teckenspråk signs</th>
<th>Capitalize Teckenspråk signs and enclose in backslashes.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E.g., /GO/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Words/signs referred to as words/signs</th>
<th>Use single quotes to indicate that a word/sign is being referred to as a word/sign.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E.g., The word ‘go’ is difficult to conjugate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.g., The word ‘gå’ is difficult to conjugate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.g., The sign ‘/GO/’ is easy to produce.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signs co-occurring with speech</th>
<th>When the speaker produces a Teckenspråk sign simultaneously with a spoken word, enclose the Teckenspråk sign in parentheses. E.g., Go (/GO/)!</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translations into English</th>
<th>Enclose English translations of Swedish words in parentheses.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E.g., The word ‘gå’ (to go) is difficult to conjugate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interpreter-authored utterances</th>
<th>Use italics and brackets to indicate the type of interpreter-authored utterance: explanation, repetition, request for clarification, source attribution, introduction, response to question, summons, or interference.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E.g., [repetition] Hello.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix G

Rules for Transmuted Text

1. Delete ‘um’ and ‘uh’.
2. Delete sentence-initial, ‘So,’ when it does not signify consequence.
3. Delete sentence-initial, ‘And,’ when it does not signify connection to an earlier thought.
4. Delete false starts that don’t contain any content. (e.g., It was / you were not allowed to use sign language. It was a very ugly language.)
5. Delete discussions with interpreter regarding the correct translation to English. Leave only the final, correct, translation.
6. Replace slashes (/)—initially used to indicate a break in thought—with more conventional punctuation, carefully chosen to represent the intended meaning.
7. Correct grammatical errors and awkward diction. (e.g., “They are going in Johanskolan” = “They were going to Johanskolan.”)
8. Translate to English any Swedish text that can be translated without a loss in meaning.
9. Let unfinished thoughts be concluded with a hyphen (e.g., “I wanted her to know that-.”)
Appendix H

Interview Segment at all Stages of Transmutation

Excerpted from Christel’s Pre-Observation Interview:

Interim Text 1:

C: [interrupts video – time?] Yes, and his signing is a little bit odd. He’s signing *cow* like this (signs lower?), not on his head, and he’s a little / he have / xxxx and sign for *film*, he film / use this / this is quite EXCITING actually, to just look WHAT he’s / when we’re talking about filming, he can see this / he can see the shape / he can see what I’m doing. But when HE’s signing, he’s doing it differently. So, just outside, but interesting.

Interim Text 2:

C: [interrupts video at 5:07] Yes, and his signing is a little bit odd. He’s signing *cow* like this (signs /COW/ below her ears) not on his head. And he’s a little—he have / image / sign for *film*, he film / he use this (signs /FILM/ as an amalgam of the verb and the noun). This is quite EXCITING actually, to just look WHAT he’s / when we’re talking about filming, he can see this (/TO FILM/ handshape) / he can see the shape / he can see what I’m doing. But when HE’s signing, he’s doing it differently. So, just outside, but interesting.

Transmuted Text:

C: [interrupts video at 5:07] Yes, and his signing is a little bit odd. He’s signing ‘cow’ like this (signs /COW/ below her ears) not on his head. And he’s a little—his sign for ‘film’, he uses this (signs /FILM/ as an amalgam of the verb and the noun). This is quite EXCITING actually, to just look at WHAT he’s-. When we’re talking about filming, he can see this (/TO FILM/ handshape). He can see the shape. He can see what I’m doing. But when HE’s signing, he’s doing it differently. So, just outside, but interesting.
Appendix I

Pre-Observation Interview Transcript, Christel

Pre-Observation Interview: Christel
Length: 52 minutes
Location: Researcher’s home

TRANSMUTED TEXT

R: I’m going to be asking you a few questions about your experiences learning languages yourself, your experiences being trained to be a teacher, and then your experiences as a teacher.

C: Yep.

R: OK. So to begin with your experiences as a student: What do you remember about your experiences learning-

C: (overlapping) When I was a small student? Or when I was grown?

R: Throughout. As a language learner yourself. So, learning Teckenspråk when you were young, and then perhaps learning English and Swedish later on. What do you recall about that experience? What sorts of approaches were used, that kind of thing?

C: Let me think. Back in my time, during the 50s, you were not allowed to use sign language—it was a very ugly language—in the school system. So, I became deaf when I was 8 months old. And the doctors during that time said to my parents and my grandparents, that “Christel, she’s deaf, but she needs to practice her hearing. You have to practice and all try to use her hearing.” And they thought it was very strange because I was deaf. My parents and my grandparents, they said, “That’s strange because she’s deaf. Why should we use her hearing?” But they said, “OK, we will do that.” And my grandmother, she was very active. She was a strong woman, and she had lots of time. A very wise person. A very good one. My grandmother, she tried to speak. I remember that I didn’t like having people near my ear. So I would look at their faces. I didn’t like that system. So they tried new systems. They used a ball. I saw the ball, so I went and I pointed at the ball, and my grandmother understood: “OK, it’s impossible to speak to her ear. So we have to use visual language for communicating with her.” So, through the visual language—they didn’t believe it at the doctors—they said, “Well, you have to use and speak into her ears.” But, my grandma said, “OK, we will try to use SIGNS instead.” HOME-made signs. And she took me to travel a lot, my grandmother. We went by plane. And she showed me practical, also abstract things. She presented me with different things, even though I was very very small. She took me to the airport and said, “These are airplanes.” Her method was to take me to different places just to show me things. And the fairytales, with lots of pictures. I remember very strongly that she was talking about a story about an ant was working very, very hard. She said, “This is ant. He lives in the woods, and he’s working very hard to build his own home.” They had text and also pictures.
And she said, “This says ‘ant’.” And then she also went through magazines and cut out letters from magazines and made puzzles of the letters, and she said, “Could you please point out the word ‘ant’?” So I had to find the different letters. And she was very practical. It was very practical training, and I remember it very strongly. My grandmother was very interested in astronomy, stars and things. She tried to find different things about stars and words, so she tried to educate me through her system visually and with letters. And she tried to find out if there were any deaf adults in the same city, and she found parents of older children and asked them where the older children were going in the school. They said, “Well, they are going to Johanskolan.” During my time, they had very good hearing at Johanskolan. It was divided in different systems. So, the students in Johanskolan had a little bit better hearing than I had, in my day. The ones with the worse hearing were in other schools. So I wasn’t allowed to go to Johanskolan because I was too deaf. So they put me in a school 400km from my home. Johanskolan was most closer, but I had to go to Vanadisborg instead. It was far away from home, to the deaf school in Vanadisborg. I went there for first grade in the deaf school. I remember everybody, they weren’t reading, they weren’t writing. And I could already write and read. And so I didn’t understand. My grandmother, she didn’t like that, so she asked them, “Couldn’t she, just for tests, go to Johanskolan?” So I went to Johanskolan after one month in Vanadisborg, and I saw that everybody was speaking. I didn’t do that. They were hard of hearing, so they could use their hearing more than I could. So I felt left out, because I couldn’t participate. So, I read a lot instead. I could read. The teachers said, “Can you read?” “Yes, I can read.” I had to pronounce the words, instead. I had to use my speech. I COULD read, and they thought it was quite strange that I could read. So they asked my grandmother, “How, why can she read so well because she’s much better than—we can see—the other students?” And she described her system, what she had done, and they said, in Johanskolan, “Well, sign language is not so good.” Today, it’s different, but back then, they didn’t look well upon, they didn’t like sign language. But, I remember. Thanks to my grandmother. So, from first grade to eighth—for eight years—I went to Johanskolan. They were very good teachers. They were interested in languages. I felt that we had a good connection. I read a lot. I was READING. You know, in Swedish, we use the saying that you have to “bathe” in language, take a “language bath.” And I read. That was my way of taking a bath, going swimming around all the words via reading, instead. Because sign language wasn’t allowed. So I moved, then, after, to Nilskolan. After the first stage, you go to the second grade, or you’re now continuing in another system. We have another system, compared with what you have in the United States.

R: Is it around age 8?

C: No, around 15.

R: Oh, so like Middle School. OK.

I: [explanation] So, it’s middle, yeah. Middle School. It’s Bytaskolan. We don’t have that anymore in Sweden.

C: (overlapping) You go from nine to tenth of class.
C: My language was growing all the time. But, the DEAF—I was very active within sports, in swimming—so I was together with deaf people a lot. And I think that my general knowledge—not only what you are taught in school, but my general knowledge—is through my DEAF friends, through sports and the DEAF community. So, I was growing a lot through my language, and I attained a very rich language while I was growing up. And then afterwards in high school. I went there, and I took the exams, and continued. Then I went into the University. Maybe I’m explaining too much.

R: No, no. It’s wonderful. You might be answering later questions, but that’s OK. I just won’t ask them. (laughs)

C: (smiles) I went into the University to become a teacher. OK, actually, after gymnasium I was a little tired of school because I’d been a lot like, you know, like a study rat. They’d been practicing all the different methods on me during my upbringing, so when I was in gymnasium, I was a little bit tired. I was the first one, in 1967, to go to gymnasium in Johanskolan. And they tried me. They said, “Can you do this? Can you do that?” And I had to always PROVE myself, that I actually know things. And they didn’t actually BELIEVE me, so I always had to PROVE that I understood or that I could. So, they asked if I would like to go to University. I said, “Absolutely not.” So I went to become a podiatrist. And I got work. I worked with that for a few years. And then I participated in the hearing world through that job, but I was feeling quite alone being deaf. But that was an exciting period of time, working together with the hearing, and also to try to understand how the hearing communicate. Because my communication with hearing was absolutely poor. I tried to read lips and tried to understand through that, but it’s very hard. I was struggling during that time. I worked with that for 7 years, and I had good salary. I could travel a lot. But afterwards I was thinking, I actually didn’t CHOOSE that job. That was absolutely not what I would like to become for the rest of my life. So, I, after 7 years, I rethought. I thought I would like to work with children, instead. So, I stopped that job and didn’t work at the hospital anymore with feet. I started to work with children, instead. And I NEVER regretted that choice. At first I was taught as a preschool teacher, together with hearing students and with an interpreter. And after that I worked with deaf children. And then I went into special education. It’s special education for children with special needs.

I: [explanation] I don’t know what you call it. It’s something you have to do extra. And also you have to go through a special branch. Working with deaf children requires more education, not just to become a preschool teacher. You have to also specialize with deaf children.

C: And through that I started to work with—in Swedish we call it hemvägledare (home counselors)—you go to the parents, hearing parents who have deaf children. We go to their homes, visit them, talk to them, inform them. So it was a very good job. I worked with that for three years. After that, I felt that I would continue to study. I wanted to work with a little bit older children, in the middle grades. I went to the University to become a teacher and concentrate on deaf children. At the same time, there was a new group at the University in Linguistics, where they were actually now studying sign language. And when I came there, to the University, it was the first—it was like the world was opening up for me. So, they were
actually now studying about sign language. I would get knowledge about my own language, which was impossible before. 34 years of age, and I was for the first time aware about sign language, and I could speak and I could have discussions about my OWN language for the first time when I was 34. So I felt that, should I be bitter? Should I be angry because I didn’t have that knowledge before? Or should I feel that, “Ah, this is better than nothing.” Because lots of people my age never had any information or teaching about our own language while we were small.

R: If I could, for one second, just to clarify: You said at around age 15. Did you leave Johanskolan at 15 and go to Nilskolan? Or did you stay at Johanskolan?

C: Yes, I went to—just close to Nilskolan—it’s a small place called Bytaskolan.

R: OK.

C: Yes, so I went there from 65 to 67.

R: OK, and they didn’t use Teckenspråk, either?

C: Yeah, they used it.

R: But they didn’t teach ABOUT it?

C: (Shakes head ‘no’ and mouths “Nej” (No.).)

R: OK.

C: They were using sign language, but NOT when they were teaching. They were using more, signs for just communication, signs to support-

R: Support speech?

C: Yeah.

R: OK. OK, interesting. So you weren’t even really exposed to Teckenspråk as a language until you were 34.

C: No, no. AWARENESS of language, sign language. I had sign language earlier, but I wasn’t aware about sign language as a LANGUAGE. About the topic: Why do you raise your eyebrows? Why do you use your face in that way? And I didn’t, I couldn’t EXPLAIN it. For the first time, when I was 34, I could explain ABOUT sign language. I KNEW sign language, but I couldn’t explain about sign language.

R: OK.
C: Because hearing people, they say all the time: “Why do you use your face so much when using sign language?” And it was very hard for me to explain. And afterwards, it was much easier for me to explain because they had a group in the University now working with studying sign language. So I now had the tools to explain to other people why sign language was as it was. And afterwards I felt very strong. I was very proud about my language because it was the first time I actually could explain what I was doing. And I studied 20, 40, and then 60 HP in the University.

R: I don’t know HP. Is it like credits?

I: [explanation] Högskola Poäng (University points). We have a system in Sweden that you can earn points. I don’t know whether it’s actually in the newer system.

C: But I was studying at the University and studying Linguistics, also, in parallel. So that was very difficult. But, then afterwards I was ready to work as a teacher. And also I was working as a research assistant, as I told you, at the Linguistics Institute. They were doing research about deaf children’s language, and I was hoping that they would do a doctoral defense on deaf children’s sign language. I was there one year and a half, but I wanted to work with living material, with children. Working as an assistant and RESEARCHING is not working with LIVING materials. It’s like, you know, papers and research studies. It’s very interesting, very interesting to be there. But, Nilskolan, they heard of me, my name—Christel—and they said, “Actually, we need a teacher in Nilskolan who can explain for the deaf children about sign language.” So I went to Nilskolan in 1987 and started teaching sign language as a language.

R: OK.

C: University: OK, it was very nice, but I felt I would like to work with children. I was thinking of my upbringing, my chances—or my lack of possibilities—for knowing my language. I felt that I would like to give deaf children the opportunity to know about sign language, their own language, because I didn’t have the opportunity. So, that’s why I left the University world. I never went to research. I went to work with children, so I still work with children today. And I never regretted it.

R: Mm-hmm.

C: But I also studied Swedish as a second language at the University. 40 points. Do you know Maria Karlberg?

R: Yes.

C: She was also studying, and during that time, I gained more knowledge. I could go more into depth about the Swedish language, how to effectively teach the Swedish language to deaf children. Because deaf children have sign language as a first language, and how shall I give them the Swedish language as the second language? And I gained so much knowledge studying that. And through these—sign language at the University and Swedish as a second
language—after those two and getting all that information, I could later teach deaf children. I think it’s very good to have that knowledge.

R: OK. I’m curious. You said in addition to your work preparing to be a teacher of the deaf, you also did research in the Linguistics department on children’s language, and you also studied Swedish as a second language. Were those two things—the Swedish as a second language and the Linguistics research—were they part of your Teacher Education program, or were they things that you did in addition?

C: No, no. It’s not part of. In addition.

R: OK. So you can become a teacher of the deaf in Sweden without doing research and without learning English as a second language?

C: How do you mean?

R: I mean, the requirements for becoming a teacher of the deaf in Sweden, do they include studying Swedish as a second language at the University level?

C: TODAY, they need to. Today, but not during my time.

R: OK, OK.

C: But I did that because with my education today, I can teach them in all the different subjects up to the fourth grade. But when it comes to bilingual education and Swedish as a second language, I can teach up through high school, according to MY education. And I also have passed the teachers’ exam in language. I’m a language teacher. So I can work with small children, at Nilskolan, for example. They have small, small children, and maybe I need to work with small children. I talk to the teachers who are teaching the small children, and maybe they say, “OK, in the first grade, or up to the fourth, I can go in there and teach them.” Maybe I don’t want, maybe I’ll get tired of working with small children, and I can go up to the older children. So, I can work with more or less all the children through my education. And I can also work with—only in the lower grades—I can work with different subjects. But in the higher grades, I can only work with Sign Language and Swedish as a second language for the deaf.

R: And another, just clarification: You were teaching in preschool before you went to work with older kids. How long were you teaching at that level? In preschool?

C: Three years.

R: OK. And you’ve been at Nilskolan since 1987?

C: Yeah, from ‘87. OK, so preschool in ‘81, and then I worked there for three years, at the preschool. Afterwards, 1984, I went to the teachers college to become a teacher. And then afterwards I worked at Nilskolan. They offered me a special—they asked me if I would like
to do an addition to work in this area. It’s called förstadiet (precursor). We don’t have anything like that today. It’s an addition to work with children after preschool.

R: Is it like Kindergarten?

C: No, it’s not. Preschool is like Kindergarten. You’re working children six years of age. And Kindergarten is small, small children. Today it’s different. We don’t have förstadiet teachers. Today we call it “special teachers.” Back in my time, it was additional education for preschool teachers, but focusing on deaf and hard of hearing children.

R: So is it extra support for deaf and hard of hearing children at the preschool level?

C: Yeah. Something like that.

R: OK, OK. OK. (laughs)

C: (laughs) Yeah. So that was ‘84, I started to study at the University, and I was studying also in the University ‘85, ‘86. In 1986, I was at the University as a research assistant. And from ‘87, I started to work at Nilskolan. Unfortunately, just one year, ‘87, and I went to Thailand afterwards. I worked as a teacher consultant for 2 years in Thailand. Then afterwards I went to Nilskolan in 1990, from ‘90.

R: OK. And at Nilskolan have you always been teaching at around the first grade? Or have you taught a number of subjects and ages?

C: Yes, I have had all the subjects with the small children, but my responsibility, or my main focus, is sign language. We have sign language in the curriculum. In 1983, the Swedish curriculum said that you should have sign language in the curriculum. But, we didn’t have the right people to be responsible for that. So, I was in charge of that subject. I’ve been working with that from ‘87, just focusing on sign language. That’s my main purpose.

R: OK. Interesting. OK. Let’s see. I think you’ve answered a lot of the questions. (laughs) Let me back up a little bit to when you were learning Swedish and—well, let’s talk about Swedish—when you were learning Swedish when you were young, was there any focus on grammar or sort of formal analysis of the structure of Swedish?

C: Yes. In my school days?

R: Yeah.

C: Yeah. OK. My teacher was writing a lot at the blackboard. A lot. It wasn’t so much grammar, actually, just writing. And we had to copy the writing, and try to memorize how to write. If I can—maybe I can write? (The interpreter gives Christel a piece of paper. She writes a sentence in Swedish: “Jag är en...”) So this is how to pronounce it in Swedish: “Jag är en...AHAAAA” (elongating the vowel sound). So that’s how they wrote it, and then you had to know how you pronounce it, how you say it. It was very important during my day to
pronounce it right. Object, verb—not so much about grammar. We had to study text, memorize text, all the time. How the structure was in text form. But not so much grammar, explaining the grammar, during my day.

R: Mm-hmm. And did you study English as a second language in school, as well—or a third language (laughs)—in school, as well?

C: (laughs) Yeah. Third language, third language.

R: Yes, sorry.

C: I started in seventh grade. The teacher wanted to teach us some English, and I was very glad because I like—I LOVE language. I’ve always loved languages. And English was something very different. I wanted to study English because I knew about Swedish, and I wanted to learn about ENGLISH. I didn’t feel so much for the Swedish language, actually, because the hearing couldn’t explain to me about the Swedish language. But, suddenly, we had somebody who was explaining about English. For me, it was exciting to know about English because they were explaining more about English than they did about the Swedish language. The Swedish language was a little bit too much of how to pronounce it right, and I didn’t like the Swedish language. But the English language wasn’t this way. I saw it as a normal language. Actually, a language, because they were explaining it more.

R: When you say “explaining,” does that include grammar?

C: Yes. They were including grammar in English, which they weren’t doing in Swedish. “I am...”—why they were using “I am”—things like that. Very different. But in Swedish, they didn’t do that for us deaf. So, that was interesting. And also, German. I studied some German, also, in addition. Because we could choose it if we would like to know that, so I chose German. That was in seventh grade, and eighth, and also in Bytaskolan, and in ninth and tenth grade. So, English and German. And also in high school, in Johanskolan: English and German. And Swedish, also. But the Swedish language, the grammar wasn’t so—actually, they didn’t teach us so much about the Swedish grammar. Just how to write it and which form to write, but not so much grammar. I feel that English and German were more—they taught more about the grammar there than in my Swedish language class.

R: OK. But, when you worked with Maria Karlberg at City University in Swedish as a second language, she talked about the structure, the grammar of Swedish?

C: Yes, she did.

R: OK.

C: Yeah, she did. That was very nice. That was very—a fun time to learn, to study about the Swedish language.
R: Mm-hmm. And do you feel like understanding Swedish better THAT way—understanding the structure of Swedish better—has helped you to explain it to your students?

C: Yes, that’s why. Yeah.

R: OK. In your teacher training experiences, were there any particular methods for teaching that they tried to teach you? So, for example, this is how we suggest you teach Swedish to deaf kids. Were there specific methods they gave you?

C: Special method? No, no. We should write something. We should learn something, and we should write it down. And we should also do performance analysis. There was one lady, her name was Charlotte Svensson, a very good language teacher in the teacher training school. And she was actually teaching us students how to analyze future students’ levels, how to analyze their language levels. And through that, we could see what they were missing in language, though that analysis. And she could say, “That student’s language is like this.” And she was explaining, through that analysis, how to help that student because they are having problems in this and that. So, through analyzing, she could explain. And I also remember, Maria Karlberg, she said the same thing, how we should not look at the grammar and point out the grammar is wrong. We should never say, “This is wrong.” You should instead look at the text, the form of the text and performance. And look at, “HOW do they express themselves? What can we do better?” And analyze it. And it’s also very sensitive, you know, language has so much to do with the person, also. It’s very hard just to go directly and say, “This is wrong. This is wrong.” You should maybe approach it in a different way. And we, as teachers, should SHOW them, “OK, you did this. Maybe you should do this, instead.” And by showing them, copying maybe other texts and showing them—not using their own texts, because it’s very sensitive to be talking about their own texts—but we are using other texts and saying, “Well, if you look at this text, analyzing text, what do you think is very good in this? And why is it good? What is the verb? What is the spice in this text? What is the art, or?” So we’re going THROUGH a text. Through that method, we can analyze a text much better. So the students could understand, “OK, this is how I should use the Swedish language,” or “this is how I should write.” By doing analysis of different texts. Not pointing out their wrongs and mistakes. I got this theory from the University and also from the teacher training program.

[1 minute interruption while the researcher checks her phone to see if there is a call from her son’s day care.]

R: OK, can you tell me, from the time when you first began teaching deaf children until now, how have your teaching practices changed and why?

C: Today, through cochlear implants. More and more children have cochlear implants. During my day, during the ‘90s, when I was working with sign language and the Swedish language as a second language, I was more focusing on the deaf and hard of hearing, explaining Swedish and sign language. It was very easy because we were doing it through texts as I explained earlier, through books, and explaining through sign language. So it was quite easy to work with the groups—hard of hearing and deaf students—because they were using sign
language as a first language. But today, the new students with cochlear implants, they are not profoundly deaf. They don’t use sign language as the first language, and we need to have other teaching methods. They have Swedish, but not Swedish as a second language. They have Swedish, spoken Swedish, and for me, it’s difficult. And I say, “Stop. I cannot teach all the students and use my methods. I have Swedish as a second language, but—I feel—not Swedish as spoken language.” So today, it’s a little bit different, comparing to back then. Because back then we didn’t have cochlear implanted students when I started to teach. Today it’s sign language and spoken language, spoken Swedish. And not everybody can hear. And the cochlear implanted students, not all of them have good hearing. They don’t have good speech, either. They’re different, also. Some of them need Swedish as a second language, with explanations in Swedish and sign language. So they can understand it. The Swedish language should be taught through sign language, not through spoken Swedish. So, today, it’s a little bit, it’s different. It’s a heterogeneous group. I, as a deaf person, I have students in third grade divided in two groups. And I teach them. Some of them have cochlear implants, and the parents say that they NEED to have spoken language. But the spoken language may be not be ENOUGH for them. And we see that they NEED to have sign language, because we can see—if we just talk to them, speak to them, and explain Swedish through speaking—we can understand that they’re not going to understand it. So we HAVE to give them sign language, also. We can see that, even though the parents want them just to have spoken language, more or less. And I feel that today, first grade parents haven’t been given good information about sign language from the beginning, from the doctors or from the teams. So, that they ABSOLUTELY need sign language. ALL the deaf children, even though they have cochlear implants. And the doctors say, “OK”—when they are giving birth to deaf children—they say directly, the doctors, “Give them cochlear implants.” But the parents haven’t had the chance to realize, actually—they’re oral—that maybe my child needs sign language. Because they’re now so focused on hearing all the time. I have children whose parents are in the grey zone. They don’t actually know, “What does my child need?” I, as a teacher, can today see that some of the children need a good structure. I need good arguments to explain to the parents, “Actually, your child needs sign language, also. Not only the spoken language, spoken Swedish. But, also sign language.” Maybe they can use the spoken language at home, but in school, they actually need sign language. It’s like, we have to put our effort in knowledge, not in hearing training and teaching them how to speak. That’s not the main focus we should have in school. They can speak at home. But in school, we should put our effort in knowledge. And in second grade, the parents are more or less OK. They understand more. But, in first grade, it’s very hard. If I compare to ten, fifteen years ago, maybe, it was much easier. The children got sign language very early because there weren’t any cochlear implants. But today it’s different. So, they are actually postponing sign language. They don’t give sign language to the children so early today. They’re focusing on speech.

R: OK. Let’s see. It’s a little bit past 4:00. What time do you need to leave?

C: Yeah, around 4:00.

R: (to interpreter) And you need to leave at 4:00 also?

I: [response to question] Yeah, around 4:00. Yeah.
R: OK. So, we’re pretty much done here. Can we take maybe ten more minutes?

C: Ten more minutes. Yes, it’s OK.

I: [response to question] Because it’s / I feel now, it’s-

R: Are you getting tired?

I: [response to question] Yeah.

R: I’m sure. I’m sure. OK. It’s just maybe short answers if you can. It’s about your teaching. If you could just say, let’s see: You were just talking about the hardest. What is the most satisfying part about teaching language to children who are deaf? And what is the hardest part?

C: You mean sign language? Swedish or sign language?

R: Both. Language. Yeah.

C: What I feel, OK. The easiest part is to give them knowledge about sign language. What is sign language? The knowledge of sign language. Because that’s my—I love to teach about sign language because I know what I’m doing. I have many years of experience, and I LOVE to give them my experience. I feel it’s very fun. And also, I can see them, they’re very alert, they really enjoy taking all this information. It works very well. I like it very much. And also the Swedish language. How to read books, and explaining and presenting the books through sign language. I sign half of the book, and afterwards I give them books: “OK, now you can read the rest of it.” I think it’s very easy to work in that way. It’s a very good way to work. Also the grammar. When it comes to the grammar, I don’t have so much focus on grammar in first or second grade. They just have a little bit, a little input about grammar, starting awaken their AWARENESS about grammar. But I don’t give them too much grammar in the beginning, when they’re so small. Because it’s too tough, and it’s too much. I need to focus on their curiosity more than to just put in so many facts in the beginning. The hard part is if they are struggling with reading. We have different groups, but one group is a little bit easier. You’ll see when you film it. One group is easier, and there’s one boy in that group, especially, he has learning difficulties. It’s hard for him to LEARN languages, so now we have a different program for him. We don’t know how to—we need a different program. And it’s very exciting, actually, HOW to teach him. I think it’s very hard, HOW to teach him, what METHOD is the best way to give him the opportunity to learn? And also a girl, she’s signing very well, but she has difficulties in reading, understanding what she’s reading. So, THAT’s the hard part, how to give them the right tools so they can learn.

R: OK. And you’ve talked a lot about strengths that you have as a language teacher, about your knowledge of language and your experiences. What would you say are your weaknesses as a language teacher?
C: My weakness is the ones who are struggling, who don’t know how to read, HOW to just let them go, how to make them start to understand. If I build the ground, how to let them to continue building on by themselves on that ground. That’s the hard part. How should I?—I would like to have them reading by themselves. That’s my weak side: how to do that well, how to strengthen them, how to make them ABLE to read by themselves. And also how to teach them how to write. If I write something on the blackboard, on the Smart board, they have difficulties in understanding, and I cannot just let them go. They’re not learning by themselves, and they’re struggling more or less with every word, everything I’m doing. With some of the students, it’s easy. Just give them new words, new texts, and they understand. It’s no problem. But some of the students, they don’t know how to go on by themselves. And how I should find a way: that’s my weakness. Some of the students are very easy to teach. They have good levels. They know they can—they go in steps all the time, in stairs. I give them something, they learn, and they progress by themselves. But some of the students, especially two, are struggling all the time. And that’s my weak side, how to find the [right thing to do?].

R: OK. And very last question: Do you feel that Nilskolan promotes a particular style of teaching, or particular methods? And do you feel that there are methods that are discouraged, or ways of teaching that are discouraged at Nilskolan?

C: In general, or?

R: From your perspective, do you feel that Nilskolan wants teachers to teach in a particular way and perhaps doesn’t want them to teach in another way?

C: When we talk about sign language and Swedish as a second language, I feel that there are too few teachers in Nilskolan who know about sign language as a language. We need more teachers who know about sign language. The ones who are working, I know that some of them have studied sign language at the University, but they don’t have the pedagogical abilities, they don’t know pedagogy, HOW to TEACH and how to explain. I think there’s a big lack when it comes to knowledge about sign language. But, there are a FEW actually in all of Sweden, when it comes to this area—about sign language, how to teach. And I will retire in a few years, maybe four or five years, so I’m thinking about the next group after me. We’re very few that have my knowledge. And lots of the teachers, when they’ve gone to teacher training, they’re HEARING, and they’re being trained together with hearing students also. We need more teachers who are focused on Swedish as a SECOND language. And we have FEW teachers now. We have category meetings in Nilskolan. My responsibility is sign language, and we are few. Through these meetings we can go through how to teach the different classes, how to use—. I don’t understand. The QUESTION maybe wasn’t THAT. What was the question? (laughs)

R: Yeah: If—so maybe the administration at Nilskolan—do they want teachers to be teaching in a certain way? Or do they restrict teachers from teaching in other ways? Does the administration send teachers a message about how they should be teaching?
C: Depends on—. We have to follow the curriculum. So, according to that. But I cannot answer for the other teachers and what they’re doing. I can only answer for me. Hopefully everybody’s doing their job to reach the curriculum (slightly frustrated posture).

R: Yeah, OK. Yeah. And we need to go. But, maybe we can talk about it, and I can ask better, at a later time. But, thank you BOTH for your time. I’m sorry it went a little bit over.

C: Thank you.
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R: So, I'm going ask you questions, basically about your experiences learning language
yourself, as a child and then up through gymnasium (high school) and even college, and then
your experiences being trained to be a teacher of the deaf, and then your experiences actually
teaching.

H: OK.

R: So, we’ll start way back with your experiences as a language learner yourself. What do you
remember about your experiences learning Teckenspråk and Swedish in school? For
example, what sorts of approaches were used to help you learn language?

H: Good question! (laughs)

R: (laughs)

H: In second grade, more or less, they discovered I was hard of hearing. I was hearing until
then—when they discovered it—around second class. They didn’t know that I was hard of
hearing until then. I didn’t realize myself that I was hard of hearing because in my world, I
was hearing.

H: But-. I’ll speak some English because it’s EASY. When it comes to the University, then it’s
different. (laughs)

R: OK. (laughs)

H: So when I grew up, I didn’t know I was hard of hearing. So when I watched TV, it was very
hard for me to HEAR, but I thought THAT was the case. I thought it was the same for other
people. So I didn’t know I was lacking because my father and my brother spoke—they are
hearing—they spoke very well, very loudly, because my mom was deaf. So THAT’s why, I
guess, I was able to get the language. At the same time, I got sign language from my mom
and my grandma, who are also deaf. So, I don’t think I had problems learning language. But
HOW I learned language, that’s very hard to say. But in my class, in my school, there were a
lot of GRAMMAR lessons. You know, old-fashioned. You have to repeat, repeat, and repeat
the same, the same, all the time. Today it’s a little different. We have grammar lessons, but
we have NORMAL text, a normal book. But then, it was just grammar. But my mom liked to
read a lot. She reads a lot. And she also was hard of hearing from the beginning, so she was
able to talk, and she read a lot. She took me and my brother to the library once a week or twice a week. So, I was learning at a very early age to take books home and start reading. My brother, HE was my first teacher, my older brother. He’s six years older than me. He taught me how to write my name. And that’s how it started.

Hs: Just letters in the beginning. (laughs) Now I figured something out! I thought I wrote something important but it was just letters, you know. (laughs) Mixing letters. And he showed me how to spell my name, around four or five years of age.

R: OK.

H: But I believe it was because of the books, too. That my mom loves to read. She loves language. She’s always our teacher. So, maybe that’s why.

R: Right. So you feel like the grammar lessons in school weren’t necessarily very helpful in learning-

H: (overlapping) Boring. No. (laughs)

R: OK, OK. (laughs) OK. Let’s see. And you’ve studied English, obviously, as a foreign language. What kind of approaches were used when you were learning English, or any other foreign language?

H: I went to a school for hearing people. So, I haven’t been to a deaf school. I missed quite a lot. It just passed me buy.

H: Because I was ashamed of wearing aids. I wanted to be as normal as possible. So, I don’t know. Maybe we were reading English in the third grade. And it is easy for me to learn language. That’s genetic or something, too, I guess. So, I don’t know how we started to learn English, but we used to have EASY books, easy words. And my brother was always pushing me. He said, “It’s important for you to learn language. It’s important you to ‘be’ ‘done’ ‘did’, you know, ‘gone’ ‘done’ / how do you say?

R: Conjugation?

H: Yeah. Yeah. He said, “You have to learn.” He was pushing. We traveled around once a year in the summer with a caravan. We went to Spain, England. So when I was little, I was used to USING English because we were tourists and we were trying to talk. We started to travel when I was around six years old, so I KNEW there was a goal. I knew why it was good to know how to speak English. Because I can communicate with other people.

R: OK, OK.

H: And then I studied French in seventh class.

Hs: It’s one thing to learn French in school and another thing to actually practice it.
R: Yeah. Mm-hmm. I studied French, too. I don’t know a thing. (laughs)

H: I remember I came to France, and I was speaking some French, and they were just saying, “Excuse me, can you speak some English, instead?” (laughs)

R: Right. (laughs) OK.

H: So, I was using the language, English, first. And then I went to the United States, when I was about twenty years old, and I worked there for one year, in Washington, DC. And that was good. I didn’t know any Swedish people there, which is very good because then you HAVE to use the language.

R: Mm-hmm, mm-hmm. Did you learn American Sign Language when you were there, as well?

H: No, that came later.

R: Ah, OK.

H: When I was in the teacher training program).

R: Right.

H: Then we went to Boston.

R: OK.

H: There we learned some ASL.

R: OK, and for your French and ASL classes: Anything you remember particularly about the approaches they used to teach the languages? Or things that helped you in learning them?

H: Well I had private lessons because I couldn’t hear French from the other students. So, I was a lonely student with one teacher. The first teacher I had, she was very BORING because she was very GRAMMAR, grammar, grammar. And I was (affects a yawn). I was SO tired all the time. I don’t think I was speaking French very well then, but then I changed teachers. That teacher, she didn’t do much grammar. She was SPEAKING, speaking. She was trying to figure out a subject. And we would try to speak some French, and then it was easier. And then you feel motivated. So-

[1 minute break while Helena’s son asks her a question from where he is playing upstairs.]

H: Where were we? Yeah, anyway. So, the second teacher, she was much better because then you feel a lot more motivated. So, that’s how I learned to speak some French.

R: Right.
H: Communication instead of grammar, grammar, writing, writing.

R: Mm-hmm.

H: I think you need to have both, but it needs to be a balance.

R: Mm-hmm. Yeah. OK. Ah, OK. So, just a little bit of background, how long have you been a teacher of the deaf?

H: Thirteen years.

R: OK, OK. Has it always been at Nilskolan?

H: Yeah.

R: Yeah, OK. And what grades and subjects?

H: The lower level. Often first grade up to third or fourth, and then I go back again to the first grade. My MAIN subjects are Swedish and sign language, but often you have to teach all the subjects, especially at the lower level, yeah. So, it’s mathematics and Social-

R: Studies.

H: Yes. So, I’ve been teaching, but often I’ve been teaching students that have extra problem with learning language or mathematics.

Hs: Additional disabilities.

R: Oh, OK. I see.

H: So, it’s the first time, right now, I’m teaching (open air quotes) NORMAL (close air quotes) students, yeah.

R: OK, OK. First time since you’ve started teaching?

H: Almost.

R: OK, OK. So, two years ago, when I was observing, I think you were teaching fifth grade? Or sixth grade?

H: Sixth.

R: Yeah. That was unusual? You don’t normally teach that high?
H: No. That one, I was teaching two groups. You were watching the smaller group. And a large one. That was actually the first time I was teaching students that were learning in normal way.

R: I see, OK.

H: Yeah, you were watching me and what was my colleague’s name?

R: Oh, Ella was?

H: No, no.

R: Oh, there was another teacher.

H: She was deaf.

R: Right.

H: Oh my gosh! I forgot her name. (smiles)

R: I don’t remember. (laughs)

H: Anyway, there was one.

R: OK.

H: Yeah, you were watching us then.

R: Right, right. Way back. (laughs) Yeah. So, and why did you decide to become a teacher of the deaf?

H: Actually, I didn’t want to become a teacher. I never thought I would become a teacher (laughs). Actually, after I worked in United States—I worked in a very wealthy family—and they said, “You have to do a career. You have to have a good job with lots of money. And you are hard of hearing. Well, you should work with computers.”

R: Hmm.

H: I said, “Me and computers? Mm. Mm. Well, maybe.” So, I went back to Sweden. I was trying to find funding. There’s some money for study. I was ACCEPTED into a college in United States, North Carolina. I got into Computer Science.

R: OK.

H: But, it was very very expensive. So, I didn’t get enough money. Often you have to be born here in Stockholm or you have to be in a deaf school to get—it’s easier to get more money
then. And so, I was born in the wrong PLACE, and I haven’t been to a deaf school. So it’s very hard to get enough money. So, I was looking at an Education catalog, and then I saw this, and I thought, “Me teaching deaf? Well, why not. I can TRY.”

R: Right. (laughs)

H: I can try. So that’s how I got in. Because I took some tests, sign language tests, and Swedish tests, and yeah! And I came in. That’s HOW, and I felt, “This is ME!”

R: This works, yeah.

H: This is good. This is a good job!

R: OK, OK. And so tell me a little bit about your teacher preparation. Did they promote a particular style of teaching language?

H: No. There was never ONE method.

R: Mm, mm.

H: But, we were lucky that OUR teacher was a teacher himself. You know, sometimes when you go to the University, the teachers only teach students. But THOSE teachers—both of them, often we had two teachers—they were in Nilskolan. They were working at Nilskolan. So they had lot of experience.

R: Mm-hmm.

H: Very good experience. And I think that was very good. Because sometimes you feel like University is its OWN world and then you came to the REAL world, and it’s like, “OK.” But, they were very good teachers. They gave us lots of examples. How do you do? How do you teach this if they have problems with this or that or? And then we came to Nilskolan, also, and had a lot of practicum experiences.

R: Mm-hmm. Mm-hmm.

H: There, they didn’t give us special method. But, one of them said it’s very important to have lust (desire), ‘lust’, can you say ‘lust’?

R: Yeah.

I: [repetition] Yeah.

H: ‘Cause if you don’t have THAT, you can’t teach.

R: For the students to have it? Or for-
H: (overlapping) For the students. Exactly. For the students to have desire. If they don’t, you can stay there and try to teach, but they won’t learn that much. And I think that’s a good way to be because we work in a different way sometimes. Even me and my colleague, she is very much for books: “Give them books. Do this, do this.” But I am more like, you have to have practice also. You have to have lust (desire), lust att lära (desire to learn).

Hs: I have students with other disabilities, other problems, not only hard of hearing or deaf. Other problems.

H: They have a hard time reading, so I CAN’T give them books and grammar and “do this, do that.” They are like (mimics refusing to pay attention). They don’t want to do it. So I have to be careful. I have to do something they’re interested in. Depends on what they are interested in. If they are interested in pirates, then you have to find a book about it. And maybe you change the meanings yourself, make them easier. And give them something to TALK about. I mean, you can’t teach grammar. Like “tch, tch, tch,” (gestures methodical motion) if they don’t have desire.

R: Right, OK.

H: It doesn’t give them anything. You have to find a text that’s very good, get them interested. That’s the most important.

R: OK.

H: But, it’s HARD. Because, you see, in my older class, they were seventh and eighth graders. They had different-. We had a two boys and four girls. The girls wanted to have subjects that were about LOVE, and the guys were like, “Ohhh, my gosh!” (laughs) So we were trying to find a book because they had to read a book at home. They COULD read. They had started to read. So then we would come back and talk about the book. That’s one way.

R: Right. Did your teachers in the training program talk about—if you ARE going to teach grammar, so in some sort of interesting context for the students—any particular ways to teach Swedish grammar or Teckenspråk grammar to deaf students? Do you remember anything particular about types of instruction?

H: (Sighs) That was a long time ago.

R: Yeah.

H: Agneta went to the same school as me, but I can’t remember that they were teaching, saying, “Write this.” SOMEtimes, they did. But, not much.

R: No?

H: No.
R: Did they talk at all about comparing the two?

H: Yeah. At the University, we were studying sign language. Then we were studying some Swedish. Then we were talking about how we can compare the languages. So, in terms of-, yeah.

R: OK, OK.

H: I think that’s very positive for me as a Swedish teacher, that I’m teaching through-, that I ALSO teach sign language and know a lot about sign language. Because, I think, learning language is very good when you can compare your first language and the second language, and you can compare, and you can talk about it: “Hey! What’s different with this? What’s the same?” Because many teachers are only teaching Swedish, but they don’t know anything about sign language. They can sign, but don’t know much about sign language. So, I think it’s very positive that I’m teaching both of them. I can COMPARE because that makes the language much more interesting.

R: Mm-hmm. Mm-hmm. OK. Thanks. Another one asking you to think back to when you started teaching: Can you think of any ways that teaching practices have changed since you first began teaching the deaf, and why?

H: First, when I start to work, I worked with two older teachers that are retarded right now. No! R: Retired.

H: Retired. Ah! (laughs) I was like, “Stop!” Oh my gosh! So, they wanted to have a book that was repeating, repeating the same meaning. Maybe THAT book is good for the students who have a HARD time learning language. They need to repeat, repeat. But, it’s a BORING book. When you can learn language and you don’t have any problems with remembering, then it’s very-, it goes again and again. But, they wanted to use this book, so I started to teach from this book. It didn’t feel OK for me, but I was beginner. I TRUSTed them. “It’s a good book? OK, I’ll try!” But I noticed that they were like, “Oh my gosh! We don’t want to read, to have this book anymore.” That was in the first grade, and they was getting tired in the Spring. They didn’t want to have that book anymore. So the BOOK is a very important, what kind of students you have. So, I’ve changed because I have a book that is not repeating all the time. If the student needs it, yeah, then I have that kind of a book. But if they’re learning in the normal way, you have to have a book that they can identify with. I love that book, “Theos Läserbok” (“Theo’s Reading Book”). I can show you.

R: OK.

H: OK. Because it’s about a boy in the first grade, and they like to read about him. So I’ve changed. And now, today, I use the Kiwi method, where we talk about pictures.

Hs: And when they’re totally clear about the MEANING of the book, or the GOAL of it, then we talk about the text afterwards.
H: Because before I had to sign the story before I started to read it.

R: Mm-hmm.

H: That was one method. I was signing, and THEN we started to look at the Swedish text. Because it’s very important.

Hs: They have to know the context. [unclear sentence – interpreter and Helena are speaking at the same time] It’s too much to have both at the same time, to have context and the text at the same time. So you try to focus first to understand what it’s all about and then, afterwards, focus on the text.

R: Mm-hmm.

H: There are very few materials that are in both sign language and Swedish in parallel. But “Adams Bok” (“Adam’s Book”). I was using Adams Bok.

R: Is that the repetitive one? Or?

H: That was signing. No. It was signing. They have the video that has signing. And then they have the book in Swedish.

R: Ah, the video. OK.

H: That’s about a deaf boy.

R: Right, right. I’ve heard of that one, yeah. While you’re talking about Kiwi, I’ve been wondering: Was that curriculum designed for deaf children, or was it just a language learning curriculum?

H: That’s for students in general. It came from New Zealand.

R: Hmm. OK.

Hs: More and more people are using it today. A small part of the Kiwi books or materials are more focused on deaf, hard of hearing.

R: Hm. OK. And I’m curious about the curriculum. Did they give you specific goals for each book? Like, I was noticing in some classes that the past tense comes up a lot in a certain book, and so it gives the teacher the opportunity to talk about the past. Are there teaching materials that direct you toward, you know, a good way of using the book for teaching certain parts of language?

H: No, I think it’s more like, in the United States, in America, you are more-. When I was at a US school, recently, they had a very, “This is a book you’re going to use to teach…”
R: To teach X, Y, Z.

H: In Sweden, you don’t have that at all. It’s up to the teacher what book to use.

R: Mm. OK.

H: It’s both good, and also bad. Because then it’s different. Teachers use different books, and they give different grades, different expectations.

R: Ah.

H: So now they are start at Nilskolan with Mathematics. They want to have one book.

Hs: The same book, you know, like, a series of the same book.

R: Mm-hmm.

H: But I think it’s good to not have the same book in SWEDISH. Because then you can use what they are interested in.

R: Mm-hmm.

H: But I think- Hs: the Kiwi method is very good. In the beginning, anyway.

R: Mm-hmm. Mm-hmm.

Hs: But there are no special books at our school, no grammar books. There ARE grammar books, but every teacher can decide themselves what book to use while they’re teaching.

R: Hmm. OK, OK. Let’s see, OK. What’s the most satisfying part of teaching children who are deaf for you? And what’s the hardest part?

H: The most fun, is when they say, “I can read! (smiles glowingly) Ah! I was reading for my mother and my father! Oh!” They are so happy about it, and you feel like, “Yeah, wow! You can!” I think that’s the most fun thing, when you get to see how happy they become.

[1 minute break while Helena’s son asks for some cookies.]

H: When they know they can, I think, when you see the happiness. “Ah, I CAN! I can do this.” And they’re surprised by themselves. Like, the other students I had before, they were like, “No way. I’m not gonna open a book.” And then they start to get interested. “I can!” Then you get very happy. The HARDEST thing is to see: When I see they are trying-
Hs: struggling, struggling. Because some students have a very short memory. Very short memory.

H: It’s hard for them to remember. And they feel frustrated. “(Affects a sigh) How am I gonna do this? I want to help you, but HOW?” I think that’s hardest. I can be teaching the same, the same, repeating. And two weeks later, they’ve forgotten the words. That’s the hard thing. Because I WANT them to read a little, but they keep forgetting. Then it’s something else. That’s the kind of-

Hs: They have difficulties in learning language. They don’t know how to use language, or language learning problems.

R: Mm-hmm.

H: And also when I took my older class. I took them when they were fifth grade, I guess, when I was pregnant with him. When I started work again, I got this class, and they were like fifth grade, and many of them were like, “Don’t teach me Swedish!” They were (mimics resisting). Maybe some teachers before had been trying to (signs /TEACH/ aggressively and repeatedly), you know. You have to have balance.

Hs: You should not destroy the happiness. They should feel the JOY of studying.

H: Because I have made mistakes myself, especially in the beginning. I was like, “No, you have to read.” Or “No, you have to read.” And they were DYING every time. They were bored. But now I’ve learned, as fast as you see that they are (mimics refusing to pay attention), then you have to change the book. That’s what I did with the boys in the small class. They were (mimics refusing). “We’ll take another book. That’s OK! That’s fine.” They said, “This is boring.” “Fine! We’ll take another book. That’s OK.” THEN you find another book, and then it was, “Ah!” Reading. You have to bryta (break) (mimics breaking something, like a stick, between her hands).

I: [explanation] You have to DARE not to walk in the same steps all the time. You have to think in new ways.

H: Yeah. Sometimes teachers are like, “The goal is here. You want to go this way. You go this way” (signs /GOAL/ repeatedly). And they stop listening to the students. Because you REALLY want them to read this thing, but you need to be flexible. I don’t know if I answered your question.

R: Yes, you did. I think. Yes, you did! Yes. (laughs) What do you think are your strengths as a language teacher? And what are your weaknesses?

H: [short phrase in Swedish the interpreter doesn’t translate] I’m very creative. I can use many paths. I’m not very afraid of how to work, to try to have fun. And I also know about the language, that’s [mostly because?] I like to read by myself. My weakest side, sometimes I feel, if they ask me in grammar, “WHY is it like that?” It’s like, “OK, why?” Because often
you KNOW it’s the right thing, but WHY? That’s a hard question, especially in the higher grade levels. You REALLY have to know. So I was asking some other teachers, I said, “Why do you use this and not that?” And they said, “We don’t know.”

R: Right. (laughs)

H: I was like, “WHAT?!?” (laughs) I think that’s my weakness, sometimes. I have to know more WHY is it in this way.

R: Mm-hmm. Mm-hmm. OK. Let’s-

H: (overlapping) And then I say to students, “Wait a minute! I’m gonna figure it out.”

R: Let’s see, OK. Why did you choose to work at Nilskolan?

H: I didn’t want to work at Nilskolan, actually (laughs). Because I was born in another city, another part of Sweden. So when I finished four years here—I studied for four years here at the University—when I finished with school, I was going home. I was going to work at the school at home, called Norraskolan. So I asked them, and they said, “Yeah. We are paying for the ticket, the plane ticket. We’re gonna give you an interview. So I went there for the interview. Everything was fine. Yes. But also I thought, “Maybe I’m gonna interview at Nilskolan, too, in CASE. But, anyway, I’m not gonna work at Nilskolan, but in CASE. So, I went to the interview in Nilskolan, and she was asking me a lot of questions. And she said, “Do you really want to work here?” “Mm, no. I don’t.” (laughs) “No, I don’t,” I said. And she was like, “Huh? What are you doing here then? OK, bye!” And then, in the same year, Norraskolan had too little money.

Hs: They couldn’t employ any more people. They hadn’t enough money. During all the time of the history of Norraskolan, this was the first time they ever had problems with their financials. So, they couldn’t employ any new people.

H: So, they said, “Sorry. We’re not going to hire anyone this year.” And I was so depressed, and I was so [xxxx], because I had to go back to Nilskolan (laughs)-

R: (laughs)

H: in SHAME. You know, “I’m sorry! Can I have work?” And they said, “Of course.” So I start to work at Nilskolan. The very next year then, they called me back, Norraskolan, and they said, “NOW, now we’re gonna have some openings. You want to work with us?” And I said, “No, I don’t.” Because then I had started to work, I had worked for one year. The FIRST time you start to work, you have to communicate with the teachers. I didn’t focus so much on the students because I had to communicate with the teachers I was working with, and we didn’t get along always. We had different kinds of ideas. The “retarded teachers” (laughs).

R: (laughs)
H: No! They didn’t think in the same way. So, it was very very-, it was very central for me right then. But, after a year, when we figured out where we stood, then I could focus more on my students. And that works, you can figure out the students. And then I started to focus on the students. And then they called me at Norraskolan, and I was like, “No, I just STARTED here. So, wait. Wait for another year.” But then I was (mimics being rooted in the ground).

Ht: Grounded.

H: Yeah. At Nilskolan. I think that was very important because if you can’t work with your colleagues, then it’s very hard to work with the students.

R: Mm-hmm. Mm-hmm.

Hs: Too much impact on the students if you don’t work together well with your colleagues.

R: Too much impact?

I: [response to question] Yeh, NEGATIVE impact on the students-

R: (overlapping) I see.

I: [explanation] IF you don’t work well with your colleagues.

R: Right, right.

H: It’s, I mean, you can’t be-

Hs: We don’t agree always, my colleague and me, who I’m working together with now. But I have to always find a NEW way, how to work well together for the sake of the students.

R: Right, right. OK. Do you feel that Nilskolan promotes any particular style of teaching language? Like, do the administration have ideas about the ways the teachers should be teaching language?

H: No. Not as long as I’ve been working with-. First, when Agneta got-

Hs: She was VICE principal, not principal, but she was working.

H: (overlapping) THEN she started to (bangs on the table with her fist)-

Hs: She actually was very strict, and she said, “You have to focus on HOW we’re teaching languages.” Before that, there weren’t any, you know, special strategies, no special WAY to teach language. But when Agneta started to work, she said, “we HAVE to have a GOOD way of teaching language.”
Hs: So when Agneta started to work, they had different strategies. And also the children had different diagnosis. They have DIFFERENT problems. They need different ways of teaching. So we were aware of HOW we are now teaching the students. And last year, we haven’t had that before.

R: Last year it started that there’s a focus on how you’re teaching language.

Hs: No, maybe three, four years. Yes, HOW to teach.

R: We’re almost out of time, but I’m interested in that idea. Can you tell me something about how? So you’re talking about how, but what are some of the ways that you’re doing it?

Hs: Lots of teachers are teaching Swedish as a first language.

R: Mm.

Hs: They are becoming more and more aware that they have to compare the languages. They HAVE to feel safe and comfortable in the first language. And when they’re comfortable in the first language, it’s much easier to study a second language because you can always compare, because you have the first language to lean on, go back to, all the time.

R: And the grammar particularly, or?

Hs: Yes, actually, the grammar. And also the books, and the LAYOUT of the books, the pictures, are more strategically-. They’re more aware of how to use the layout than before. It’s about society in general. It’s very important with pictures, you know, the visual impacts are more focused on today in society than they were maybe ten years ago. All the books were text-based, more or less no pictures. Today, more pictures, less text-based. I’m not talking about the higher levels. You know, the lower levels.

H: What was the question?

R: Just, um-

Hs: HOW? What’s the differences? You have more demands. You have to reach the goals much more now than we had to before. Today, they say that you have to reach all these goals. That’s a DEMAND more today than it was before. Today we have special forms. We fill out special forms about the students, which say, “Well, you’re now on this level, and you need this to reach the goal.” And before we didn’t have those type of forms to fill out. So, we’re more focused on HOW we are teaching for the students to reach the goals, different goals that we’re setting for the students.

H: Because when we met the parents before, when I started, we could say, “Ah, he’s having a little bit of a hard time learning language.” And that was it. But now you have to SHOW what’s hard for him, and you have more paper. And THAT’s good because then you have to think more, ‘HOW do you teach?’ You have to start thinking about how you teach.
R: OK. Where did those forms come from? Were they created at Nilskolan? Or was that a national curriculum?

Hs: It’s from the National School Board. But, it’s different in different schools. There are different ones in different schools. But, in general all the schools have these types of forms. Nilskolan has always been in the front line, trying to teach in new ways, to listen to the new directives from up above. And they’re always listening and trying to readjust all the time. So, Nilskolan’s been very [xxxx]. Sometimes too much. And with these papers, forms, we give them every Spring and every Autumn. We check the goals, if they’ve reached the goals. It’s too much at Nilskolan, TOO much GOAL-focused. Too much filling out forms. And when you’re sitting with the parents and going through the student, the child, it’s too much. Takes too much time.

H: Because my other children, I went to THEIR school. They have one paper that tells about the goals, how do you do it, in a GOOD way. And they have one paper. We have twenty-five or thirty papers. I mean, there’s a lot of papers. So, I think we have to change a bit when it comes to this document, [conversation?] with the parents. So I think that’s one way that’s GOOD. We have to document because we’ll be more aware of how we teach-

R: Mm-hmm.

H: than before. Before you could teach: “Oh! It wasn’t successful, but OK.” But now you have to, “What am I doing?”

R: Right, right. OK, all right. That’s all I have. Thank you.

H: Did I give any smart answers? (laughs)

R: (laughs) It’s great. Thank you. Just some background. Thank you.
Appendix K

Stimulated Recall Interview Transcript, Christel

Stimulated Recall Interview: Christel
Length: 89 minutes
Location: Researcher’s home

TRANSMUTED TEXT

R: We talked a little bit about what this was going to be. It’s called a Stimulated Recall interview, and what that means is that: Over the past 5 weeks, I’ve videotaped twelve hours of your teaching, and so I’ve gone through and picked sections of that video that I want to show to you because I want to hear your thoughts on the teaching. And they’re specifically chosen because, for the MOST part, they represent grammar teaching in some way. Because I’m particularly interested in the teaching of grammar. I have a little script here that I’ll read to you about the procedure, and then if you have any questions about it before we start, you can tell me. OK?

C: OK. Not now. But I hope there are some clips that are good, so you have good ones. Because, I don’t know—we discussed that earlier—because we want something that’s very good. If I see something very very good that’s useful to show parents. Also, I don’t know how—for my OWN sake—we’re discussing bilingualism, and I would like to see how, actually, we are working: pedagogy, how we are teaching. I think this is very rich and very good material, and I think this is very important.

R: Ah, yeah. Me too. (laughs) Really with your class, there was SO MUCH video that was good—that I thought represented some really fantastic technique and was really worth looking more into—that the hard part was picking, getting it down. I tried to get it down to about twenty, twenty-five minutes because we only have ninety minutes to talk about it. So, this is a sliver of what I’ll be probably writing about in the paper, which you’ll certainly get a copy of, and you can tell me what you think.

C: OK, good. Good. Very good.

R: Yeah? OK. So, (reading from prepared script): we’re going to watch sections of videotapes from lessons I’ve watched over the past 5 weeks. I chose these particular sections to share with you because I believe that your thoughts about them may provide insight into your thoughts about the teaching of grammar. It absolutely does not matter whether the lessons we are about to watch are GOOD ones or not. I do not intend to evaluate any of the lessons. I’m solely interested in how you THINK about your practice as a language teacher. The purpose of this interview is to stimulate you to remember what was on your mind during the lesson. I may also ask you specific questions to help you reflect on your teaching practices. OK? If you want to stop the tape yourself any time to comment, you should feel free to do so. OK? OK. No questions?
C: No, no questions.

R: OK. OK.

C: OK. So, we’ll try. We’re practicing now.

R: Yeah. See how it goes-

C: (overlapping) Let’s see what happens.

R: Yeah. (laughs) OK. Let’s see, let me just make sure I have this right.

C: (pointing at still video shot) Good quality.

R: Yeah. Actually, I should mention, this very first tape is from the first class I observed, and I was using a resolution on the camera that was too high, and so sometimes when you’re signing, your fingers look blurry. And the kids’ fingers are blurry. Hopefully you can still understand. Every video after this is better than this one. OK.

C: OK.

R: All right, let’s see, the first one. OK, this is forty-five seconds. OK, they’re short. (laughs)

[watching video – C1/V2 7:00-7:45 (IND/DEF: loppa-n)]

R: OK. Any thoughts / what you were thinking at that moment? Particularly when Joana added the ‘-n’.

C: I was thinking, “OK, I would like to emphasize loppa (flea)—the uninflected form is loppa”—because they were going to read about it later on. And it will also be in the text, loppan (the flea) with an ‘-n’. And I KNEW that some of them would be a little bit confused, “Why with an ‘-n’? Loppa, loppa, loppa.” And I have to tell them, “loppan,” because in sign language we don’t have loppan. We just have loppa on the mouth. That’s why I told them it also is loppan in the definite form. And also, when we sign loppan, we don’t have the ‘-n’ on the mouth, just loppa, so that they will know that ‘-n’ will show up in the text. Because if I don’t tell them—I normally don’t tell them—but in this case, I KNEW that the ‘-n’ word, loppan, with an ‘-n’ was going to show up in the text. And then they would remember what I told them about loppan. It’s the definite form.

R: Yeah. OK, OK.

C: That’s why I told them. OK?

R: (looking over shoulder at camera) I’m just checking to make sure (laughs) we’re still working on the video. OK. We’ll skip forward a little bit. OK, and this one is about two minutes long.
C: OK.


C: [interrupts video at 10:11] I feel a little bit—I don’t think I understand. You’re interested in grammar, actually, but HERE, I will just tell you that—OK, in the book it says ‘gick nedför’ (went down), and I would like to tell them the verb in present time. So I don’t know if—in normal cases, I wouldn’t tell them things like that in my grammar lessons, in lessons like that. So, this is not NORMAL for me to do this.

R: OK. So why in this situation did you decide to do that?

C: I think because, during this period, we have been talking about present and past tense. And when they’re writing, it’s important to choose the right form. Is it presens (present) or dåtid (past tense)? And repeat that. So maybe—I remember this one, and also because of this—I tried to somewhere break this and make a NEW one, just during this situation. If they know that it is går (go), for instance, when I ask them. I asked them, “What is it called in the present time?” He said, “går.” It’s just for me to make them aware: “OK, then you know, present time is går. Past tense—this is past tense when we’re talking about gick.”

R: Right.

C: And ‘went down’, ‘gick nedför’, I think this also was a little bit not so obvious, not so clear. Because they’re walking down hill, nedför, and he went like this (/SLIDE/), fast. And it needs to be correct. Also, later on, he will not WALK downhill there, later on in the book. He will SLIDE down. So that’s why I needed to make them aware in the beginning, because more or less this is the same sentence.

R: (presents Christel with copy of book they were reading so she can show the page she’s referring to)

C: (looking at text) OK, now. OK. Yes. No, no, no. OK, actually, in the END, in the end, he’s sliding down the back. He’s jumping from the ear, and he’s sliding. Yes. He’s jumping, he’s sliding.

R: (flipping to a page) I think it’s that one.

C: (pointing) Yeah.

R: Ah!

C: This (/JUMP SLIDE/). Like this.

R: Mmm.
C: Yeah. He’s walking and jumping and walking down like this. But in THIS case, in the beginning, he’s walking, you know, with the same hand shape. I needed for them to understand: You can use the same HAND shape, and it’s more or less the same. But ACTUALLY it’s not the same as in the end. Because I already was thinking about the end in the beginning.

R: OK, OK. Um, OK. So, just so I understand: You’re saying typically you wouldn’t stop when you’re reading and say, “This is a past tense. What’s the verb in the present tense?”

C: Yes.

R: But the reason you did for this book is because it’s something that they’ve been working on in their writing and you wanted to remind them about it.

C: Exactly. Exactly.

R: OK.

C: Exactly.

R: OK. Let me just write that down (notes time of video interruption). OK, so this one continues. We’ll just…OK.

[watching video – C1/V2 10:11 – 11:14 (TENSE: sjöng – sjunga)]

R: OK. Actually it continues. So I can keep playing unless you wanted to say anymore about that?

C: No, no.

R: OK, it goes on. (laughs) We’ll go on a little bit further. Um, here we go.

[watching video – C1/V2 11:15 – 13:20 (TENSE: speech in present (italics))]}

C: [interrupts video at 11:58] (gestures toward researcher)

R: Do you want to stop it?

C: Do you understand this? Do you understand? No?

R: Oh, OK. Yeah-

C: (overlapping) I’m just asking: You understand why we’re talking about this one (/ITALICS/), yeah?

R: Mm-hmm.
R: OK. So I was interested in—you were talking about past tense and then you were talking about present tense. What was the motivation behind doing that?

C: Because in the text, they are saying in present time, “I am the king.” He’s singing, “I am the king of the mountain.” So they should be aware that he’s saying it in the present time. But, actually, it’s in the past tense. And also, in the normal text, it’s all in the past. Often, when they’re saying something, it’s more or less based normally on the present time, like they are saying something, like “I’m the king of the mountain.” And that’s ALMOST in present time when they’re using things like that.

R: I’m not sure I- (puzzled expression)

C: The text is written in the past tense: “He went down the hill and sang.” And when he’s singing, WHAT he is singing, THAT’s actually in the present. That’s why, “I AM.” So I would like them to understand that difference. The text is in past, but they’re singing in present.

R: OK. WHY is that something that you want them to understand? Why is that important?

C: In case maybe they are confused: “WHY is it now and past, present and past, why are we jumping between past and present all the time. So that’s why I’m explaining. Because when somebody’s saying something, it’s normally in the present.

R: Right. OK. OK. And then it continues for about another minute.

C: [interrupts video at 13:42] Why is he not walking to the front? I’m a bit confused.

R: Oh, because he wasn’t in the study, yet. This was the first day, so he wasn’t supposed to be on film. So, yeah.

C: Ah, that’s a little bit—that’s a pity.

R: Yeah. Here, I’ll rewind a little bit just so you don’t miss. Here we go.

C: I would like to give them AWARENESS, how they translate from Swedish text to sign language. Earlier, I gave them—in first grade—that ‘am’, ‘I am’, ‘on’: We don’t use that in
sign language. So I would just like to remind them: “Not ‘am’. And Collin, he didn’t have me as a teacher earlier, so my thought here was to check with him—all of them—do you remember when we were talking about ‘am’, ‘on’? We don’t use that in sign language. So that’s why I was talking about that. And how to sign it: /I KING MOUNTAIN/. /MOUNTAIN STAND(-on) KING I/. How to do it in sign language? In sign language, it’s very short. Sometimes I remind them how we use sign language because I would like them to remember that, and not to forget how sign language works compared to Swedish.

R: OK, OK. OK, thank you.

C: I’m not so fond of signing, you know, following the Swedish text. So I—in parentheses—I would like to-. The cochlear implants are increasing, and if we don’t use the right sign language, take the chance to teach them about correct sign language—maybe when they go to Nilskolan in the first grade, they’ve been to another day care or something, another school before, they don’t have good sign language—and I would like to take care of sign language, the proper care, so we don’t destroy sign language, the form of sign language. THAT’s why I’m reminding them.

R: OK. Um, OK. We’re going to skip to another tape. Same class, later. Just so you know, as well, the camera automatically cuts and makes a new file every twenty minutes or so, so sometimes I’ll be showing you a clip and it’ll stop. And then I’ll start the next one. Just to save it on the disk, it does that. OK, 4-

C: (overlapping) This is still the loppan (the flea)?

R: Yeah, this is the last page, or near the end. Yeah.

[watching video – C1/V4 4:05-7:25 (PREP/TSP: ut ur, längs, utför)]

C: [interrupts video at 4:42] (laughs) Yeah, that’s typical.

R: Ah?

C: That’s typical. He’s quite often—he talks about other things. ‘Ur’ (out of), it’s the same word as ‘clock’. You know ‘out of’, it’s the same word. So, quite often he’s-. And I try not to get off track too much because I still have to say, OK, correct him: “THAT’s correct, BUT now we’re talking about this.”

R: Mm. OK.

C: I have to always put him back.

R: OK.

C: And I think he has a little bit of ADD. You know?
R: Yeah, OK. OK.

[watching video – C1/V4 4:42-7:25 (PREP/TSP: ut ur, längs, utför)]

C: [interrupts video at 5:07] Yes, and his signing is a little bit odd. He’s signing ‘cow’ like this (signs /COW/ below her ears) not on his head. And he’s a little—his sign for ‘film’, he uses this (signs /FILM/ as an amalgam of the verb and the noun). This is quite EXCITING actually, to just look at WHAT he’s-. When we’re talking about filming, he can see this (/TO FILM/ handshape). He can see the shape. He can see what I’m doing. But when HE’s signing, he’s doing it differently. So, just outside, but interesting.

R: OK.

[watching video – C1/V4 5:07-7:25 (PREP/TSP: ut ur, längs, utför)]


R: Mm-hmm.

[watching video – C1/V4 5:17-7:25 (PREP/TSP: ut ur, längs, utför)]

C: [interrupts video at 5:57] Ah, it’s quick. He’s signing ‘outside’, not ‘utför’, you know, ‘down’. This is ‘längs utför’ (down along). ‘Utför’ is ‘down’, it’s very slight. ‘ALONG’, you know, ‘längs’, ‘along’. ‘Utför’, but he’s signing ‘OUTSIDE’. So, he sees ‘out’, ‘ut-’, ‘-för’, and he see those words, but he thinks ‘utanför’. They’re his own words.

R: OK.

[watching video – C1/V4 5:57-7:25 (PREP/TSP: ut ur, längs, utför)]

C: [interrupts video at 6:44] She’s a little bit shy. I try to make her talk a little bit more, but I would like her to feel that, “OK, you can SEE me. You see me. You are aware that I’m in the class.” Sometimes she’s very very shy, so I HAVE to. She’s very smart. She’s bright. She’s a good reader. But I would like her to show more because I KNOW she can, but she’s shy.

R: OK.

[watching video – C1/V4 6:44-7:25 (PREP/TSP: ut ur, längs, utför)]

C: [interrupts video at 7:02] I’m seeing, I wanted to see if he would succeed doing this (/SLIDE/) with the right hand shape, and not ‘walking’.

R: ‘Walking’, mm-hmm.
R: (overlapping) Sliding, mm-hmm.

C: Yeah, sliding. In fixed position.

R: Mm. OK.

C: So that’s why.

R: OK.

[watching video – C1/V4 7:02-7:25 (PREP/TSP: ut ur, längs, utför)]

R: OK. OK, so as a whole, on that page, you spent a good deal of time making sure they understood what that meant. Was there any particular reason why this page you thought it was important to have them explain?

C: Which one? This one (pointing to a copy of a page in the book).

R: THIS one, mm-hmm.

C: Because it’s so very rich language. There’s so much content actually explained in sign language. In the Swedish text, it’s very short. But in sign language, it’s very rich. I don’t want them to, when they’re reading something—OK, they can see the text. But, I don’t want them to just sign it. I would like them to see the whole picture, actually what is it saying? And in sign language, it’s much richer than just these words. So that’s why I’m spending so much time to help them to understand. There are a lot of polysyntactic signs, you know, lots of things are happening at the same time within one sign.

R: Mm-hmm. Mm-hmm.

C: So that’s why. Because later, when they HAVE all this, they KNOW how sign language is working and how to process this language, sign language, it will be much easier for them to read and understand, actually, the text.

R: OK, OK. Is there anything particular about the Swedish words on this page that make THEM more-?

C: (overlapping) Yes, yes ‘ur’, ‘ut ur’, ‘out from’, ‘out’, ‘ut ur’. It’s very strange because ‘ut ur’, ‘out from’, ‘ut ur’: What does it mean? How do I sign it? That’s why I’m spending so much time telling them, “‘ut ur’ means ‘out from’.” And also, we had one lesson later—we once more were writing on the board ‘ut ur’, later on. Just for them to understand how it works with the word ‘ut ur.’ And ‘ut’ and ‘ur’, looks more or less the same, and together it means something special: ‘out from’. And ‘längs’, also, ‘längs’, this word (pointing) that you
see this, ‘långs’, and ‘tallest’ is with a ‘-t’, ‘långst’. “I’m tallest,” ‘långst’. So it’s very exciting. It’s a very good word, an exciting word. And ‘kons’, ‘the cow’s’, ‘kons’: It’s quite advanced.

R: Mm-hmm. OK.

C: ‘Långst kons’ (along the cow’s), in Swedish words, HOW do we actually sign it? How do I explain it? And that’s what we’re discussing now in third grade, how they’re using Swedish words. And ‘utför’—‘ut’ ‘för’ (for)—it’s quite complicated, these words, this kind of word. ‘Ner’ (down), ‘på’ (on), and ‘kons svansen’ (the cow’s tail) down on the ground. This is very SPECIAL, these words and this combination. This text is quite special. That’s why I’m spending so much time in explaining it.


C: Yes.

R: Yes? OK.

C: Yes, prepositions. Yes.

R: OK, thank you.

C: Yes.

R: OK, so we’ll go to a different class now. (setting up video) OK.

C: (commenting on still image) AHH! Now I remember. This is about animals, how they keep themselves warm.

R: Exactly.

C: Yeah.

R: Exactly. Mm-hmm. And this segment really starts, from my thinking, Maddi volunteers to translate to Teckenspråk, and then it goes. You can’t really see her do that, but you repeat that she’s asking that, and then it goes on for only about a minute. OK.

C: OK.

[watching video – C2/V1 16:20-17:23 (TSP: (T) wants to, “perfekt”)]

R: (finding copy of text page) Um, I don’t know if I should? Was it this one? No, this one? It was that page. So, any comments on that?
According to the Kiwi books, the writer is writing with THICK letters: small, but very thick, big and thick. (pointing to a bold word on the page) Yeah, as you see. And it’s quite unusual, when it comes to reading books, to do this. And I wanted to give the reader something extra. It’s the point. The thing is ‘warm’. It’s emphasizing the word ‘warm’. So that’s how Kiwi books work: (pointing to another bolded word) ‘fur’. They would like them to understand. So ‘warm’, ‘fur’: according to the headline, in the beginning.

R: OK.


R: OK, yeah. And then the other part was Maddi’s translation to Teckenspråk.

C: Yes.

R: Any comments on-

C: (overlapping) No.

R: what you were thinking? No?

C: No, I don’t have any comments. I’m very glad that she understands because she’s hard of hearing. And she’s not signing fully. But she’s aware, very much aware, about language and how to translate it to sign language.

R: OK. And then this is a little longer. OK, this is about a five minute segment, so again, please feel free to tell me if you want to stop it while we’re going. It will go to the end of this tape, and then I’ll have to start again for the next tape because it gets cut in the middle. OK?

C: OK.

[watching video – C2/V1-2 18:40-3:20 (PART: håller om/med, etc.)]

C: [interrupts video at 21:20] I’m thinking the Swedish word ‘håller’ (keeping). It has different meanings, actually, depending on where you put it. And it demands some repetition, how to give them awareness about the word: ‘håller om’ (embrace) or ‘håller sig’, ‘keeping THEM warm’ or ‘håller om någon’ (embracing someone). It’s the same with ‘går’: ‘went’, or ‘walk’. The ‘klockan går’, ‘the clock is ticking’, ‘or you’re ‘walking’, ‘går’. ‘Går inte’, ‘not working’, ‘impossible’. It’s the word ‘går’. I am trying to tell them about the word ‘håller’. It has SO many meanings depending on where you put it. And sometimes it’s a little bit over the line. Sometimes it’s too much, so it would just confuse them. So, I try to keep-. I know, I KNOW it’s sometimes too much, but I don’t actually care. So, I keep telling them again and again because I know that this word is actually going to appear several times. Afterwards, I was actually thinking about this lesson: “Was it a good lesson? Or was it too much?” I always take notes and try to do an evaluation of myself all the time to see what is a good way to teach.
R: Mm, OK. (accidentally rewinds video to beginning when trying to restart it) Whoops! Whoops! Good thing I wrote that down. (laughs) Uh, OK, there we go. What?! I don’t know what’s happening. Oh! That happened to be the end of the tape. OK, here we go, so it continues here.

[watching video – C2/V2 0:00-3:20 (PART: håller om/med, etc.)]

C: [Interrupts video at 00:28] How? What? How’s the sign? Back- 
R: (overlapping) Should we go back? 
C: Yeah, back. Just trying to see.

[watching video – C2/V2 0:00-3:20 (PART: håller om/med, etc.)]

C: (comments at 00:28) Yes.

[watching video – C2/V2 0:28-3:20 (PART: håller om/med, etc.)]

C: [interrupts video at 1:12] I hope you understand, it’s so exciting with this boy. I’m going to have a meeting tomorrow with his parents about his language, and this is very special, when it comes to him. So, very exciting.
R: Mmm?

C: Some things in this—I think it’s very good to show, actually—some things like this, so they will understand. EVK, it’s a special group who takes care of students. It’s a special team called EVK, a special meeting: elev vårds teamet (the student care team). And several times I have wanted to have a film just to show them clips, so they understand actually what I’m talking about. Because sometimes when I’m trying to explain, they don’t understand. Maybe I should use another method so we can discuss the situation, HOW actually are we going to confront him, or work with him in a proper way.
R: Mm-hmm. So this group meets to talk about particular students who are having trouble? Or do you meet to talk about all of the students?
C: No, special students. Yeah.
R: OK.
C: Yeah. They have EVK for all the students. But tomorrow it’s just going to talk about him. Elev Vårds Konferens. It’s ‘Students’ Care Conference’.
R: Mm-hmm.
C: So, tomorrow we’re not talking about ALL the kids. If I, as a teacher, can see there’s something very special with one student. I cannot reach the goals and we’re struggling with a special student—something in his behavior, something in his language, he’s not actually grasping, understanding—then I tell the parents: “Now we need a special meeting. HOW are we going to achieve the goals?” And then we have to talk also to the psychologist, and also with the team within the school, and the parents, about HOW we are going to meet his demands. Maybe we will have a special evaluation about him and HIS needs. So that’s what we’re going to do tomorrow.

R: OK, thank you.

[watching video – C2/V2 1:12-3:20 (PART: håller om/med, etc.)]

C: [interrupts video at 1:38] Also, ‘håller’. This is in another context. It means something else. I think this lesson was a little bit too much with the word ‘håller’. (laughs)

R: (laughs)

C: It happens. Because NOW it’s actually a totally different meaning than the word ‘håller’ (laughs).

R: Ah. (laughs)

C: Sometimes I have to stop myself. It comes too much sometimes. (laughs)

R: (laughs) OK.

[watching video – C2/V2 1:38-3:20 (PART: håller om/med, etc.)]

R: OK, you’ve talked about it a lot. Is there anything else you want to say about it?

C: No.

R: OK, good. Thank you. All right, so let me move this to another lesson. Oops. OK. So, this is about a minute. OK.

[watching video – C5/V1 15:33-16:30 (SYN: (W) puts period)]

C: [interrupts video at 16:20] Ah, I think it’s so terrible that she’s actually looking up at me. It would be much better if I was sitting down because then we would have better eye contact. I feel so tall compared to her. She feels like she’s actually looking up to me.

R: Let me see, 16:20. Little bit more.

[watching video – C5/V1 16:20-16:30 (SYN: (W) puts period)]
R: OK, any thoughts on this before I ask a question?

C: No. To make them aware about how to start a sentence, with a capital letter. And names also have capitals in the beginning.

R: OK. I was interested in how Betty decided where to put a period. And her explanation (gestures toward interpreter)—we actually struggled a little to understand (laughs) exactly HOW she was explaining that. Maybe you could explain to me what her explanation is and comment on it. Should we watch her again?

C: Yes.

R: Yeah? OK. Oh, I went back too far.

[watching video – C5/V1 15:33-16:30 (SYN: (W) puts period)]

C: OK, OK. Yes. In the beginning, she says: “There is no break. It’s just one long text without any breaks.” And it’s very hard to grasp the text, to understand the text when it’s too long. So, OK, this text is too long. It just goes on and on and on. It’s like water. Just flowing all the time.” You HAVE to stop it to understand actually where to put the period in the text. And how to break it. So they would understand, when they read, as the reader, understand, “OK, THIS is this: connected. This is a NEW sentence. And it looks as if she understood: ‘Maja’ and ‘them’, ‘de’. It feels—‘Maja’, ‘de’—feels unnatural to have them together. There has to be a period between them because ‘de’ doesn’t feel good together with the word ‘Maja’ just in front of it.

R: OK, OK. Thank you. Um, and then it will cont-

C: (overlapping) ‘De’, it’s the pronoun, it’s instead of.

R: Exactly.

C: Substitute. So that means that she understands that ‘de’ is actually heading to ‘Maja and Pelle’ to-

R: (overlapping) OK, does she actually say that?

C: Yes, she said that-

R: (overlapping) Yeah. I thought maybe she pointed. OK. OK. OK.

C: Yeah.

R: Thank you.

C: She understands it.
R: OK. And then, this next part is about that pronoun. It will go for about a minute.

[watching video – C5/V1 16:30-17:20 (PRO: (T) explains “de”)]

C: (comments at 16:47) I’m just checking. That’s why I repeated.

R: Mm-hmm.

[watching video – C5/V1 16:47-17:20 (PRO: (T) explains “de”)]

R: OK, so we talked about that a little bit. Can I ask why you think it’s important that they understand who the pronoun refers to?

C: Because if ‘de’ wasn’t there, they wouldn’t understand where. It’s like meta-knowledge. It’s like a higher level of understanding. They HAVE to know who ‘de’, ‘they’, who the word ‘de’ is actually heading at. Being in the second grade, they have to repeat names. They always repeat names: Maja, Pelle, Maja, Pelle, Maja, Pelle, Maja, Pelle. I would like them to understand, “OK, we have to change this one to a pronoun instead, so it will be much easier to read and more fun to write, more fun for other people to read.” Because otherwise it will be too much nagging about the same names all the time, repeating themselves all the time. So we have to have pronouns instead.

R: OK. I noticed that you used the word ‘pronoun’. And you’ve used ‘nutid’ (present) and ‘dåtid’ (past). How do you decide when to use a grammar word, per se?

C: I know Maria Karlberg, the professor, she ofte n discussed how to use them, how to give them grammar words, the proper grammar words. ‘Imperfect’ and ‘verb’ and ‘present’—it could be too much for small children. We sometimes have to change, make a decision: “Now we’ll talk about nu, nutid, now, and då, past tense, då, past, dåtid.” Not to give them too much in the same time, to make it a little bit easier to understand, to grasp, than to just use the terminology too much. Then you spend a little bit too much TIME on understanding THESE words. This is not actually sign language, to fingerspell ‘p-r-o-n-o-u-n’. So, we use instead, for example /POINT BACK/, and signs like this.

R: OK. OK.

C: I don’t want to give them too many grammar words in the beginning. I would like to WAIT, just give them small pieces, and build up. It’s more important that they understand, are aware, about how the language works. So, it won’t be too heavy for them to learn how the grammar is working and also to understand all the words. We have to take care of the Swedish, see that Swedish actually is a FUN language. Or language in general: English or Swedish or reading and writing. It should be fun. It shouldn’t be too much struggling. Understanding words so we can build it slowly. I think it’s much better.
R: OK. And just to clarify for myself: MY Swedish teachers used ‘nutid’ for present. Is that the
technical term?

C: (fingerspells /P-R-E-S-E-N-S/ (present tense))

R: You would actually spell. ‘Presens’ would be more-

C: (overlapping) Yeah, ‘presens’ or ‘nutid’.

R: Ah.

C: Sometimes I say ‘presens’. SOMETimes, sometimes, I throw them the word ‘presens’ so they
will have to understand: “OK, now that word showed up again.” “What does it mean?” So,
‘presens’ or ‘nutid’: ‘now’, what are they doing now? Nutid.

R: Right.

C: So, in time, they will understand the words ‘pronoun’ or the grammar words ‘nutid’ or
‘presens’, so I have to build it slowly, to make it more INTERESTING. They should be more
interested in analyzing the text, the style, how the text is working. To understand the text and
not to focus so much on the grammar WORDS.

R: OK. OK. Thank you. I’m just noticing that it’s 4:30, and we had originally said 3:00-4:30,
but we started about half an hour late. Are you able to stay until around 5?

C: Yeah. Yes. It depends on her (/HER/ toward interpreter), but yes.

R: Are you? (to interpreter)

I: [response to question] Ah, it’s OK.

R: OK. OK. If you don’t mind, my son is probably gonna show up in two minutes (laughs), so
let me just tell my husband to take him somewhere else. (laughs). I’ll call actually.

[2 minute pause while researcher communicates with husband to adjust schedule.]

R: OK. So, OK. So, I THINK the rest of them. No, MOST of them are related to the Sockerbok
(Sweet Book) now. OK, and they tend to be—well, this one, actually, is a little bit longer.
Maybe I’ll skip-. I’m just trying to decide. Yeah, OK, this is about three minutes. This one,
and that’s not the right place. Here we go: 6.

[watching video – C10/V3 6:30-9:55 (TENSE: berättar (+ use))]

C: [interrupts video at 8:35] As you see, I’m signing following the Swedish text. I’m signing
Swedish, so they will understand actually what words to use. That’s quite interesting that I’m
signing following strictly the Swedish. So, I’m asking myself, more or less, if it’s to make them understand.

[watching video – C10/V3 8:35-9:55 (TENSE: berättar (+ use))]

R: OK, so what were your intentions at that moment? What were you thinking? Any comments on that?

C: I would like them to write WELL, a good text, a correct text, not confusing different tenses: present, past. I would like them to use good structure: how to begin a story, to begin with what? So I would like to make them aware about how to start a story. I think, quite often, they’re confused, they’re mixing in the text. They don’t understand: “Has it happened already? Or is it going to happen? Or?” So I would like them to be aware of the DIFFERENCES between these times.

R: Yeah, OK. Can you talk a little bit about how you use the SMART Board and the White Board when you’re explaining things? Or why you use them?

C: You mean writing directly on the White Board?

R: Right.

C: When I’m using it as a White Board, it’s because the SMART Board was already taken, it’s-

R: (overlapping) No, no. I don’t mean why you use which.

C: No? OK, OK.

R: I mean, sort of as the same idea? Why you use BOTH? When you’re explaining ideas, you EITHER tend to write it on the SMART Board, or the White Board, either one. Why do you write it, as well?

C: Why I’m USING it?

R: Yeah. I don’t mean why are you typing versus why are you writing. Whichever one you pick, it doesn’t matter. I’m just asking why do you choose to put it in text, either on the SMART Board or on the White Board.

C: Because when I’m signing, I would like them to see me signing and ALSO, at the same time, SEE the text, so it will be double-visual. To see me, see the signing, and also because Swedish is the second language for deaf students. That’s why I need TWO visual things. So, how to explain: “This is how it looks in sign, and this is how it looks in text, Swedish text.” So I’m working with two languages, that are both visual at the same time.

R: Yeah, yes.
C: Now we understand?

R: Yes.

C: Was it correct? (laughs)

R: Yes. Thank you. (laughs) Yes. OK, and then-

C: (overlapping) How do they do in HEARING school? Do they NOT using the White Board or SMART Board, or just talking? And writing at the same time, how do they do that? Because I think maybe this is very special when it comes to deaf students. I don’t know.

R: It, I mean, it depends on the teacher. Some language teachers are always writing on the board to make it clear. I’m just interested in your thinking about it. I’ve also never worked in a hearing school, so I don’t really know. (laughs) Let’s see. What do we have here? Maybe before—let’s take a small break from the video, and I just had a few questions about some materials I saw you using but never saw you teaching a lesson around. So I was just curious how you use them. And the first one is the book that goes along with the ‘Kiwi’ series (presents a photograph of the book).

C: Mm-hmm.

R: And the second were these workbooks (presents a photograph of the book), or, you know, the ‘Word of the Week’ book. And then you keep track of which books they’ve completed in your log. So, I noticed these materials, but I’d never seen how they got used. So I was just curious if you could tell me how you use those materials. Like, when do students work on them? WHY do they work on them?

C: The ‘Word of the Week’ is so they can work by themselves, more independently. That’s why. And maybe I SEE something very special with the student. It’s very individual, depending on what they need. So, maybe I see that THIS student needs a special explanation about this word or this area, so I can give them that to work with it by themselves. So, I don’t have to TEACH all the time. So I can spend my time on teaching Swedish. I don’t only have this one. I have another one, also. It’s ‘Reading and Thinking’, it’s called. Or actually, ‘Think and Read’. It’s another book. So, they should sit and think and understand the questions by themselves, work by themselves: “WHY is the question put like this? What does it mean?” So they have to think. And I have to also think from their mind. “How will THEY find this book? How will THEY read it? How will THEY understand it?” So I give these special assignments depending on the individual.

R: Ah.

C: And THIS is like, for me to understand during one year, what HAVE they read? And also to tell the parents in the meetings about their child. So that’s why I’m keeping a log.

R: OK. And the ‘Kiwi’ book is also independent, or?
C: Yes. It’s also independent.

R: OK.

C: ‘Kiwi’ has different books. They have a lot of focus on-. In the beginning, it’s different. There are different steps. In the beginning of ‘Kiwi’, you have the ‘Kiwi’ box called ‘Klara’. That’s forty books, small books. And the next one is forty books, also, called ‘Färdiga’ (Prepared). And the third one is ‘Går’ (Go). ‘Ready’, ‘Steady’, ‘Go’. It also has forty. So, when they’ve finished ONE, they go to the next one, as you saw in my lessons. I explained to them about knowing where we’re heading in the books and stuff like that. And there are also extra materials, more than this (points to photograph of Kiwi book I’ve presented), that—if they’re understanding the questions more—they can be more independent. This one (points to photograph of Kiwi book I’ve presented): “when, how, where, why?” So they would understand. Because quite often the teacher is teaching, and it’s just like, I’m just teaching them. But, I would like them to understand for themselves. To THINK by themselves. To understand, actually, WHY? How does it work? To stimulate their own minds, their brains, how they should think. In small children, up to eleven or twelve years, they have both halves of the brain, which are actually just gathering information all the time, so I would like them to USE the mind and work with it by themselves.

R: OK, do ALL of the students do these books, or just students who have extra time?

C: No, no.

R: Not all.

C: No, it’s individual.

R: Individual, as well.

C: Yeah, the ones who have time left, or are mature enough to do this on their own.

R: OK.

C: Some of the students actually need more extra help. They also quite often get stuck. If they have a book, they need more extra help. So, not everybody can use them like this.

R: Right. OK, OK. Thank you. We’ll watch a couple more very short segments, and then we’ll be done. Uh, let’s see. C11, Video 2. OK.

[watching video – C11/V2 18:05-18:30 (TENSE: kan bli (N))]

R: OK, any thoughts on that interaction?
C: He wrote ‘kan blir’, ‘kan BLIR’, ‘can become’, ‘NOT ‘kan bli’. Where is the limit? Where is it heading? I think sometimes I need to explain to him directly: “It’s not ‘kan blir’, with an ‘-r’ in the end,” to make him understand. Some of my colleagues say, “Just let him be. He will understand in time.” COULD be. Could be not. But I think sometimes I NEED to correct him instantly instead of just waiting, because he could get stuck with this. If he doesn’t know the differences between ‘kan bli’ without an ‘-r’ or with an ‘-r’ in the end.

R: Mm-hmm.

C: So, it’s a little bit, it’s like (mimics making corrections)-

R: The red pen?

C: Yeah, the red pen. I don’t want him to have too much red pen in the end, you know. I don’t want to have that. I would like to explain just here and now, the facts, so he will understand. Instead of when he’s doing something, then correcting him with a red pen. I would like to AVOID that because that’s an OLD method. Do you understand what I mean? Why I’m going to it directly instead of waiting. And also, when it comes to him, when we’re talking about age, different ages and stuff, how a person can become 80, and I tried to explain to him, “can be.” It’s not like you will just be 80, and then you will die. You can be more than, you can be less than 80. You COULD be. The man COULD be. So, that’s why I’m explaining to him. And I also explained to him more after this lesson just to make him understand, actually COULD become. It’s not that they will actually ALWAYS become 80, and then they will die.

R: He looked confused there, and he was pointing to all the ‘-r’s’, because he had other animals “blir” (become). “Blir, blir, blir, blir,” and then “people kan bli.” Um, did you think that he understood, or do you think he understands, that when there’s no ‘kan’, it’s ‘blir’, and when there is a ‘kan’, it’s ‘bli’? Did you think he understood that? Or not?

C: I’m not so sure, actually. My thinking is, I actually don’t know how his mind works, how he understands. If I compare with other students, I think they could understand this difference, or the meaning of it. But, I’m not so sure that actually HE understands it. Without the ‘kan’, it will be ‘blir’ with an ‘-r’. I don’t know if he understands that.

R: OK, OK. Thank you. Let’s see. Oops. OK, this is a very short clip, about fifteen seconds, and it cuts itself off because the video ends at the end of it. So, it will seem a little abrupt. (laughs)

[watching video – C12/V1 20:54-21:04 (PRO-W: ‘de’ is “extra” (O))]

R: Did you see enough to understand what was happening? Yeah?

C: Yes.

R: OK.
C: ‘Keeping themselves’, ‘de sig’, ‘DE’ (them). It’s not necessary to put the ‘de’, because you have the word ‘D-E’, ‘them’. If I remember it right, she already had the word ‘de’, ‘them’, in the beginning.

R: I think she had a noun. But similar. Let’s look. (looking for copy of student’s work)

R: I don’t have it. That’s it, right? No. ‘Man’. (showing Christel) ‘Man.’

C: Yes! Exactly. Yes, exactly.

R: OK. OK.

C: Because we already have the word ‘man’, the noun ‘man’, then you don’t need the word ‘de’.

R: OK. OK. And what about the interaction with Joana? What were you thinking at the time, or why did you explain it the way you did?

C: Because her Swedish is—when it comes to text, creating text—she must practice more when it comes to creating text. I have to EXPLAIN to her. The other ones, they understand more or less. But she doesn’t actually understand fully how to create a text. I’ve been thinking a lot about Joana’s understanding when it comes to text because she’s very good at signing, but not so good at creating text by herself, how to actually make a Swedish sentence correctly. So I have to check with her sometimes, how she produces text, writing text.

R: OK.

C: So that’s why I’m having these discussions.

R: OK. There’s just one more short one, and it’s with Yassin, again. We’ll go back a few days. OK, let’s start.


C: [interrupts video at 15:36] I have a lot of difficulty in understanding because the communication with him is very—I’m struggling all the time. I think we don’t understand because he has very hard time expressing himself in sign language. So, many times we’re actually talking past each other. I have to drag things out from him to understand because, also, he’s sometimes a little bit insecure about what he’s actually going to say. So this is a very confusing, very difficult discussion we’re having.

R: Yeah, OK. Let’s watch a little more.

R: OK, so particularly there, I was interested that you said in Swedish, “First subject, then verb.” And why you chose to use that terminology in this situation?

C: Actually, ‘noun’, and ‘verb’, and ‘adjective’ are very easy. THOSE three things are VERY very easy. I remember from a long time ago, you can use these three grammar words very early. You have them in sign language, but also in Swedish. You have signs for those, instead of fingerspelling, just to give you an awareness about the different languages. So now they have knowledge of what a ‘noun’ is in Swedish: It’s things. And in sign language, what is that? This is ‘table’, ‘glass’. So that’s why I’m using it. And also there is ‘subject’, and I will actually go deeper and deeper into it. “The cat-.” We haven’t started with that NOW, but I would give them those words quite early because we can go deeper and deeper into it. And ‘adjective’. And NOW we’re into ‘adverb’.

R: ‘Adverb’?

C: Yes. Later on. ‘Adverb’ in sign language. In Swedish we have ‘adverb’, and I will explain to them more or less how it works. But in sign language, we’ve started on that subject now, in sign language, with adverbs.

R: Ah, OK. All right. That’s all the clips I had for you. Is there anything you want to add, or any questions you have about the clips I chose, or anything you want to say?

C: No. I think it’s very interesting to have somebody to discuss with, to start to develop myself, and to have other eyes to see actually what I’m doing. It’s very interesting. And also the students, their perceptions, how they are actually understanding. It’s very very interesting. Very good to know. Very interesting.

R: OK. All right. Well, thank you, again, for everything.
Appendix L

Stimulated Recall Interview Transcript, Helena

Pre-Observation Interview: Helena
Length: 94 minutes (excluding breaks)
Location: Helena’s home

TRANSMUTED TEXT

R: So, let me just explain this procedure. We talked a little bit about the fact that I’d be picking sections of video from the last five weeks and asking you to look at them and talk about them. But just to be clear, I have a little script I’ll read about the process, and then if you have any questions at the end, let me know.

H: OK.

R: OK? So, (reading from prepared script) we’re going to watch sections of videotape from lessons I’ve watched you teach over the past five weeks. I chose these particular sections to share with you because I believe that your thoughts about them may provide insight into your thoughts about how you teach grammar. It absolutely doesn’t matter whether the lessons we’re watching are good ones or not. I don’t intend to evaluate any of the lessons. I’m only interested in how you think about your practice as a language teacher. The purpose of the interview is to stimulate you to remember what was on your mind during the lesson. I might also ask you specific questions to help you reflect on your teaching practices. Also, I’ve broken the tapes into chunks, but if—while you’re watching—you want me to stop it at any time because you want to comment, please feel free to tell me and we’ll stop the tape.

H: Mm.

R: OK? Any questions?

H: No.

R: OK. All right, so this is the first segment. Just to let you know, this was one of the first videos I took, and I didn’t have the settings on the camera quite right. So your signs are a little hard to see. But, after this one, they get much better. OK?

H: Mm.

R: Let’s see. Hmm, OK.


R: OK. So, any thoughts about what you were focusing on and why you were focusing on that in terms of grammar?
H: I’ve found there are problems sometimes, especially when they’re small: It’s ‘me’, ‘her’, and ‘he’. And then often they think about, “‘Me’, ‘me’, I am a dog.” So, that’s why I want to, “WHO is me?” That’s why I want to point it out, so they will think, “All right, it’s not ME.” Because often you sign ‘ME’. But it’s not ME. “I’m the dog.” That’s why I want to talk about ‘me’.

R: OK, OK. Um-

H: (overlapping) See, you will see later, when they get older, often it says ‘he’ or ‘she’. They have problems that: “WHO? Oh.” They don’t think about who it is.

R: Yeah. OK. We’ll skip forward a little-

H: (overlapping) That’s sometimes a problem when you’re signing.

R: Mm-hmm.

H: Because you’re pointing. So you have be aware that Swedish is a little different.

R: Can you explain?

H: Sometimes they point, ‘she’ (points to her left). They point only this way. Who’s that? That’s why you have to point out, “Who is ‘SHE’?”

R: Right.

H: Yeah, that’s the girl.

R: I see. OK. OK. 9:35. OK.


R: OK.

H: Uh, ‘olydig’ (disobedient), it’s, uh, it’s a hard word. Actually, I am trying-. We don’t use that very much. ‘Lydig’ (obedient): you don’t use it very much. I don’t know. Hearing people probably use it more than the deaf. So I am trying to explain what it means, ‘olydig’. And the sign, ‘lydig’ (/OBEIDENT/), we don’t use that one very often, either.

R: Mm.

H: But there is that sign. Because you can see other people, especially the elderly, using ‘lydig’ (/OBEIDENT/). So that’s why. I was trying to explain the special word, ‘olydig’.

R: OK. Was the ‘-o’ prefix, was that new for them, or is that something you think they-
H: (overlapping) Yeah. ‘-o’ in Swedish (coughs repeatedly)-

Ht: I will sign.

[30 second break while Helena gets water and a cough drop.]

Ht: OK, looking back, actually, I should have brought up more examples, not only this one.
Because THIS (/O/), the ‘-o’ connected to ‘not’. So when I see this one, I say, “OK, I should actually have more examples. Not only this one.”

R: Mm.

Ht: Because THESE types of words show up more frequently later on.

R: Mm. OK.

Ht: You can be wise after looking at it. But in that situation, I didn’t actually think about it. I should have had more examples.

R: OK. OK.

[watching video – H3/V2 7:40-8:45 (TSP: “jag” twice (no är) – flytig)]

R: Let me just (checking notes): ‘flytig’. Yeah. OK.

H: ‘Är’ (am).

R: ‘Är’?

H: Yeah. Often we take it and explain for Swedish. But in sign, PURE, real sign language, we don’t use ‘är’ that much. It’s very influenced by the Swedish. So that’s what I want to point out. Often they sign “I am” (/I AM/). Often in sign language, I say, “me sorry” (/I SORRY/). We don’t say “me, I AM sorry” (/I, I AM SORRY/).”

R: Mm-hmm.

H: That’s what I want to /REMIIND/, so they’ll be aware. It’s different. But, when they come down here (to the front of the classroom), they’re standing, they follow the Swedish. That’s OK. That’s OK. They’re still very young. As long as you as the teacher are aware about it.

R: I see.

H: You can talk about it all the time, and then finally, the students will understand this point. But you can’t be like (makes scolding gesture with her index finger), “Agh, don’t sign like THAT!”
R: Right, right.

H: You just (signs /REMIND/ gently). You point it out.

R: OK.

[1 minute break while she checks the pie for the coffee break.]

H: I’ve noticed that when the students get older—if the teachers don’t /REMIND/, make them aware about the language—often when the students get older, and when they’re gonna talk about something: “I’m gonna talk about this subject” (mimics reading from the board), they keep following (/SIGNING/ while watching text), and it’s very hard for the other ones who are listening to understand anything. And every teacher doesn’t /REMIND/, “Ah, it’s SIGN language.” Then I think it’s too late. It’s never too late, but they should be aware a long time before they get older that it’s different. Because sometimes they are very, like, this way (/SIGNING/ while watching text).

R: OK, OK. And why do you feel like you don’t want to insist that they use the correct Teckenspråk all the time?

Hs: Then they will be more stuck. Because when they’re standing there, if you’re just pointing out that, “You are WRONG. You should not do it like this,” it will actually keep them from opening up. You’ll probably make them more CAREFUL with what they’re saying. They will probably be scared of raising their hands, asking questions, saying anything, because they’re afraid of having, “No, you’re wrong.” So I have to be very careful, just pointing out, making them aware. Not to just correct them saying, “You are wrong.” That’s why I’m doing this. You have to be thinking of (mimics taking the middle path)-

R: Balance?

I: [response to question] Yeah, balance.

H: Because you WANT them to come and tell you what they are thinking about.

R: OK, OK.

Hs: When I was studying, before I was teaching, I saw some teachers correcting them so hard that it actually stopped them. They didn’t want to go up and say anything. They were scared to say anything because they were so afraid to be incorrect in front of everybody else.

R: When you were a student?

Hs: Yes, when I was student, out doing my field work, my training work.
H: See you can see when they’re sitting beside me, they’ll follow the text, and that’s OK. At THAT point, I just want to see that they understand the words. That’s most important at that time. You have to see, “What’s most important at this time? Is it to understand the text or is to sign correctly?”


H: So when they were signing like this for me, when I was sitting behind them, I said, “OK, the word you were signing,” like ‘duktig’ (clever), “can you find the word HERE in the text?” And then they’d point at the word. You have to be aware that they understand the text because if they’re only doing this (mimics signing mindlessly), like a parrot, they don’t understand the text. So, you have to, “Where do you find this word?” They’ll say, “Here.”

R: OK, OK. Um, Are there other times—like in THIS situation, you’re focusing on mostly comprehension—are there other times when you’re focusing more on grammar, on Swedish grammar, or Teckenspråk grammar?

H: Mm. Mm.

R: Yeah. OK. Maybe we’ll see some of that. Let’s see.


H: [interrupts video at 14:18] It’s funny. I don’t know if I can say it here, but her parents are deaf. They get mad at me after these lessons. They say I am OVER-acting.

R: Ah.

H: Because when she came home she was signing, “I dog I” (/I DOG I/). And they said, “That’s too much over.” And I said, “No it’s not. Because often you point in sign language, ‘I’ (/I(head-nod)/) again, in the end, when you want to-

Hs: emphasize.

R: Aha. Mm-hmm. Interesting. OK.

[watching video – H3/V2 14:18-14:40 (TSP: “jag” twice (no är) – smutsig)]

R: OK, any other ideas about that?

H: He’s still following the Swedish. But I want him to be aware that you can point—that’s IF you follow the Swedish—and you’re trying to use REAL sign language. But it’s very hard. They’re like, “OK” (mimics confusion on the students’ part). It’s too confusing. (laughs) Maybe I’m not good at explaining.

R: No, it’s OK. I understand. Let’s see, 11-
H: (overlapping) Because sometimes you feel—, sometimes the students—when I say you’re
going to have to sign—they try to look at the text, you know, memorize the text (mimics
staring at the text and then looking away), and “tch- tch- tch-” (mimics signing
methodically), follow what the text said. And they think THAT’s sign language. (laughs)

R: Oh, OK.

H: But you have to-. It takes time.

R: Can you explain a little? Do you mean that they try to sign exactly what it said without
looking? Is it-

H: Mm-hmm. Mm-hmm.

R: So they don’t change the grammar.

H: Mm. Mm.

R: I see.

H: They think this is sign language.

R: OK, if they’re not looking, it’s-

H: Ah. I haven’t seen it with these students. But I’ve seen it other students that I’ve had.

R: OK.

H: So, you have to explain, be aware, it’s coming.

R: Yeah. OK, OK. Let me, I’m going back a little bit.

H: I feel that all the years I’ve been working, Nilskolan teachers don’t pay much attention to
how they express themselves.

Hs: When I want to show some work, or explain some work that I’ve been doing, they actually
don’t pay attention or focus on HOW they are PRESENTING the work that has been done.
It’s like, ALL the work that has been done before is MORE important than the presentation,
HOW they present the work they have been doing.

R: Who’s they?

I: [response to question] The kids.
Hs: My experience of many teachers is that they are putting SO much focus on the work BEFORE the presentation, HOW to do the work before, how to do all the layouts, everything. But then when it comes to the presentation, they don’t pay so much attention and so much effort to the presentation. That’s my-

R: (overlapping) Meaning the actual teaching?

I: [explanation] Yeah, the teach-. Now that the kids actually are not presenting-. The teachers are not putting so much focus on ALLOWING the kids to do a good presentation.

Hs: So, for example, when they have a special assignment, they should [xxxx], and then they put down something about the text, the students. They put so much focus on CREATING a text, MAKING that work. But then, when they’re going up, standing in front of their classmates and doing a presentation, they don’t know HOW to present it, how to do it well in sign language. They just follow the text strictly. That makes it’s very difficult for the other kids in the classroom to understand what the presentation is about. Because they’re signing according to the Swedish text. So, they should put more emphasis on the presentation, also.

R: OK, right.

Hs: Not only on the work. So, I would like them to learn how to use KEY words when they’re doing a presentation. They should UNDERSTAND what the text is about, the content of the text. And then they should all use key words, so that will make them more free in their presentation.

R: OK. At the beginning you said something about many teachers do it differently. What do you mean? Many teachers emphasize the Swedish writing more than the sign?

Hs: Yes, yes.

R: OK. Thank you.

Hs: So, as a teacher, for me it’s very important for them to understand. When they’re doing a presentation, they should understand what they’re actually presenting. That’s why I’m starting with this quite early because, in the future, they’re going to do more and more of this kind of work. But then they have to focus on WHAT they actually are saying.

R: Right.

Hs: In the United States, they have more self-confidence, standing in front of other people. Presenting. Special lessons. They understand how important that is. So I would like to build up their confidence in the beginning.

R: OK, OK. OK.

[watching video – H3/V2 11:56-12:40 (PLAY: k-e-n-d-r-a)]
H: [interrupts video at 12:17] She is playing with words. I didn’t understand what she meant in beginning. She said, “I took this, and I took this, and I took that. Then I have a new word.”

R: Mm-hmm. Let’s watch the rest.

[watching video – H3/V2 12:17-12:40 (PLAY: k-e-n-d-r-a)]

R: OK, so your response to her doing that: Can you talk about what you were thinking?

Hs: In the beginning, I didn’t understand what she was heading at. And then she [obviously?] was playing with words, picking out letters. THEN I explained to the other ones—maybe they didn’t catch up with me. I don’t know if THEY understood what she actually heading at. I was just telling the other ones, “Now she’s playing with words.” The other ones, they were starting to play with words, also. All the letters to make our own words, with letters.

R: Right. Do you think that there’s a value in them playing with words like that?

Hs: Absolutely. I think we do that too seldom.

R: What’s the value?

Hs: They notice that, “I can. I know some words in Swedish.” I TEACH them that they can change their own words. They like to play with words like that. “If I take away the ‘-g’, they understand that, “Yes, I can.” Sometimes they don’t understand actually that they KNOW a lot of words. So, by PLAYING with letters and words, they can actually see, and have more confidence in knowing, “I DO know many words.” That’s why I think it’s valuable to play with words. Sometimes I just put up ONE word, a long word, and from that word, I would like them to,— “How many words can you take out and make new words from these letters?” In the beginning, it was impossible. They had too FEW words in the library, mind library. But now they know more and more. Karlos wanted to play with words. He wanted to write a word, and the other ones should actually GUESS: “What is the word I’m now writing?” I don’t know if you remember that one. Karlos was playing with the word, he was writing a word-

R: I don’t remember. Was writing?

Hs: Yeah, he was writing. I think you were there. I had time left in the lesson, and Karlos said, “I would like to write a word on the White Board. I would like to write a word and students guess what kind of word I am writing now.” So he wrote a word, and the other ones were actually going to guess: “What is this word?” And they thought it was so fun.

R: The meaning of the word? Just the meaning?

Hs: Yes, just the meaning of the word. And they wanted to go and go on. So, I said, “We’ll take turns doing that.” You know, we’re-
R: Ah! Ah, now I remember. OK, OK.

Hs: Yeah, because they have more and more words to play with now. Two months ago, it was impossible. They didn’t have words enough to play with. Today they are more rich in words. They have more words.

R: OK, OK. Thank you. Yeah. OK.

Hs: I think it’s a big value-

H: to be aware of, “Ah! I can understand words. I’m trying to read! I know what the word means.”

R: OK, OK. Mm. OK. OK. And now, same class, but a different video. Oh, I should explain, as well: My camera, since it’s digital, when it saves to the card, it automatically cuts the lesson in twenty minute chunks, so there’s three videos for every class, just so you understand why. (laughs)

H: OK.

R: Um, 8.

[watching video – H3/V3 8:13-9:30(ADJ: “hur ser ut” worksheet)]

H: I hardly understand myself, either.

R: Ah.

H: Pointing out ‘adjective’, yeah. But not very good. Yeah, we had a subject, in that case ‘adjective’. And sometimes—I feel now—they’ve been working with ‘noun’, ‘verb’, and I think it’s TOO-. I’m not very satisfied with myself because you SHOULD have-

Hs: special areas-

R: Special areas?

I: [response to question]Yeah.

Hs: Now we’re talking only about verbs. And now we’re only talking about subjects. So I think that THAT time has been too short.

R: Mm-hmm. Mm-hmm. OK.

Hs: With the dog: It’s ‘clever’, ‘happy’.
R: You designed a worksheet (presents worksheet), I think with Agneta. This was before she hurt herself. Can you talk about what you were-, because there was a worksheet that came with the Kiwi book, but you made another one. So, what was the motivation behind making another one?

H: Agneta.

R: Agneta. OK. (laughs) OK, OK.

H: Agneta made this.

R: OK.

H: Yeah, she wanted to take out some of the common adjectives: ‘large’, ‘sweet’, ‘small’. And she wants to follow Kiwi: In the end, it has a point. It always has a point in the end. And that’s why that picture (points to photo of baby eating from a dog bowl). I don’t know. She wants to see if the students understand this, “No, I’m not a dog.”

R: Right, right.

H: Some of them did. Some they didn’t. Also, I want to see if they’ve seen these words before. Some of them haven’t seen-, MOST of the students. I don’t think it was a very good lesson because they weren’t aware of these words, just a FEW of them. So I should have taken that up before I started to give this out. I should have been talking about those because they were very new for them.

R: OK. Let’s see. Let me just ask, I guess. So you said you’d been focusing on nouns and verbs and now adjectives. How do you choose which grammar areas to focus on?

H: I follow Kiwi. But now when I’m looking back, I think it’s too fast. Because one book was like ‘adjective’, the next book was ‘noun’, and the next book was ‘verb’. So I think that was too fast. We should have followed-, the next book should be also ‘adjective’. Actually I DON’T have to follow the book because no one’s telling you, “You must do this.” But I did. In that, I was following. But now, when I’m looking back, I should have been doing something different or made up our OWN story because I think it was too fast. You shouldn’t be, like: “No, it’s ‘adjective’. You should only work with ‘adjective’, ‘adjective’.” Because that’s boring. But, it was too fast, anyway. You should at least work two weeks with it.

[30 second break because Helena’s son falls.]

H: So at least two weeks you should be working with it, I’m not sure. But you shouldn’t be working TOO much because it gets boring. That’s what I was talking about before, about grammar. You have to work in a natural way. But that was a little too fast, I think.

R: Yeah, OK. OK.
H: So I’m a little surprised that Kiwi had it that fast.

R: Right.

H: Yeah.

R: So the books—sort of somewhere in the curriculum—it suggests what you should focus on related to the book. So, like, this was good for teaching adjectives, or this book is good for verbs.

Hs: Nothing in the curriculum that says we HAVE to follow it that way.

R: Right. No, but the Kiwi book itself has suggestions-

Hs: (overlapping) Yes. That book and that lesson.

R: Right, OK. OK. This is-

H: (overlapping, to her son) Would you like a snack?

H: (to researcher) Can we take a break?

R: Sure.

[4 minute break while Helena serves pie and ice cream to everyone.]

R: OK, this one’s short. You can still see? Yeah? OK.

[watching video – H2/V1 4:00-4:25 (ART: hund - en hund)]

R: OK, tell me why you’re focusing on THAT, particularly.

Hs: They need to know the structure. The students need to know much about the structure. If you notice, it’s very hard for some of the students to focus. It helps them if I have a very strict structure by telling them exactly, “Now we’re going to read about especially this one, or this one.” THAT sequence. We’re going to do text—that’s why I tell them—we had just done the picture walk. This is not preschool. I now want them to have Swedish more. For the first half hour, we had a picture walk, and the other half we have a text walk.

R: Ah, so you’re saying that it used to be that you spent the whole hour on a picture walk.

Hs: Yeah.

R: But then the preschoolers didn’t have any chance to see the text.
Hs: Yes. They didn’t have the text. It’s nice to just talk about pictures, but they didn’t have any text. We want some Swedish text. That’s the point, why they’re here, to get some Swedish. That’s why they’re here. That’s why I’m spending so much time on telling them. Some of the students NEED that structure to know, in advance, what we are going to do during this class. In the beginning, Agneta had pictures of many different types of dogs. And the whole lesson we were just talking about dogs. That’s to teach the student how much you can get, how much information you can gain by just looking at a picture. OK, now they understand HOW to look at a picture, how to READ a picture, and the different things you can gain from a picture. And now we’re focusing on the TEXT, also, to read ABOUT the picture. It’s about time. It’s time. You actually must have time to do all things. And that’s why.

R: OK, is there anything particular about comparing for them between the general idea of *hund* (dog) and then *en hund* (a dog)? Was that important, or was it only that the book happened to be called “*En Hund*?” Or, did you want to emphasize for them the difference between *hund* and *en hund*? If that’s clear? (laughs)

Hs: No. Maybe I should have. I didn’t. (laughs)

R: (laughs) No, I’m just curious! OK, OK. OK.

Hs: You’re correct. This is a GENERAL dog. But, THIS story’s actually talking about one, special dog. We did that before in the last class. We were talking in general. This is in general. But now we’re focusing on, in particular, this one.

R: Right, OK. OK, now we’re going to look at a different lesson.

H: (looking at still video image on computer screen) I’m very happy because, Elvin, he’s now entering. He couldn’t do that before. He’s approaching. He’s standing there. He’s not deaf. He just has difficulties in speech. He has difficulties in understanding sign language, so that’s why he needed the voice of an interpreter in the beginning because he didn’t understand sign language very well. Now, recently, he’s started to raise his hand. And approaching. And standing in front of the other ones. And he’s actually developing his sign language. It’s very, very nice to see.

R: Yeah. OK. Let’s go forward.

[watching video – H5/V2 6:50-8:12 (TSP: åker is optional (pulka))]

H: It’s a very, kind of, high level. I think it’s only two or three of the students who understand what I’m actually talking about. Anna, she’s not here. She’s sitting here (half off-screen). She’s talking a lot about this (/SWAP/ (as words in a sentence) /DRIVE GO/).

R: Ah.

H: *Åker* (go), because her mom is deaf. So she’s always saying, “Why do you say ‘åker’?” So I am very, very aware that she would point at this. So, that’s why I’m taking it up. It’s kind of
high level, anyway, for them to understand. Use ‘âker pulka’ (/GO SLED/), but ‘âker’ means what? By car? Or bicycle? Whatever. So, what does ‘âker’ mean?

R: Ah, OK.

H: Also, I think, Van is aware of it, too. Kind of. A little.

R: OK.

H: When he’s THERE. When he’s listening.

R: Right, right. (laughs)

H: And also, this guy, Mikel.

R: Huh.

H: He’s very very-, and Angela.

R: Angela. Mm-hmm. OK.

H: So sometimes it’s hard to understand, “How much do you explain the difference between Swedish and sign language. How much should we tell them right now?” Because some of them don’t understand. Some of them do.

R: Right. Right.

H: And this point I was talking about: ‘âker’ (/GO/). Because often we have to say “âker cykel” (ride a bike), but we don’t say ‘âker’ /RIDE BIKE/ in sign language.

R: OK.


H: [interrupts video at 10:24] No. I was talking about, it’s different. Sometimes ‘âker pulka’ (/GO SLED/), or “I pulka” (/I SLED/). ‘Åker’ (/GO/), no. “Jag pulka” (/I SLED/). In ONE, it said ‘âker’-

R: Tefat (saucer-shaped sled).

H: Tefat. You have to say almost “âker tefat” (/GO SAUCER/) (go sledding on a saucer-shaped sled) because “me tefat” (/I SAUCER/) (makes confused expression)?

R: (laughs) Right.
H: Because there are no movements (/MOVEMENT/). Not sled, though. You can say “pulka” (/I SLED/), but you can’t say “me” (/I SAUCER/). You have to say “I am going” (/I GO SAUCER/). I have this feeling, but it’s very hard to say, “This is OK, but this is not.” So that’s very hard, actually, because it’s hard to explain WHY. It’s a feeling you have.

H: (to interpreter) Can you explain?

I: [response to question] No. I’m not educated in explaining sign language. I don’t have the-

H: (overlapping) No. But, I can’t say, ‘Jag-’ (/I SAUCER/)?

I: [response to question] No. This (/SAUCER/) is nothing. This is nothing. This is-

H: (overlapping) That’s because it means tallrik (dinner plate) (/SAUCER/). That means something is round (/SAUCER/). This (/SLED/) is the base sign (/BASE SIGN/). We use pulka (/SLED/). But this (/SAUCER/) can be everywhere. That’s why you have to /GO/.

I: [response to question] It would be more ‘pulka’ (/SLED DOWNHILL/), and ‘åker sladda’ (/GO HOLD-REINS/). ‘Jag åker (/I GO/). Jag åker sladda’ (/I GO HOLD-REINS/). I think I would do like ‘pulka’ (/SLED DOWNHILL) more.

H: Yes, exactly.

R: OK.

H: So, actually, maybe I should point out that /SAUCER/ can mean EVERYTHING, a lot of things.

R: But this (/SLED/) is only ‘pulka’, so it can’t mean anything else?


R: OK, OK. OK, we’ll watch the rest, but you may not have more to say. We’ll just, let’s see, 10. OK.


H: [interrupts video at 10:57] Also, in sign language, they probably would have said ‘pulka’ (/SLED/) there, too (points to Swedish word ‘kälke’ (tobaggen)). In Swedish, it’s very different what you’re going with. But maybe in sign language, I want to say ‘pulka’ to MOST-

R: (overlapping) types of sleds.

H: Exactly.
R: Right. OK, OK, OK.


H: Yeah, so here he’s saying, “WHY are there all these words in Swedish?”

R: Did a student say that?

H: Yeah.

R: Oh. I didn’t catch that. Who said that?

H: Someone there (points near edge of screen).

R: Oh, over there. OK.

H: Said, “WHY do you have to?” I said, “Yeah, sometimes Swedish have to-”

R: (overlapping – responding to Helena’s son banging on the table) It’s going to be hard to hear.

[Helena asks son to sit quietly.]

R: Sorry. It’s hard to hear.

H: Yeah, she’s asking, “WHY does Swedish have all these words?” I said, “Yeah, sometimes it must.” Because you can’t explain why some of these [show?]. They are too small. So I just say, “Sometimes you use some other words.”

[Helena asks son, who has been chattering in the background, to be quiet, again.]

H: So she was asking why. And I said, “Sometimes Swedish [write?], and sign language doesn’t have to say all those words.”

R: Mm-hmm. Right.

H: It’s different. I think that’s enough to tell them. It’s two languages.

R: Right, OK.

H: When they get older, though, you have to explain some differences about the grammar. Why must these words be here in Swedish? But they are too small.

R: Right, right. OK. In that case, what WOULD you—if you were GOING to explain why you have to say ‘åker’ in Swedish and not in sign language—what would you say? If they were older?
H: It must have pre-verb. How to explain the word pre-verb?

R: Is it a helping verb in English?

H: Help. Yeah, exactly: ‘hjälpverb’ (helping verb). We find the words. (smiles)

R: Yeah. (laughs)

H: *Hjälpverb*. It needs a *hjälpverb*. And you have to explain the words ‘subject’, ‘predicate’. And that kind of thing.

R: OK, OK.

H: *Hjälpverb*, yeah. You have to explain the *hjälpverb*.

R: OK.

H: So they’re verbs.

R: And that you don’t always need helping verbs in sign language?

H: No.

R: Yeah, OK. OK, let’s see. 19:15.

[watching video – H5/V2 19:15-19:40 (POSS -S: papas mage)]

H: (comments on video at 19:17) Oh! I like this lesson.


R: OK, that was short. But, can you talk about that?

Hs: About the ‘-s’, the importance of ‘-s’. What does it mean, the ‘-s’.

H: ‘Her’, (/HER/), ‘his’ (/HIS/), ‘mine’ (/MINE/). And we had a fun lessons when they wrote the names of ‘AngelaS’ (/HER/). “What does that mean?” “Ah! AngelaS.” You point at this. And then we came to Karlos.

R: Mm-hmm.

H: He already has an ‘-s’. What do we do now? One of them said, “Take that away. Say ‘Karlo’.” “No, that’s not his name: Karlo. His name is Karlos. What do we do?” “Ah! Put another ‘-s’.” “No! We can’t have two ‘-s’.” So I really like this lesson when we talk about ‘-s’, what it means. And it seems like they really understand in the end.
R: Mm-hmm. And just, why is it important for them to understand the “-s”?

H: Yeah, because “papas mage” (daddy’s stomach): What does that actually mean?

R: Mm-hmm.

H: “Papas mage.” “Oh! FAther’s” (/HIS/). Wonder WHOSE stomach? “Your FATHER’s” (/HIS/).

R: Right. OK, OK. I think, let’s see. Yeah, the next episode is where-. Well, I guess we can-. Maybe we’ll save it if we have time at the end because I have picked the one where you’re going “Angela’s whatever,” and “Anna’s sweater,” and “Karlos’.” And you do it together. But since you’ve talked about it, maybe we’ll skip it for now, and if we have time, we could watch it later. OK.

H: [interrupts video at 15:10] That’s the same, like, är (am). På (on). You don’t use it in sign language, pure sign language. That’s what I want to tell them about there.

R: OK.

H: We call it ‘små ord’ (small word).

R: OK.

H: [interrupts video at 15:10] That’s the same, like, är (am). På (on). You don’t use it in sign language, pure sign language. That’s what I want to tell them about there.

R: OK.

H: The Kiwi wants to make them be aware of på (on/at) and i (in/on). They wanted me to take up the grammar. I took it up, but I didn’t do it very well, the difference between på and i.

R: It’s hard: the difference. (laughs)

H: Yeah, yeah. It’s ve-, yeah.

R: Mm-hmm. OK.

H: Maybe I should have some more examples. “When do you use på? When do you use i?” I should have more examples because there weren’t any examples in the book. There’s something also you can work with.

R: Right, OK. 19:44. (locating next segment) Oh, wait!

H: And after that, I was sick after that. And I was sitting home, and I thought, “I should talk more: ‘How do you write this?’” Because they are signing, “I can write on the refrigerator.”
So I SMS’d to Ella. I said, “Please—when they’re signing ‘write’—please tell them, let them be aware, what are they writing on?” On the refrigerator (WRITE-on-large-vertical-object), or the street (WRITE-on-ground). So they don’t only sign ‘write’ (WRITE-on-small-horizontal-object). They should be aware of what they do. Do they do this (WRITE-with-index-finger-in-the-air) when they write? Whatever. So, remind them. I asked her to remind (REMIND) them. Because I think-

Hs: for me, the sign, the base sign (WRITE), but also to remind them, on WHAT are they writing? Not only ‘WRITE’, but on what?

R: Mm-hmm. Mm-hmm. And I’m being redundant, repetitive (laughs), but why do you think that’s an important thing for them to understand, that they’re writing (WRITE-on-large-vertical-object) on a refrigerator, but writing (WRITE-on-small-horizontal-object) or writing (WRITE-in-air)?

Hs: The differences between sign language and Swedish. Writing on a refrigerator, writing on a table. Actually, what is the TEXT saying? Because in sign language, you don’t have to go ‘ON’ (ON), ‘ON’ (ON). You go, ‘write table’ (WRITE TABLE). So in the text, they must be AWARE of the prepositions, the ‘ON’.

R: OK.

Hs: So that’s the difference.

R: Ah. And is it—just to make sure I’m understanding—is part of it to make sure that they understand the Swedish?

H: (overlapping) Yes.

R: Because if they’re just signing ‘write’ (WRITE-on-paper), you don’t know if they understand how that person’s writing?

Hs: Writing on the refrigerator. You can write in different ways. To make them understand that now they just have the base form of ‘write’ like this, ‘write’ (WRITE-on-paper), and that ‘I write on a refrigerator,’ (WRITE-on-paper) ‘I write on the road,’ (WRITE-on-the-ground). They should be aware that, actually, they can write, like, on THIS (WRITE-on-large-vertical-object). They can write in the air (WRITE-in-the-air). You can USE it in different ways. So THAT’s why they need text, also, to compare to the sign. So we’re talking a little bit MORE about how they can write in different ways. They just know the base from of writing, like this (WRITE-on-paper).

R: OK. I guess what I’m trying to-. It seems like you’re saying TWO reasons. One is so that they understand that the Swedish verb ‘write’ has different meanings? And the other is so that they understand there are various ways of saying ‘write’ in Teckenspråk?

H: Yes.
R: Yes? Are those equal. Do you feel those are equally important? Or is there one that you’re emphasizing more than the other?

Hs: (sighs) In this situation, I thought it wasn’t SO important to know it in sign language.

R: In sign language?

I: [response to question] Yeah.

Hs: I wanted them to practice at home on the word ‘WRITING’, at home. Because if they had that for homework, then it would be easier to explain later on. If they understood the word ‘write’, doing homework and doing the text at home, it would be much easier to discuss going more in depth afterward. Because if I’m just putting in everything in the same time, it would be too confusing. So it’s much better, then, to do the homework first. Let it sink in. And then, afterwards, I can put more effort into going more in depth about ‘writing on what.’ And also talk about the sign language, the homework they’ve been doing, to make them understand that ‘WRITING’ is not only ‘writing’ like this (/WRITE(-on-a-horizontal-plane/), but writing is in different ways. Maybe it’s right, maybe it’s wrong, to do that. Maybe it’s too late because they had it in homework, you know ‘writing’, and then AFTERwards I would point it out to them. Maybe it’s the wrong way to do it. Maybe you should do that in the beginning, to make them aware of the different ways of writing. But I was thinking maybe they can do that in homework FIRST. So they understand ‘writing’. And then afterwards we can go more into depth, HOW to write.

R: Right, right.

Hs: What is more important? Both of them are equal for me.

R: Yeah, yeah. OK, OK. Thank you. Ah! I think this goes on further. Yes. OK, this keeps going.

[watching video – H7/V1 15:25-17:44 (PREP: Ss don’t translate, no corr.)]

Hs: [interrupts video at 15:37] If you want, you can use ‘vägen,’ ‘the road.’ I was fingerspelling ‘road’. I didn’t say ‘THE road’. I just said ‘väg’, ‘road’. I didn’t explain it was actually, especially, this road. I think it was too much information. I just said ‘road’.

R: OK.

Hs: Enough. I was not pointing out a special road. If they ASKED me about ‘-en’, ‘vägen’, ‘THE road’, then I would explain to them. But as long as they don’t ASK about the ‘-en’, it’s enough for me to just tell them now, “It’s ‘road’.”

R: Mm. OK.
R: OK, any thoughts on that?

Hs: I didn’t talk so much about the preposition ‘på’. I just said ‘refrigerator’, not ‘ON’, just ‘refrigerator’.

R: Mm-hmm.

Hs: Maybe I should have brought it up. I have to keep a balance. I’ve been NAGGING so much about it before (laughs), so I thought we HAVE to move on. We have to go to the next step. And maybe we can go back later on.

R: Ah. OK, OK. OK, well, let me ask: What is—if you did it TOO much, if you went on too long with på, på, på—what would be the effect? WHY is that a bad thing?

H: It would start getting boring. If you over-analyze a text, it starts to get boring. We have made that mistake, many of us. Even I. We have a book called ‘Adams Bok’ (‘Adam’s Book’). It’s both the text and sign language. And they have SO MANY examples for what you can talk about with the text, and there’s SO MANY examples. It’s a teachers’ guide. There’s so much to talk about. In the end, the students came out, “No! God! We don’t want it! Please! Please!” It was too much, too much analysis.

R: OK.

H: And especially when they’re that small. You want them to feel, “Hey! It’s fun! It’s cool! It’s fun.” If you analyze it too much, it gets boring. It’s not fun with Swedish anymore.

R: No, no.

H: It’s all the balance.

R: Yeah. OK, OK. Let’s see. Let’s skip this one-

H: (overlapping) In that case—I want to say—the last time you saw we had ‘ABC books.’ And I have two girls. This one, Samantha, she HATES Swedish. She really hates it. Because she has such a hard time reading, such a hard time understanding. And you can see, she didn’t actually look at the text, really. She looked a little, and she forgot it. And I didn’t POINT. I didn’t want her to, “You have to memorize this. You have to memorize this.” Because she’s already struggling-

Hs: with the homework. In the beginning, I just go through a little bit on the surface with the ‘ABC book.’.

H: I’m not actually working that hard with her because that was too much for her. It’s enough for HER just to see the word. Because she didn’t want to look at the text. You can see Anna.
She was more like, (interested expression) “Uh-huh. What does THIS say?” It’s different. Then you can talk about it. But I don’t want to take up too much.

R: Mm-hmm. OK.

H: She just had a TASTE. That’s OK.

R: Right. OK. Let’s skip here. Video 2.


H: (comments at 12:38) I’m starting get sick there.

R: Oooh.


H: [interrupts video at 13:14] NOW, actually, if I was smart, which I wasn’t there, I should have pointed out, what’s the difference between ‘titta’ (watch) and ‘såg’ (saw).

R: Mm-hmm. Ah. Keep watching. (laughs)


H: [interrupts video at 13:34] Yeah. ‘Cause he’s pointing out: “What does it say? What does THAT mean if it says something different there?”

R: Right, right. Yeah, and a couple more seconds. I think it’s-.


R: Yeah, yeah. That was it. But pointing out the difference between ‘tittade’ (watched) and ‘såg’ (saw): What did you mean?

Hs: I didn’t explain, actually, in a good way. Instead of saying, “I watched television,” “I was looking at the television,” or the TV. Normally we say ‘-de’, ‘tittade’. “I was watching, ‘tittade’.” You CAN use ‘såg’, ‘looked at’ the television. But normally you just say, ‘tittade på’. I don’t know if you can compare it in English.

R: I see what you’re saying. Because in English you say, “I watch a movie,” and “I watch TV.” But in Swedish, “I watch a movie.” I’m sorry: “I SAW a movie,” and “I watched TV.” No! You would say, “I saw a movie,” in English, too. (laughs) But, OK. So, you mean, the difference in MEANING: tittar (to watch) and ser (to see) are-

Hs: (overlapping) You could also use ‘tittade’ instead of ‘såg’.
R: Oh, you COULD use it.

Hs: So, I should have used same—’tittade’ and ‘tittade’—two times, so as not to confuse them.

R: OK, I see.

Hs: They’re in first grade. It’s too much for them. Maybe if they were older, we could use the difference between the two words, and we could also have a discussion about WHEN you use ‘tittade’ and when you use the word ‘såg’. But, in the first grade, I think it’s a little bit too early.

R: OK, I see. Let’s see.

Hs: It’s good to look at yourself. (laughs)

R: Yeah. (laughs) It must be, yeah.

Hs: Actually [more exciting?]. Maybe I’m not so smart. (laughs)

R: Ahhh. (laughs) OK, 3:00 to 4:00.

Hs: (responding to video as I’m forwarding to the right spot) Yeah, Olle is very good at memorizing.

R: Oh! OK.

H: Memorizing words.

R: OK. OK.

[watching video – H11/V1 3:00-4:00 (VERB: vad kan stolen göra?)]

Hs: [interrupts video at 3:34] She’s from an actor’s family. Her mother and father are actors.

R: Oh, yeah? (laughs)

[watching video – H11/V1 3:34-4:00 (VERB: vad kan stolen göra?)]

R: OK, I’m gonna fast forward just a little. Where are we? Ah! 6:30.

H: Now we are talking about verbs.

R: Right, right. There we go.

[watching video – H11/V1 6:30-7:40 (VERB: IDs and defines)]
R: OK.


R: Was this was the first time-

H: (overlapping) Yes.

R: you had introduced the word ‘verb’?

H: Yes.

R: Oh, OK.

H: Yes.

R: And this Kiwi book had recommended you work on verbs?

H: Yeah, yeah. Exactly.

R: OK. How did you feel about the lesson?

H: Uh (sighs). I feel like more they were TASTING at it, but they didn’t actually-. If you want them to KNOW it, you have to practice more and do more different assignments. If I follow Kiwi, that was too little. Too little to understand about this. Maybe they have a TASTE of it, but they will have forgotten about it in a week. Or two.

R: Mm-hmm. Mm-hmm. OK.

H: So, actually, next week I should do more talk—if I want to work more with the verbs—I should give more examples.

R: Mm-hmm. OK, OK. What kind of work might you have them do to practice with verbs?

H: I don’t want to do it, like, just, you know, ‘går’ (go), ‘gick’ (went), ‘gått’ (gone), dot, dot, dot, dot, dot, dot, dot, dot. You don’t LEARN that much. You have to have a TEXT. And I would take a little text, an easy text, and I say, “NOW, you remember verbs, something with movement. Hey! Let’s help me. Let’s figure out what could be the verbs HERE, in this text.” In three, four sentences. And then we will pick some verbs and try to WORK on-. And maybe you can say ‘nu’ (now), ‘då’ (then), ‘förut’ (before then). They would work with that. Not RIGHT NOW. We would do it very very soon.

R: Right.
H: Then I would pick verbs. And they would help me to pick out verbs. And then we’ll put it on the board. And then we talk about, “If you did it NOW, what would we call it? What would we call it then?”

R: Right. I know there’s not a curriculum, per se. There’s not a curriculum you have to follow at Nilskolan for language teaching. But is it typical that they, in the second grade, for example, do future and past and present.

H: Yes, yes. Absolutely.

R: OK. So there are typical subjects they handle at different levels.

H: Yeah.

R: OK. And you’ve taught first grade before, but not so recently? Is that right?

H: A while ago.

R: Right. OK. So working with this level again is sort of new, yeah?

H: Yeah. No, actually, I would have them talk about them pretty SOON.

R: Ah. In the first grade.

H: I think Agneta will say, “Wait, wait.” She hasn’t been teaching in the first grade. She always wants me to wait. I’m more like, “Yeah. Come on! They can do this. They can do that.” Because sometimes students CAN understand some of-. Because it’s very common in deaf people that they have a very hard time when it comes to verbs. They often use NOW, presens (the present tense), in their writing.

R: Mm-hmm.

H: So I think it’s important to start early, to have to do it the right way. Because if you only read this dot, dot, dot, dot, dot, dot, it doesn’t give you the FEELING. It’s just TERMS. You have to use it in a TEXT to talk about it.

R: OK, OK.

H: When I was teaching in the sixth grade, I had some boys, and they were writing some stories. And then we took the stories, and we would talk about the story. “Hmm. You have to think about if you change-. JUST think about the verbs right now. Forget about anything else.” And then they would change that.

R: Mm. OK. Change them how?

H: To ‘dåtid’ (past tense).
R: Ah. I see. Change the whole text to the past tense.

Hs: There’s a lot to think about in a text. So that time I wanted to focus on ONLY-. It’s like, “OK, let’s see this text. Now we will focus ONLY on past tense, or on present.” And then we’ll just look at those small words. How can we change it to the present or the past tense?

R: Right, right. OK. I think we have one more segment, and it’s one minute long. Then we’re all done. Um, let’s see, it was from-

[2 minute break while she gets some stickers for her son to play with.]

R: OK. Last one.

[watching video – H10/V2 14:50-16:12 (W-O: kan stanna, stanna kan)]

H: [interrupts video at 15:03] I remember that was very-. I think it was a little difficult to explain the difference between ‘dance’ and ‘twirling around’.

R: Ah. Right.

H: Because in the picture, they couldn’t see, actually, it was ‘around’ (/SPIN/) and ‘dance’ (/DANCE/). ‘Dance’ with a wheelchair? (confused expression)

R: (laughs) Right, right.

H: I remember, I thought that was difficult.

R: (restarting video) OK. Wait! I think something happened. We’re in the wrong place.

H: (pointing to still image on computer screen) Yeah, we are talking about the pictures.

R: Yeah, I’m in the wrong-

H: (overlapping) How you could see movements.

R: Uh-huh. Yeah, actually, since that was there, why were you emphasizing that you could see movement in the picture?

H: Because before you couldn’t see that much in the pictures. They were very still. And, in the Kiwi method, in THIS book, they want you to talk about movements. (smirks)

R: (laughs)

H: I’m a SLAVE! I’m a slave to the book. (laughs) I thought that was OK. Sometimes you need to have a break. Whatever. You can talk about the pictures. Because sometimes I think we
talk too little about the pictures. We talk about what we SEE. I thought it was a good point to talk about movements, too.

R: I see. Hmm. OK.

H: It’s a good break.

R: Yeah. OK. OK, then we’ll get to-

H: (overlapping) But, I feel now like, I think a little of this Kiwi material, it doesn’t have any connection. It’s very ‘verbs’ and ‘nouns’ and ‘adjectives’ and ‘talk about movements’.
(puzzled expression) A little.

R: Hmm. Yeah. Whoops. There we go.

H: And I wouldn’t say ‘my CHAIR’, either.

R: No.

H: No, I wouldn’t do that.

R: You’d say-

H: (overlapping) Because we would never say ‘chair’. We say ‘wheelchair’ in Swedish. But here it says ‘chair’. Remember, I took it up, “You CAN say ‘rull’ (roll) ‘chair’.

R: Yeah. Uh-huh.

Hs: We don’t divide it to two words, like ‘wheel’, ‘chair’. ‘Wheelchair’ is ‘wheelchair’. It’s-

R: (overlapping) Right, it’s its own word.

I: [repetition] It’s its OWN word, yes.

Hs: It says ‘chair’, ‘chair’, ‘chair’, ABOUT the wheelchair. Normally, in Swedish, we don’t use the word ‘chair’. “Chair, ACTUALLY it’s the one with the wheels on it.” We don’t do that. ‘Wheelchair’ is a ‘wheelchair’.

R: OK.

[watching video – H10/V2 15:03-16:12 (W-O: kan stanna, stanna kan)]

H: [interrupts video at 15:43] I think most are generally like, “K!” (absent expression)

R: (laughs)
H: But, I think they will understand. You know, I just want them to be aware: Sign language, Swedish, are different languages. If they REALLY understand what’s different right here? Maybe they won’t. But I think, in the end, they’re going to understand the difference.

[30 second break while Helena answers her son’s question.]

H: So, right now it’s not that important, “You HAVE to know the difference.” Just let them be aware.

R: Mm-hmm. It goes on a little bit longer.

[watching video – H10/V2 15:43-16:12 (W-O: kan stanna, stanna kan)]

H: (laughs)

R: (laughs) Right. Right. OK. So if you don’t want to add anything?

H: No.

R: No. OK.

H: Poor children.

R: I know.

H: They’re like, “OK.” (frustrated expression)

R: I know. You’re being so patient.

H: I hope they’re aware.

R: (laughs) Oh no! I meant your son, also. HE’s being so patient. (laughs)

Hs: No, we’re talking about the children here (points at video screen).

R: Oh, here! I see! I thought because he was bored. (laughs) OK. So that’s all the clips I have. Is there anything that you want to say, or add, or?

H: No. Actually, I’m not very satisfied with some of the lessons. Like I told you, I should be working MORE, maybe one, two weeks with—like we were talk about this—verbs and adjectives. Because I’m scared that sometimes it’s too much. And sometimes it’s too sett.

R: Too?

I: [response to question] ‘Sett’, it’s too long, it’s too boring, ya know, it’s getting boring-
H: (overlapping) (mimics exhaustion)

R: Tiring.

I: [explanation] Yeah, tiring because it’s too slow, too much of the-

R: Same thing?

I: [response to question] Yeah.

H: Hmm.

R: Yeah.

H: I hope the students understand SOMETHING.

R: I’m sure. I’m sure. Well, thank you, again-

H: (overlapping) You’re welcome.

R: for letting me observe and for talking to me. I know you don’t feel well. So, I appreciate it.

H: It’s very good for ME, too. We should have more /FILM/, more often. We talk about that. We should take movies more often.

R: And watch yourself.

H: Yeah. And say, “Ah! What am I doing?”


H: I feel like, “Oh my GOSH!” But, I know, I’m a HUMAN. I’m human. [I can do something wrong, too.]

R: Right.

H: But, I feel like now I’m really, I’m like really like this (gestures widely and dramatically). What you see. But I remember I had a lecturer. She told me, when you’re in front of an audience, NINETY percent is body language.

R: Mm-hmm. Mm-hmm.

H: And ten percent is only what’s coming out (gestures from mouth).

R: What you’re saying.
H: Yeah. So, I think I’m very, very aware of that. That’s why I have (gestures widely and dramatically). Children today need more ACTION to pay attention, that’s, you know, from TV. They want to have action. Because if you don’t—if you only stay there (/SIGN/dryly)—they won’t listen.

R: No. Mm-hmm.

H: So that’s why I’m a very (gestures widely and dramatically)-

R: Right, BIG and alive. Yeah. (laughs)

H: I want to have their attention.


H: Maybe some think I am OVER-acting.

R: Oh, no.

H: I don’t care.

R: Right. Good! All right.

H: That’s the same with teachers, with signing. Even if it’s sign, you can be very tiring if you stand there (/SIGN/dryly). Especially when they’re kids. You have to, (claps) “Wow!” Actually. Then, they’re like, (mimics coming to) “What?”

R: Mm-hmm. Yeah. They seem to be having fun in your class.

H: Yeah. I think so. MOST of them.

R: Yeah. Right.

H: Some of them are not. (laughs)

R: (laughs) Most of them, yes.

H: Because we have some kids that have ADHD. He needs to have a lot of—to concentrate for a long time—he needs a lot of-

R: Stimulus.

H: Stimulus, yeah, yeah.

R: It’s tough. Yeah. Yeah. OK.
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Christel’s Feedback on Her Transcripts

Christel had no comments on the Pre-Observation Interview.

Regarding the Stimulated Recall Interview, she made one correction and one clarification, inserted as notes within the text of the transcript I had sent her.

First, she corrected my spelling of the Swedish word ‘hemvägledare’ (home counselors). I had misheard her and guessed at the spelling, ‘hembagare’.

Second, she clarified her description of the Swedish University point system. The transcript contained the line, “I studied 30, 60, and then 90 HP in the University.” Christel added the following clarification:

“In Sweden it used to be that 1 point was equal to 1 week’s study. 20 points = 20 weeks = 1 semester. But they just recently changed that to fit European standards. The old 20 is now 30, 40 is 60 and 60 is 90.

Just to let you know why I’ve changed.

HP stands for HögskolePoäng – University Points.”
Helena’s Feedback on Her Transcripts

Helena sent me an email that read as follows:

“In the case of the pre-observation transcript, I misunderstood you at one point:

_R_: _Hm. OK. And I’m curious about the curriculum. Did they give you specific goals for each book? Like, I was noticing in some classes that the past tense comes up a lot in a certain book, and so it gives the teacher the opportunity to talk about the past. Are there teaching materials that direct you toward, you know, a good way of using the book for teaching certain parts of language?

I misunderstood and answered ‘no’ to the question, but, sure, I have goals for every book we go through. In one book, I focus more on the plural and singular, for example, in another book, I focus more on verbs, etc.

In the case of the stimulated recall transcript, I think that my explanation of the _Kiwi_ book was a little inaccurate.

_**H:** (overlapping) But, I feel now like, I think a little of this _Kiwi_ material, it doesn’t have any connection. It’s very ‘verbs’ and ‘nouns’ and ‘adjectives’ and ‘talk about movements’. (puzzled expression) A little.

I think I’m generalizing about the _Kiwi_ book too much. Actually, the book’s aims are often aligned with my own goals.”
Appendix O

Example Concept Map

Context - Deaf Education

- Influences on Té TLA (see other network)
- Critical pedagogy
  - Goal of grammar teaching is language preservation
    - Situated in the context of the disability vs. cultural difference divide
      - Is speech or sign better for members of the deaf community?
    - Input enhancement (necessity of visuals?)
  - Colleagues as stakeholders
  - Parents as stakeholders
    - Selection of content (do they pick confusing differences b/w signed and spoken languages?)
  - Role of grammar instruction (see network)
    - Using sign to check for Ss' comprehension (because it's a visual/iconic language?)

- Which grammar items are not unique to deaf ed context?

- Try to teach Swedish as a 1st, not 2nd, language
Appendix P

Final List of Codes

ELK: EXPLICIT LANGUAGE KNOWLEDGE
   ELK: engagement style
      ELK: engagement style_goal
      ELK: engagement style_inquiry
      ELK: engagement style_not grammar
   ELK: error correction
      ELK: error correction_no
   ELK: input
   ELK: explanation
      ELK: explanation_no

KOL: KNOWLEDGE OF LEARNERS
   KOL: input enhancement
   KOL: selection of content
      KOL: selection of content_pacing
      KOL: selection of content_signed vs. spoken
   KOL: use of metalanguage
      KOL: use of metalanguage_no
   KOL: comprehension checks
   KOL: sociocultural awareness
   KOL: motivation strategies

LP: LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY
   LP: accurate and effective use of the target language(s)
      LP: accurate use of target_Swedish
      LP: accurate use of target_TSP
   LP: non-native speaker advantage

BEL: BELIEFS ABOUT LANGUAGE AND LANGUAGE TEACHING
   BEL: feelings about grammar
      BEL: feelings_confidence
         BEL: feelings_confidence_no
         BEL: feelings_confidence_not grammar
         BEL: feelings_confidence_Ss questions
      BEL: feelings_negative
      BEL: feelings_positive
      BEL: feelings_self-improvement
   BEL: perceptions of students’ feelings about grammar
   BEL: understandings of the role of grammar instruction
      BEL: role of grammar_communication
      BEL: role of grammar_comprehension
      BEL: role of grammar_preservation
BEL: role of grammar writing
BEL: understandings of stakeholder expectations
  BEL: stakeholders_colleagues
  BEL: stakeholders_curriculum
    BEL: stakeholders_curriculum_no
BEL: stakeholders Kiwi books
BEL: stakeholders national standards
BEL: stakeholders parents

MT: MODEL TEACHER
  MT: deaf literacy difficulties
  MT: differentiated instruction
  MT: expressive language - Swedish
  MT: expressive language - TSP
  MT: identity/strategies
  MT: speech therapists/audiologists
  MT: Swedish through print
  MT: vocab - Swedish
  MT: vocab - TSP

INF: INFLUENCES ON TLA
  INF: experience growing up deaf/hoh
    INF: deaf exp teaching as calling
    INF: deaf exp deaf culture
    INF: deaf exp oralism
  INF: language learning experiences
    INF: lang learning family
    INF: lang learning school
  INF: teacher training
    INF: teacher training not real life

CON: CONTEXT
  CON: cochlear implants
  CON: elementary ed

Note: ‘TSP’ stands for Teckenspråk.
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Statement of Teckenspråk Proficiency

Statement of Teachers’ Native-Like Proficiency in Teckenspråk

As a certified Teckenspråk interpreter of 26 years, I can testify that both Christel and Helena have native-like proficiency in Teckenspråk.

23 oct 2012

Certified Teckenspråk Interpreter
Statement of Teachers’ Native-Like Proficiency in Swedish

As a native speaker of Swedish, as well as a Swedish language educator for 14 years, I can testify that both Christel and Helena have native-like proficiency in written Swedish. Helena also has native-like proficiency in spoken Swedish.

Nilskolan, Stockholm
October 22, 2012

[Signature]

Professional Development Supervisor and Teacher for the Deaf
## Appendix S

**Model Teacher Matrices, Christel**

### Reading (20 minute lesson)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>L</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>VS</th>
<th>VT</th>
<th>ES</th>
<th>ET</th>
<th>Sw</th>
<th>Li</th>
<th>SH</th>
<th>DI</th>
<th>Id</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>V2</td>
<td>7:02</td>
<td>&quot;l oppan&quot; = the flea</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7:28 definite form</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7:44 how do you sign &quot;flea?&quot;</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8:37 tell story about fleas under sheets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9:13 what does &quot;go down&quot; mean?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9:20 how do you sign &quot;go down?&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9:32 what's the present tense?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10:30 re-emphasizes past tense</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10:40 is &quot;sang&quot; present or past</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11:10 re-emphasizes past tense</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11:20 what do the italics mean?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12:40 re-emphasizes that italics means speech</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12:45 what do quotes mean?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13:15 Swedish uses the &quot;am&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13:30 how do we translate song to TSP?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13:56 don’t use “on” in TSP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14:17 covered text - focus on meaning first</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14:33 whom does he meet?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14:40 what’s this bug called?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>V3</td>
<td>0:13</td>
<td>“beetle revealed”</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0:13 infer - what does the flea say?</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0:45 where does it say “beetle”?</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1:06 read - what does the beetle say?</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1:46 explains why beetle is mad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1:55 what’s this word (&quot;trembled&quot;)?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2:05 what’s the present tense of (&quot;trembled&quot;)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2:50 what’s this word (&quot;fear&quot;)?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2:55 Ross - “strang” (string) vs “skrack” (fear)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3:40 welcomes S discussion of text</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4:20 answers S ? - how big is a flea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4:44 covered text - what’s the beetle saying? - samma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5:20 re-emphasizes - “went” (gick), past</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5:30 predict - now who will he meet?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5:52 covered text</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5:58 signs beetles dramatic ‘scared’ reaction twice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6:19 infer - what does the lizard say?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6:15 Ss reading - Joana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7:02 rephrases in better TSP</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7:20 re-emphasizes past tense - darrade</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7:29 covered text - samma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7:50 samma, samma, samma - line, line</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Writing (10 minute lesson)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>L</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>VS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0:08</td>
<td>Joana - spelling of halsduk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0:28</td>
<td>Joana - commas are too long, &quot;och&quot; before the last item, and period at the end.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0:50</td>
<td>Joana - writes on board to clarify.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2:05</td>
<td>Joana - re-emphasizes how commas should look</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2:35</td>
<td>misspelled februari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2:58</td>
<td>Betty - sockerbok is precious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3:00</td>
<td>Betty - o instead of O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3:18</td>
<td>Betty - rewrite the date, sockerbok is precious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3:35</td>
<td>Joana - still a large comma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5:05</td>
<td>Joana - add 'l' to hangsel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4:10</td>
<td>Joana - need a hyphen to show that the word continues on the next line - explains clearly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4:40</td>
<td>Joana - clarifies that its hangselbyxor and not byxorhangsel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4:45</td>
<td>Joana - reminds to add och before last item in list</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5:01</td>
<td>Betty - correct writing of date &quot;den 3rd februrari&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5:30</td>
<td>Betty - think about how you want to design the cover</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Field Notes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>L</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>VS</th>
<th>VT</th>
<th>ES</th>
<th>ET</th>
<th>Sw</th>
<th>Li</th>
<th>SH</th>
<th>DI</th>
<th>Id</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>V1</td>
<td>0:15</td>
<td>explains that she’s signing to me in ASL (had been telling me a S was absent because sick but will be back tomorrow)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0:20</td>
<td>teaches them tomorrow and yesterday in ASL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0:55</td>
<td>writes ‘tomorrow’ on the board</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1:00</td>
<td>explains that it’s not pronounced ‘tomorrow’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1:15</td>
<td>writes ‘yesterday’ on the board</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1:28</td>
<td>writes ‘today’ on the board &amp; looks to them for TSP translation - offers idag &amp; shows ASL sign</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1:40</td>
<td>Ross - day looks like dag</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1:50</td>
<td>reiterates that today, yesterday, and tomorrow are English words</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2:00</td>
<td>Ss excited to talk about English - Christel says they should hold the discussion until Friday during ‘English’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2:45</td>
<td>shows them the translations of the days of the week</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3:00</td>
<td>explains that ASL day signs are based on the first letters just like Swedish day signs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3:10</td>
<td>English, finished! (smiles) - getting carried away</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3:50</td>
<td>3 languages! Swedish, ASL, and English. - you are multilingual!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3:52</td>
<td>Swedish is a language only spoken by a small group of people. It’s not a worldwide language.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4:00</td>
<td>but English is spoken all over the world.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4:45</td>
<td>Spanish, French, and German are also more widely spoken. Chinese, too.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5:30</td>
<td>That’s why it’s important that you learn English. When you travel.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>V1</td>
<td>0:00</td>
<td>Ss leave for speech - no resistance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5</td>
<td>V1</td>
<td>0:00</td>
<td>explains that a few Ss (inc Ross) are in trouble for TSP whispering - forbidden at NILskolan because it makes other Ss feel bad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1:30</td>
<td>Ss whispering is like someone talking and excluding deaf people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>VS</td>
<td>VT</td>
<td>ES</td>
<td>ET</td>
<td>Sw</td>
<td>Li</td>
<td>SH</td>
<td>DI</td>
<td>Id</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2:45</td>
<td>everyone at Nilskolan can sign - only some can speak and hear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3:00</td>
<td>What does it mean to have 2 languages in our school?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3:12</td>
<td>Calls Betty to answer - “being at a school for the deaf means we have 2 languages. Swedish and TSP”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3:30</td>
<td>Christel says, also, “you talk, but not everyone talks. If you’re talking with one of your friends who talks, and I walk up, you need to switch. That way everyone can interact.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4ish</td>
<td>reiterates, re-emphasizes that it makes people feel bad - Ross re-enters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5:30</td>
<td>Joana talks about people signing under the table</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5:55</td>
<td>Christel re-emphasizes that it makes people feel bad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6:00</td>
<td>Joana explains that it’s happened to her - that two people were speaking and she didn’t know what was going on and she felt awful and shut out</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6:20</td>
<td>Christel says that it happened to her, too, growing up deaf. “My family and everyone I knew were hearing.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6:50</td>
<td>Christel: Then I met deaf people “Ah!” I could talk with people, and it felt so good.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7:05</td>
<td>But all of you hear pretty well with your implants. But if you’re outside of school and a lot of people are talking, do you understand well? They shake heads no. That’s why TSP is your comfortable language.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7:35</td>
<td>When it’s really loud, hearing people can’t hear either. But we can sign in those situations. It doesn’t bother us.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8:05</td>
<td>Ss still want to cont conversation, but Christel closes by re-stating that it’s not good to exclude people from our conversation. That it’s better to be open.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8:10</td>
<td>Adds that it’s also important not to make faces that make people feel bad, like rolling your eyes or showing that you’re not listening.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9:00</td>
<td>moves on</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VS</th>
<th>VT</th>
<th>ES</th>
<th>ET</th>
<th>Sw</th>
<th>Li</th>
<th>SH</th>
<th>DI</th>
<th>Id</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Appendix T

## Model Teacher Matrices, Helena

### Reading (20 minute lesson)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>L</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>VS</th>
<th>VT</th>
<th>ES</th>
<th>ET</th>
<th>Sw</th>
<th>Li</th>
<th>SH</th>
<th>DI</th>
<th>Id</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H3</td>
<td>v2</td>
<td>3:22</td>
<td>Ask Dennis to read “En Hund”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3:25</td>
<td>en - not many, one</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3:28</td>
<td>who imagined story? “text”</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3:40</td>
<td>who drew pictures? “bild”</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4:08</td>
<td>“Svensk text” Oh! This means someone translated it from another language!</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4:18</td>
<td>accepts Angela’s question about “line” on the page</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4:28</td>
<td>reviews “writer” and “pictures”</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4:57</td>
<td>What does “glad” mean?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5:10</td>
<td>who is “jag”? - how to sign</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5:50</td>
<td>Olle points out she’s missing the “ar” - explains</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6:38</td>
<td>looks at “flitig” “svart!” (difficult)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7:12</td>
<td>flitig is a hard word. It means...</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7:20</td>
<td>tells S he needs to pay attention or he’ll be confused later. Respectful.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7:35</td>
<td>explains meaning of sign flytig at same time as word</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7:49</td>
<td>shows TSP translation - jag flytig hund jag</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8:57</td>
<td>what does ‘duktig’ mean?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9:16</td>
<td>what’s the dog doing? (looking at picture)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9:20</td>
<td>rephrases in better TSP</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9:27</td>
<td>repeats “jag dukrig hund jag”</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9:31</td>
<td>repeats “jag dukrig hund jag” again</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9:37</td>
<td>goes back a page - what’s he doing? “digging”</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9:57</td>
<td>svart word - olydig</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10:15</td>
<td>Anna looks at picture and translates olydig as walking on the road. Helena signs, “Yes, of course.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10:25</td>
<td>olydig - take away the ‘o’, it means</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10:45</td>
<td>olydig - with ‘o’, it means “O+LYDIG”</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11:48</td>
<td>repeats sentence-final “jag”</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12:00</td>
<td>Kendra spells name with letters on page</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12:47</td>
<td>Olle asks why no ‘ar’ - explains again and models</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13:30</td>
<td>“is it becoming more clear?”</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14:00</td>
<td>What does smutsig mean? Signs ‘dirty’</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14:10</td>
<td>repeats sentence-final “jag”</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14:27</td>
<td>Dennis signs correctly - Helena asks for TSP</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14:30</td>
<td>Dennis doesn’t, but Helena does</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14:45</td>
<td>calls on Tim with her voice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>VS</td>
<td>VT</td>
<td>ES</td>
<td>ET</td>
<td>Sw</td>
<td>Li</td>
<td>SH</td>
<td>DI</td>
<td>Id</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14:48</td>
<td>Turns Tim so he’s facing the other students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3</td>
<td>V3</td>
<td>15:04</td>
<td>Tim guesses “I am a wash dog”, for “ren” (clean) - accepts, but makes right sign</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0:10</td>
<td>repeats sentence-final “jag”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0:13</td>
<td>explains that ‘ren’ also means reindeer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0:48</td>
<td>Olle shows that ren - r = en; Helena smiles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1:28</td>
<td>repeats sentence-final “jag”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1:55</td>
<td>Dennis struggling - H says “what’s he doing??”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2:12</td>
<td>Compares, to snail. He’s “slow”, what’s the dog?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3:08</td>
<td>Plask! Picture - what happened?!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3:20</td>
<td>A “splash” is something you hear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3:45</td>
<td>the “!” means it’s loud</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4:22</td>
<td>pulls down Olle’s hood - “better to see your signing”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4:35</td>
<td>Olle doesn’t know “gron” - (points to dog) what color is this?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4:48</td>
<td>points out “!” - means dog is really surprised</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4:48</td>
<td>Olle makes exclamation point on his head</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5:25</td>
<td>second time through the text - H reads</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5:35</td>
<td>repeats sentence-final “jag”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5:30</td>
<td>looks to Ss for meaning of glad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5:35</td>
<td>looks to ss for meaning of flitig</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5:45</td>
<td>repeats sentence-final “jag”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5:56</td>
<td>looks to ss for meaning of duktig</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5:59</td>
<td>repeats sentence-final “jag”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6:10</td>
<td>looks to ss for meaning of olydig</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6:13</td>
<td>repeats sentence-final “jag”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6:20</td>
<td>Olle says ‘svart’ for ‘smutsig’ - Helena accepts but corrects and points to word</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6:25</td>
<td>repeats sentence-final “jag”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6:30</td>
<td>looks to ss for meaning of smutsig</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6:35</td>
<td>repeats sentence-final “jag”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6:48</td>
<td>looks to ss for meaning of ren</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6:50</td>
<td>repeats sentence-final “jag”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6:58</td>
<td>looks to ss for meaning of fin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7:00</td>
<td>repeats sentence-final “jag”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7:15</td>
<td>looks to ss for meaning of “plask”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7:20</td>
<td>looks to ss for meaning of gron</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7:20</td>
<td>repeats sentence-final “jag”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7:45</td>
<td>explains that she’s going to read with all of them 1:1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>VS</td>
<td>VT</td>
<td>ES</td>
<td>ET</td>
<td>Sw</td>
<td>Li</td>
<td>SH</td>
<td>DI</td>
<td>Id</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H9</td>
<td>V2</td>
<td>3:00</td>
<td>Hera - what did you write?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3:10</td>
<td>Hera - clarifies: Saturday or Sunday</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3:17</td>
<td>Hera - writes her sentence on the board</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3:55</td>
<td>Tim - what did you write?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4:00</td>
<td>Tim - clarifies: Saturday or Sunday</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4:08</td>
<td>Tim - writes her sentence on the board</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4:55</td>
<td>Dennis - what did you write?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5:15</td>
<td>Dennis replies ‘nothing’, pushes for more, ‘I Skarholmen,’ pushes for more, ‘ate dinner’</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5:35</td>
<td>Dennis - writes sentence on the board</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5:45</td>
<td>Dennis - clarifies: Saturday or Sunday</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5:50</td>
<td>Dennis says Sunday - Helena confirms: igar?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6:20</td>
<td>Dennis - has him read the words as she points to them</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6:38</td>
<td>Dennis - doesn’t know sondags - Helena spells and signs for him</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6:50</td>
<td>Dennis - doesn’t know middag - Helena spells and signs for him</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7:00</td>
<td>Tim - asks if he checked his writing against the board</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7:20</td>
<td>Tim - verifies that he’s written a Swedish word correctly.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7:28</td>
<td>Van - not writing, Helena asks him to write about his weekend, refuses.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7:43</td>
<td>Anna - what did you write?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7:50</td>
<td>Anna - Saturday or Sunday? - Anna says the whole weekend</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8:20</td>
<td>Anna - both your mother and your father?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8:30</td>
<td>Anna - same as Angela’s, so writes Anna’s name next to that sentence</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9:25</td>
<td>Hera - asks her to read her own sentence</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9:40</td>
<td>Hera - stuck on ‘hemma’ - Helena spells</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9:43</td>
<td>Hera - stuck on ‘lordags’ - Helena asks “when?” spells</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9:55</td>
<td>Hera - Helena VERY exciting “bral!”</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>Tim - asks him to read his sentence with her</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10:16</td>
<td>Tim - stuck on hemma - Helena spells</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10:23</td>
<td>Tim - stuck on lordags - Helena asks when? And spells</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10:37</td>
<td>Angela - read your sentence, didn’t need any help</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11:10</td>
<td>Anna - your sentence (same as Angela’s)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11:16</td>
<td>Anna - stuck on helgen - Helena spells and signs</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11:28</td>
<td>Anna - stuck on akte - Helena spells and signs</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11:35</td>
<td>Anna - predicts “bus” after akte, when the word is hela. Helena corrects “b-u-s is not there”</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>VS</td>
<td>VT</td>
<td>ES</td>
<td>ET</td>
<td>Sw</td>
<td>Li</td>
<td>SH</td>
<td>DI</td>
<td>Id</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11:42</td>
<td>Anna - Helena spells and signs hela and familjen</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11:50</td>
<td>Anna - guesses right on slalom</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11:55</td>
<td>Anna - Helena translates the sentence to TSP - Hela familjen slalom helgen</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12:05</td>
<td>Olle - what did you write?</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12:14</td>
<td>Olle - H pushes for specifics, which movie?</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12:25</td>
<td>Olle - Sat or Sun?</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12:35</td>
<td>Olle - writes his sentences on the board</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13:15</td>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Field Notes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>L</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>VS</th>
<th>VT</th>
<th>ES</th>
<th>ET</th>
<th>Sw</th>
<th>Li</th>
<th>SH</th>
<th>DI</th>
<th>Id</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H4</td>
<td>v2</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>has given them more time to look at books independently to get them excited about reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6</td>
<td>v1-3</td>
<td>8:00</td>
<td>reading sledding book with students 1:1</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6</td>
<td>V2</td>
<td>1:40</td>
<td>reads a different book with Angela. Helena explains that Angela &amp; Van need extra motivation because they read quickly and learn new words quickly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15:55</td>
<td>Hera - reading out loud while signing - Helena speaks with her</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20:00</td>
<td>Van - reading out loud, not signing - Helena speaks with him</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H7</td>
<td>v1</td>
<td>8:40</td>
<td>Do they speak Swedish in New Zealand? What language do they speak?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9:00</td>
<td>That means that the author thought this book up and wrote it in English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9:10</td>
<td>People in Sweden said we really want this book and flew there to get it, but it was in English!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9:20</td>
<td>(scratches head)NOW what do we do?! You all don’t read English.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9:30</td>
<td>We’ll find a ‘duktig’ person who knows Swedish and English to translate it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9:55</td>
<td>So now you can all read it in Swedish.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>This is the name of the person who did the Swedish translation. The “duktig” person.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10:10</td>
<td>You are all also ‘duktig’! “samma” Because you read Swedish and are able to translate it to TSP!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10:30</td>
<td>Welcomes Ss ideas on topic.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10:30</td>
<td>Hera - says that she knows how to read in Swedish. Helena asks her then can she sign it in TSP? then she is translating!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>VS</td>
<td>VT</td>
<td>ES</td>
<td>ET</td>
<td>Sw</td>
<td>Li</td>
<td>SH</td>
<td>DI</td>
<td>Id</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11:00</td>
<td>Angela - I also know how to read Swedish and translate it to TSP. I CAN.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11:40</td>
<td>And all of you will learn English in the 4th grade!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12:00</td>
<td>Helena, signs “woo-eee!” “impressive!”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H7</td>
<td>v2</td>
<td>10:20</td>
<td>Explains to Elvin in Swedish (can hear but can’t speak)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H8</td>
<td>v1</td>
<td>0:00</td>
<td>ABC books - based on sign language letter handshapes not phonetic sounds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H9</td>
<td>v3</td>
<td>3:05</td>
<td>Helena explains ABC books with handshapes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H11</td>
<td>v3</td>
<td>15ish</td>
<td>reads with Hera in Swedish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>