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ABSTRACT

In recent years, anthropology's assumptions and practices have been critiqued from within the discipline as well as from without. This has resulted in reconsideration of concepts as central to the discipline as the concept of "culture". This dissertation continues such reconsideration of anthropological concepts. At present, culture transmission/learning is discussed within the field of anthropology by employing the concepts of enculturation (learning the culture of birth) and acculturation (learning a culture other than that of birth). These concepts have traditionally been kept separate in both definition and research methodology. Reconsideration of the concepts is accomplished here through a ten-month (academic year) ethnographic study of a midwestern residential deaf school where, according to traditional definition, both enculturation and acculturation occur concurrently. Thus, the concepts are studied simultaneously and with a single methodology for the first time.

The study is premised on two assumptions, that there is an American deaf culture to be transmitted/learned and that culture transmission/learning occurs through interaction. Each of these assumptions is explored in turn and is upheld by the data.
By employing an ethnography of communication framework supplemented by theories of practice and Hall’s (1959) three learning types to more closely analyze the role of interaction, the study identifies general patterns of transmission/learning. This results in a proposed model for culture transmission/learning within American deaf culture. Subsequently, through comparison of patterns of interaction for established students and new students (including both new deaf students and hearing college students), similarities, heretofore overlooked in discussions of enculturation and acculturation, are identified and discussed. At the same time, differences are delineated. Contrary to the literature where differences are based largely on age when learning is begun and source of transmission (intra- or inter-cultural), the most salient differences noted in this study occur in conjunction with perceived identity. Thus, a re-conceptualization of enculturation and acculturation based on perceived identity is proposed.

Finally, the resultant theoretical implications of the proposed model of culture transmission/learning and re-conceptualization of enculturation and acculturation are discussed. To a more limited extent, practical implications are also indicated.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

In 1952, Julian Huxley stated that "a study of the mechanism of cultural transmission and variation may be as important for anthropology as the study of genetics has been for biology" (16). Indeed, studies of culture transmission have been undertaken throughout much of anthropology's history, even before Huxley's acknowledgment of their great importance. Much theoretical work was done beginning in the late 1930's continuing through the 1950's resulting in two distinct concepts: enculturation (the transmission and/or learning of the culture of birth) and acculturation (the transmission and/or learning of a second culture, generally as a result of culture contact). Such studies did not, however, result in the understanding Huxley sought. Nor have they remained in the forefront of the discipline. There was a resurgence of interest in the 1970's and 1980's, including debate regarding the validity and importance of studies of culture transmission versus studies of culture acquisition (learning). Nonetheless, very little theoretical work on culture transmission and learning has been done in recent years. That which has been done continues to keep the concepts of enculturation and acculturation distinct. Studies of enculturation have been relegated to those anthropologists who specialize in the study of educational
systems. Studies of acculturation have remained more prominent than those of enculturation, however, they have become predominantly measures of "degree of acculturation" within the realm of culture contact studies.

As the future of anthropology is contemplated, the time has come to return culture transmission and learning to the fore and continue the search for a theory that lives up to Huxley's statement. This dissertation seeks to do just that by exploring the transmission and learning of American deaf culture through a focused ethnography of a residential deaf school. The focus of this dissertation was arrived at on both personal and theoretical grounds. Personally, I have been a student of American deaf culture for 14 years. I began my studies as an undergraduate seeking a degree in sign language interpreting. It was at this time that I was introduced to American Sign Language (ASL); deafness; and the existence of a deaf culture (into which only ten percent (10%) of deaf children are born). Since that time, I have become a nationally certified sign language interpreter and continued my studies by pursuing both undergraduate and graduate degrees in anthropology. Theoretically, deaf culture proves to be an interesting case by which to return issues of culture transmission and learning to the fore of anthropological discussion and to explore, specifically, enculturation and acculturation (based on the previously noted fact that the majority of deaf individuals are not born into the culture).

This dissertation asks, then, "how is American deaf culture transmitted/learned"? The answer to this question is sought by posing a number of
secondary questions. The first of these questions, generated by a review of the deaf culture literature (which revealed contested opinions), is “is there a deaf culture, and if so, what does it look like?” The second secondary question focuses on interaction as the primary mechanism of culture transmission and learning; specifically, “what is the role of interaction in culture transmission and learning?” This question also arose from a review of the literature (the anthropological literature) that revealed inadequate attention to interaction as a mechanism for cultural transmission and learning (see Chapter Two for further discussion). I seek to answer this question of the role of interaction in culture transmission and learning through even further questions (tertiary questions) generated by an ethnography of communication framework: “in what types of communicative events do learners find themselves”, “what cultural content is available from various events and genres”, “are there restrictions to participation based on setting, events, and/or genre, if so what are they”, “with whom do students interact”, “does participation change over time or on other bases”, “are certain genres more prevalent than others”, “are certain genres associated with particular communication events” and “is content form (explicit /implicit) effected by participants?”

The answers to the above questions inform a second theoretical question: “for deaf culture, is the acculturative experience different than the enculturative experience?” This question, too, is explored through a series of secondary questions, these posed through two theoretical frameworks. The first framework is broadly
referred to as theories of practice. From this perspective, questions regarding legitimate peripheral participation as an experience of acculturation and enculturation are posed. These questions include, “is legitimate peripheral participation experienced by all”, “in what way is peripheral participation marked”, “what is required to move closer to full participation”, and “who are the perceived masters?” The second theoretical framework follows the three types of culture learning (formal, informal, and technical) proposed by Edward T. Hall (1959). The questions generated by this framework include, “does any learning type more readily lend itself to enculturative experiences or acculturative experiences”, “how are the various types of learning related to the participants”, and “how does learning types impact learned content?”

Once in the field, I was fortunate enough to be able to pose a third theoretical question related to the enculturation/acculturation question and which could be answered using the same set of questions with a slightly different focus in terms of participants. This third question was possible due to the presence of a group of hearing college students who were living on campus in order to learn deaf culture. Their presence allowed me to ask, “is the acculturation experience for a deaf student the same as the acculturation experience for a hearing student?”

The answers to all of these questions may then be used to inform two larger anthropological theory questions. The first, “how is culture (in general) transmitted and learned?” The second, “is it valid to consider enculturation and acculturation to be two separate and distinct concepts?”
Addressing the questions posed by this dissertation is not an easy undertaking. As noted previously, there has been a tendency within the field of anthropology to look at either transmission or learning. In either case, the phenomenon being studied is complex. Two quite different perspectives, cognitive and behavioral, have been the primary perspectives used to frame discussions of transmission or learning. Cognitive perspectives on learning are typically concerned with what people do with knowledge, with how information is processed into knowledge. Cognitive perspectives on transmission are likewise interested in knowledge, in what must be shared and known in order to function within the culture. Cognitive perspectives result in discussions of sense making, schema building, cognitive mapping, cognitive domains, and developmental stages. Behavioral perspectives, on the other hand, are more typically concerned with how the information is passed from one individual to another, with the act of exposure. Behavioral perspectives result in discussions of childrearing practices, cooperative learning, practice, and interaction (generally linguistically focused). The reality of culture transmission and learning can doubtless only be truly understood through a combination of the two approaches. Likewise, true understanding can not be achieved by focusing on one side of a two-way process. That is, learning and transmission are both necessary for culture to be shared across generations, however, neither alone is sufficient. With these cognizant acknowledgments of the role of both behavior and cognition in culture transmission and learning, as well as the two-way nature of the process, this study has been designed with an intentionally behavioral
focus on interactions. Such a design, seemingly perpetuating the lack of attention to
the duality inherent in the process, is an outgrowth of a review of the culture
transmission and learning literature where it is possible to find much research that takes
a cognitive perspective while behavioral explanations are under-represented.

Two concepts, then, are central to this study and must be defined at this point:
culture (so as to identify that which is transmitted and learned as cultural) and
interaction (so as to identify the mechanism for transmission and learning and the focus
of the research). I begin with the definition of culture, a contentious issue within the
field of anthropology. Kroeber and Kluckhohn's (1952) work detailing over 150
different definitions of "culture" within the field of anthropology is frequently cited as
an example of this contentiousness. While varying greatly in their specifics, it has been
possible to classify the numerous definitions of "culture" according to their focus or
area of emphasis. Keesing (1974) has employed three broad categories for such a
classification: culture as adaptive systems (applying evolutionary/ecological approaches
to understand and delineate cultures), ideational theories of culture (viewing cultures as
systems of ideas) and culture as sociocultural systems ("Sociocultural systems represent
the social realizations or enactments or ideational designs-for-living in particular
environments" (Keesing 1974:82); a synthesis of sorts of adaptive systems and
ideational systems). It is more common, however, to refer to adaptive (evolutionary, as
in Keesing's adaptive definitions), cognitive (emphasizing shared knowledge), symbolic
(emphasizing shared meaning)*, and behavioral definitions (emphasizing shared rules
for living, similar to Keesing's ideas of social realizations or enactments within socio-cultural systems, however, lacking the relationship to environment. Each type of definition is equally useful, though none, it would seem, based on the continuing debate and lack of consensus on a definition, is wholly satisfactory. Thus, singling out any one definition provides an incomplete picture. Based on this, and the fact that this dissertation is not about resolving the definitional issue, I choose to look at culture through multiple lenses. Throughout this dissertation, I will draw upon the variable definitions of culture (in particular cognitive, symbolic, and behavioral ones) in identifying what is being learned and for establishing the existence of an American deaf culture. In so doing, I believe a more complete picture is possible. Additionally, this allows for a more inclusive use of the existing deaf culture literature, which also employs variable definitions of culture, including cognitive, symbolic, and behavioral definitions.

Interaction is defined for the purposes of this study as the state of affairs occurring in any situation in which an object (generally a human object) acts upon another (a stimulus). The stimulus may be either animate (such as an individual or animal) or inanimate (such as the physical arrangement of a room or a display) with no limitation to the number of possible stimuli in any given situation. In other words, an individual may interact with a single being, with multiple beings simultaneously or with him/herself. It should also be acknowledged that interaction may take a number of forms (referred to in this work as genres) depending upon such factors as those
outlined in the ethnography of communication (participants, setting, event). This definition of interaction differs from those set forth by many interaction based theoretical frameworks (for example, symbolic interactionists, practice theorists and the work of Chapple and Coon, all discussed in Chapter Two) in that it allows for interaction with inanimate objects as well as oneself. This definition is, however, in line with the ethnography of communication perspective (though it never explicitly defines interaction), which will be employed primarily throughout the dissertation, in that it allows for communication (a form of interaction according to the definition being used here) with inanimate objects.

As previously stated, in this study, interaction is being used to study the transmission and learning of culture. In other words, a behavioral framework is being applied to study something that has been recognized and described as not wholly behavioral (both learning and culture). While this may seem incongruous, it is a paradox of anthropology in general. It is in fact the way that anthropologists study culture. Regardless of the research agenda or the definition of culture that is employed, anthropologists are expected to proceed in a behavioral manner, to interact with persons of the culture being explored via conversation, questioning, participation in events, etc. To do anything less is suspect. It is not unusual therefore that I proceed in this manner (with what might otherwise appear as an incongruity) either in theoretical framework or in conduct, that is, through a focused ethnography.
This dissertation begins, traditionally, with an examination of the literature. Chapter Two will accomplish this through a discussion of theories and methods for the study of culture transmission and learning found in the literature. It will outline the rationale for re-examination of enculturation and acculturation, as well as the impetus for a focus on interaction. As the literature also provides a forum for the present study, Chapter Two includes discussion regarding the existence of an American "deaf culture", along with a rationale for the study of enculturation and acculturation within this population. Chapter Three delineates the methods used in data collection and analysis. It also includes the rationale for setting this study within a residential deaf school in general, as well as the specific school chosen. Chapter Four provides a description of deaf culture with particular emphasis on its manifestation at the deaf school. Chapter Five then addresses the first research question ("how is deaf culture transmitted/learned") with a discussion of general patterns of interaction. The second research question ("within deaf culture, is the acculturative experience different than the enculturative experience") is addressed in Chapter Six. In this chapter, the enculturative and acculturative experiences, as traditionally conceived, are examined and compared through an analysis of patterns of participation as evidenced in social networks, peripheral participation and Hall's three types of learning. Both similarities and differences in the experiences are outlined and discussed. Finally, a model of culture transmission/learning in American deaf culture and a re-conceptualization of enculturation and acculturation are proposed. I conclude in Chapter Seven with a
discussion of the possible applications of my findings to the larger anthropological theory questions that I have raised ("how is culture (in general) transmitted/learned" and "is it valid to continue to consider acculturation and enculturation as separate and distinct concepts"). I include discussion of limitations to such application which are the result of the manner by which this study was conducted. I also include suggestions for future research that might enhance the generalizability of this study and lead to a more precise articulation of the concepts of acculturation and enculturation.

Before proceeding, however, it is necessary to discuss some conventions that I have used in the writing of this dissertation. In recent years many criticisms of anthropological writing have been raised\(^7\). I do not set out in this dissertation to address or correct these many criticisms. However, the following acknowledgments and the conventions used are the result of the criticisms.

One criticism of ethnographic writing has been the appearance of omnipotence on the part of an invisible ethnographer. Accompanying this criticism has been a call for a more reflective ethnography. I have addressed this concern by acknowledging my presence and involvement in various events. In fact, examples from my own interactions can be found throughout the dissertation. In addition, I employ the use of first person in the writing when plausible. Further, I discuss various aspects of the process of conducting this research; identifying what worked, what didn’t, and what worked in unexpected ways.
A second criticism has been that the traditional use of "the ethnographic present" (writing in present tense) gives an impression of a static culture. To this end, I acknowledge that things today may not be as they were during the conduct of the study. To emphasize the existence of time boundaries, the past tense is used for all description and discussion of interactions that occurred during the year of the study (1995-96). In addition, the reader will find repeated references to events, etc. as they were in "the year of this study".

Ethnographic writing has also been criticized for leaving the impression that the picture presented is a complete, objective and singularly true picture. I make no such claim. In fact, I acknowledge that this study was focused on a single, bounded speech community (a residential deaf school) that was further limited by the age of participants (school age students and their adult teachers — there were no infants, there were no senior citizens on a regular basis). Further, I acknowledge that within this bounded setting I had limited access to people, places and events.

Aside from the conventions employed as a result of the criticisms of ethnographic writing, I have employed specific conventions due to the focus of this study, American deaf culture. It has become conventional in the deaf studies and American Sign Language literature to use the term "Deaf" when referring to the culture or a member of the culture. The more common term, "deaf", is then reserved for use as an adjective referring to the existence of hearing loss. In this way it is possible to be deaf, but not Deaf. It has been my experience that while this convention may be useful
in providing a fine level of distinction (as in the preceding sentence), it can also be confusing for the reader. As a result, I have chosen not to make such a fine distinction in this writing. I will use only the term "deaf." This is a matter of convenience and ease for the reader. It is in no way meant to demean or deny the existence of deaf culture.

In addition, a study of American deaf culture, by its nature, involves a visual rather than an oral language, that is, it involves a signed language. Signed languages do not have a written form. This raised an issue regarding how to represent student utterances in this writing. I have chosen to represent them as interpreted text within single quotation marks. Spoken English utterances, when represented as direct quotes, appear in double quotation marks. In those instances when it seems important that a specific sign be noted, it has been represented by its English gloss in all capital letters.

A final word before proceeding. Clifford (1986a), in his critique of ethnographic writing, issued a challenge to ethnographers that if, in the doing and writing of ethnography, we must tell stories that we can not control, we ought to at least write stories that we believe to be true. It is this challenge that I have tried to live up to in the writing of this dissertation, a story of culture transmission and learning at one midwest residential deaf school during the academic year 1995-96.

---

1 An excellent example of the debate can be found in the presentation of Dobbert, et al.'s "Cultural Transmission in Three Societies: Testing a Systems-Based Field Guide" and the subsequent invited comments in Anthropology and Education Quarterly 1984, vol. 15. See also, Lanclos 1996; Wolcott 1982; Lave 1982; and Hansen 1982.
Appendix A includes a listing of all the questions posed by this study and a graphic representation of their relationships. The questions and their relationships will be further discussed in Chapters Two and Three.

See for example Weisner 1997; Dobbert, et.al. 1984; Pitman, et.al. 1989; Kimball 1976; and Spindler and Spindler 1965.


Weisner (1997) demonstrates this in his paper, “Developmental Influences on Learning Culture: When Do Children’s and Ethnographers’ Competencies Start to Converge”, delivered at the 96th Annual Meeting of the American Anthropological Association. While the paper is decidedly cognitive in its approach, he emphasizes the study of engaged participation in culture (as practice), with activities involving regularly patterned behavior as the focal point for the study of cultural learning.

In Keesing’s classification of definitions, both cognitive and symbolic definitions would be encompassed under ideational theories. The distinction that I, along with others, make is finer.

See for example Clifford and Marcus 1986; Taussig 1993; and Aunger 1995.

Woodward (1972) introduced this convention.

There are systems for the recording of signs, however, these are not used orthographically by deaf people. They have traditionally been employed by linguists studying signed languages (see Frishberg 1997a for a discussion of the available “writing” systems).

This issue is discussed in greater detail in Chapter three.
CHAPTER 2
THEORETICAL BASES OF A PROBLEM

Again, this dissertation seeks to answer two primary theoretical questions: "how is American deaf culture transmitted/learned", and "within deaf culture, is the acculturative experience different than the enculturative experience?" The answers to these questions inform two larger anthropological theory questions: "how is culture (in general) transmitted/learned" and "is it valid to consider acculturation and enculturation to be two separate and distinct concepts". As noted, I explore these questions through a specific study of learning deaf culture, American deaf culture in particular. As a result, it is necessary to explore two bodies of literature (the anthropological literature on culture transmission/learning and the deaf culture literature) that have heretofore never been jointly considered.

The chapter begins with a discussion of the anthropological literature on culture transmission/learning. This section presents first the traditional views on enculturation and acculturation. It then presents the rationale for a re-examination of the concepts and my chosen interaction focus. The section concludes with the particular framework for analysis that will be used in answering questions regarding the role of interaction that I pose for this study. This is followed by a
discussion of the literature on Deaf culture. This section seeks first to establish the existence of a Deaf culture. It then proceeds to outline the rationale for selecting this particular culture for the present study.

TRADITIONAL DISCUSSIONS OF CULTURE TRANSMISSION/LEARNING

As noted in Chapter One, two concepts have been traditionally relied on in discussions of culture transmission/learning within anthropology: enculturation and acculturation. As this review of the literature shows, the concepts were developed and defined independently of each other. Likewise, methodologies for the study of each concept were developed independently. The review also shows that much effort was expended in defining each concept as the process by which culture is transmitted/learned without much attention to the specifics of the process. Finally, the literature shows that although each concept has been refined over time, concerns and critiques remain. Thus, further refinement of the concepts of enculturation and acculturation is called for.

Enculturation

The term "enculturation" first appeared in the literature in 1948. At that time, Herskovits defined it as "the aspects of learning experience which mark off man from other creatures, and by means of which, initially, and in later life, he achieves competence in his culture" (39). In 1963, Margaret Mead defined enculturation, in much the same manner as Herskovits had, as "the actual process of learning as it takes place in a specific culture" (185). Mead viewed enculturation as a process of learning both the unique (in terms of the individual and various cultures) and universal aspects
of culture. During this early period, definitions of enculturation had a decided focus on learning rather than transmission. Enculturation was considered to be a process which occurred on an individual level. It was a process experienced by each new individual born to the group that occurred in childhood.

By 1970, as reflected in Shimahara's discussion of enculturation, this view was being challenged. Shimahara's (1970) views, which are an early attempt to consider both transmission and learning, arose from his observation that the term (enculturation) had earlier been used alternately to mean transmission, internalization, socialization and unconscious conditioning. In addition, he was concerned that previous articulations of the concept of enculturation did not allow for change (with the exception of Herskovits who allows this intermittently "on more mature folk" (Herskovitz 1964:327 cited in Shimahara 1970:144)), innovation, or heterogeneity. Finally his views of enculturation were shaped by a concern that enculturation was considered to be primarily a childhood process over which the child had no control. In reaction, Shimahara speaks of enculturation as "a bipolar process of cultural transmission and transmutation operating on the preadult and adult levels of human growth" (Shimahara 1970: 143) where culture transmission is the unconscious "process of acquiring the traditionally inherited culture"(Ibid: 148) and cultural transmutation is the conscious "process of psychosocial transmutation through deliberate, reflective, functional, yet occasionally incidental processes of learning" (Ibid: 148). "Thus, the child [and adult] undergoing enculturative experience is not
an entirely passive learner, but rather one who can also engage in creative transaction with his culture" (Shimahara 1970:148, brackets mine), thereby allowing for the change, innovation, and heterogeneity of which he was concerned.

In 1976, Kimball presented yet another view of enculturation. His view is radically different from those discussed above. He sees earlier discussions of enculturation to be biased by a focus on the individual, a concern with the consequences of learning and a denial of the duration of learning (i.e., a focus on childhood). In his words, "that which is learned in childhood, however, nowhere completes the education that must be given if the cultural heritage is to be transmitted. In one sense childhood should be viewed as the period of preparation for the important knowledge that is still to come" (Kimball 1976:265). He further believes that each aspect of a culture requires knowledge of a different sort learned from a different source. For example, an individual's family teaches about bodily functions, kinship and household skills, while formal schooling teaches about body skills, and affective and cognitive behavior.

In the 1980's, discussion shifted from a concern with the definition of the term¹ to a debate about focus for the study of enculturation. While previous discussions of focus were concerned with individual versus group, one-way or two-way process and childhood versus lifelong occurrence, this debate centered around which side of the process to privilege: transmission or learning. In 1982, Anthropology and Education Quarterly published a collection of papers that were the result of a 1980 symposium on the Anthropology of Learning held at the American
Anthropological Association meetings. This collection of papers illustrates well the argument to privilege the learning side of the process. Wolcott (1982) characterized the symposium as “the beginning of a dialogue, [that] should be regarded as a renewed interest rather than a new one” (84). He further suggested that there had been a tendency within anthropology to equate transmission and learning. He questions this tendency and proposes a shift from a “preoccupation with cultural transmission, urging instead that we attend to what is actually being acquired in the process” (Wolcott 1990:368). Lave (1982) concurs that “anthropology has not seriously tackled questions of learning” (181). The full debate is aptly characterized by Akinsanya (1984) as “a dilemma of dichotomies” (312). It is well illustrated in the published discussion of Dobbert, et.al.’s (1984) Field Guide for the study of cultural transmission. Dobbert, et.al. were both applauded and critiqued for their focus on transmission.

While neither a consensus on the definition of enculturation nor the focus of study has been reached, a number of models for its study have been proposed. The development of the models has been influenced not only by chosen focus (transmission or learning) but also by the definition of culture that is followed. A brief sampling of these models reflecting the degree of variability in methods for the study of enculturation will be discussed here.

Sister M. Inez Hilger (1960, 1962) published the earliest model. In keeping with definitions of the time, this model focuses on childhood as the timeframe for enculturation. It is “directive in theory and procedure in the study of customs, beliefs,
and traditions as related to the development, training and rearing of the child" (Hilger 1960:i). It is a very broad based guide, including more than simply child rearing and education. It is, however, merely an extensive listing of questions that may be asked of adults regarding a variety of categories pertaining to children and their teaching. It also includes some examples that may be used for clarification when asking the questions as listed. There is no discussion of how these various categories may be related to or influenced by any of the other categories. There is also no call for observation as a "check" on that which is reported.

A second model, proposed by Bernstein (1972), is not generally included in discussions/reviews of culture transmission models, however, such inclusion is appropriate as it is a sociolinguistic model of what he terms, the socialization process. It is based on the assumption that children learn social structure through communication and language. The model is based on the interaction of speech codes (restricted or elaborated) and social roles (family, age or peer group, school and work) which occurs within open or closed social and communication systems. According to this model, in open systems, social roles are generally determined based on the psychological characteristics of individuals and are associated with elaborated codes.

"An elaborated code will arise wherever the culture or subculture emphasizes the "I" over the "we"...the intent of the other person cannot be taken for granted...[therefore] speakers are forced to elaborate their meanings and make them both explicit and specific" (Bernstein 1972:476). As such, elaborated codes allow a range of alternative meanings. These meanings are generally determined on an individual basis and may
therefore cause ambiguity and discontinuity in cultural transmission. Closed systems, on the other hand, generally have clearly separated (traditional) roles and are associated with restricted codes. “A restricted code will arise where the form of the social relation is based upon closely shared identifications, upon an extensive range of shared expectations, upon a range of common assumptions...where the culture or subculture raises the ‘we’ above the ‘I’” (Ibid 476). There is a resultant restriction on the range of alternative meanings and little motivation to create new meanings, thereby reducing ambiguity. As a result, the system and associated roles remain intact during transmission. Bernstein posits that socialization typically occurs in closed systems as a unilateral process through one’s own age mates, whereas in an open system socialization is more reciprocal (parent/child). This model has a number of strengths including allowing for change, however, Bernstein himself acknowledges that “it is not easy to give general linguistic criteria for the isolation of the two codes” (1972:474). It becomes difficult then to apply.

A third model was proposed by Whiting (1980). It is a culture and personality model and as such is largely based on the following psychological assumptions: all individuals seek responses from others and the environment, all individuals desire predictability, all individuals seek reassurance and verbal or physical comfort, all individuals have a desire for autonomy, and all individuals have anger and fear which is evoked by the frustration of these desires. The model seeks to be predictive and it is therefore quantitative in nature. It posits social behavior as a dependent variable with the independent variable being parental behavior as reported in interviews. It also
allows for influence from environmental factors, particularly age and sex. The theory behind the model is that “patterns of interpersonal behavior are developed in the settings that one frequents and that the most important characteristics of a setting are the cast of characters who occupy the set, in particular the age and sex of these characters” (Whiting 1980:103). Whiting posits that children learn by trial and error, not instruction, external reward or punishment. While the theory behind the model is appealing, the design of the variables is problematic, particularly the independent variable, the parents. Whiting states that the parents’ greatest contribution is “the assignment of the child to settings that have important socializing influences” (1980:97). It appears then that the independent variable is actually the setting rather than the parents. A further problem is found in the collection of data in regards to the independent variable (as defined by Whiting). This data is collected through parental self-report during interviews. This is problematic in that reported and actual behavior are often found to differ (see Agar 1980).

It is also important to note that the Spindlers’ (1965) Instrumental Activities Inventory (IAI) model has also been used in the study of enculturation. Though originally conceived for the study of acculturation (see discussion below), it was later conceptualized to include a relationship between instrumental activities (“including occupations, sex roles, recreational activities, interpersonal skills, use of possessions, habitation, etc.” (Spindler and Spindler 1982:113)) and desired goals termed an instrumental linkage. “Instrumental linkages are systematized and interrelated, and constitute the core of any cultural system” (Spindler 1974:4). The linkages are thus
the focus for studies of enculturation via the IAI model for they demonstrate what has
been learned at the time the inventory is administered. It also allows change in
knowledge over time to be demonstrated.

Acculturation

In 1936, Redfield, Linton, and Herskovits, working as a committee of the
Social Science Research Council articulated the first official definition of
acculturation: "Acculturation comprehends those phenomena which result when
groups of individuals having different cultures come into continuous first-hand
contact, with subsequent changes in the original cultural patterns of either or both
groups" (Redfield, et.al. 1936:149). Acculturation, according to this definition, was a
group phenomenon in which change was seen at the cultural level.

Nearly twenty years later, the Social Science Research Council Summer
Seminar on Acculturation (1954) attempted to further refine the definition. Central to
this work was the recognition that acculturation could occur on two levels, the group
and the individual. They continued to emphasize that acculturation is a process which
cannot occur intra-culturally, that change resulted from cross cultural contact and that
it "is a culture-producing as well as a culture receiving process" (985). At this time,
acculturation came to be seen as a sequence of possible events (diffusion, cultural
creativity, cultural disintegration, reactive adaptations and fusion, assimilation or
stabilized pluralism) that was effected by boundary maintaining mechanisms, the
relative rigidity or flexibility of internal structures and the self-correcting mechanisms
(found in heterogeneous societies) that were present. Perhaps their greatest insight.
however, was that "cultures do not meet, but people who are their carriers do" (980). This created the possibility of an individual focus within acculturation studies as well. Acknowledging the individual level, acculturation was defined as the learning of a culture other than the culture of birth (Social Science Research Council Summer Seminar on Acculturation 1954; Teske and Nelson 1974).

In 1974, Teske and Nelson conducted a review of the acculturation literature and published "a clarification". While they maintain that acculturation is an intercultural process, they are more assertive in stating that change occurs in both cultures — that it is in fact a two-way process. They also bring to attention several factors that were implicit in earlier discussions of acculturation: dominance (of one group over the other), each culture's values (and the need for change of those values), and identity (with the "outside" group). Teske and Nelson challenge these implicit assumptions. They conclude that dominance is not a necessary pre-condition to acculturation, it may be absent in any particular acculturative situation. When dominance is present, however, it may effect the direction and degree of change. They also conclude that "acculturation is not contingent on a change in values" (Teske and Nelson 1974:358, emphasis mine). Finally, they state that acculturation does not necessarily involve "acceptance or a positive orientation" (Ibid: 358) toward the "outside" group. They also "clarify" that acculturation may occur on both an individual and a group level, with primacy continuing to be given to the group level since "the acculturation process at the individual level is affected by the acculturation
process at the group level” (Broom and Kitsuse 1955 cited in Teske and Nelson 1974). As a result, they suggest that care be taken when defining the level of analysis in studies of acculturation so that potential ambiguity is removed.

Models for the study of acculturation have also been developed. Like the models for the study of enculturation, these models are influenced by the definition of culture that is followed as well as by the definition of acculturation that is employed. The first model for the study of acculturation was developed by Redfield, et.al. (1936) as they attempted to define acculturation, analyze the work already done on the subject, and “explore new leads for further investigation” (149). The model is presented in the form of an outline including approaches to the problem (method), means of analysis, psychological mechanisms, and results of the process. The outline does include some definitions, however, it is essentially a simple listing of options within each of the above named sections. The model was acknowledged as a “work in progress” at the time of publication. Even in its tentative state, the model is useful in that it established the kind of information that was to be expected from a study of acculturation. In so doing, it created the possibility of comparability across studies. The model is, however, inconsistent in the identification of the object of study, culture traits or individuals. It also implies that the process of acculturation is a one-way process with a “donor group” and a “receiving group”. Finally, the model assumes an end to the acculturation process.
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A second model that has been proposed as "a technique for the study of the psychology of acculturation" (Spindler and Spindler 1965:1) is the Instrumental Activities Inventory (IAI). This model is based on the assumption that instrumental activities, those that allow one to achieve or maintain a lifestyle or status within a group, exist within any given culture and are known to its members. In its early conception, these activities were said to reflect cultural values, therefore, as they changed, the degree of acculturation could be measured. The model is a projective technique that seeks to produce a cognitive map. It consists of "a number of ethnographically accurate line drawings depicting various activities that, within the perceptual field of the respondent, lead to certain goals that in turn are expressive of certain lifestyles" (Spindler 1974:4), in the case of acculturation studies, traditional and non-traditional lifestyles in particular. Drawings include depictions of traditional and non-traditional occupations, traditional and non-traditional roles, traditional and non-traditional means of dress, etc. The drawings are shown to informants who are asked to identify the three most valued drawings and the three least valued. It is therefore important that there be no ambiguity in the pictures that are used. Once drawings have been identified as most and least valuable, informants are asked to comment on each picture. Cognitive maps are generated from the informants' responses. This model is valuable in that it is culturally relative. It is also useful in the identification of what has been transmitted during the process of acculturation and for the documentation of changes over time as a result of such transmission (that is, it
documents learning). However, it does not allow for discussion of who or what is causing those changes or how the content is transmitted (that is, how learning occurs).

**Critique and the Challenge at Hand**

Concerns about both concepts (acculturation and enculturation), beyond their simple definition, have been raised in the literature. Beals (1953) and Spindler (1974) have raised concerns over the lack of an agreed upon methodology (as demonstrated in the variability of models discussed above), the result of which is an inability to compare studies of either enculturation or acculturation. Tindall (1976), and to a lesser degree Beals (1953) and Spindler (1974), expressed concern that there has been a lack of theorizing, only “theory work”. Another common concern is the emphasis in studies of enculturation that has been placed on the early years of childhood to the exclusion of later years in life (Brown 1970; Kimball 1976; Pitmann, et.al. 1989; Shimahara 1970; Spindler 1974).

An additional, and not unimportant, concern can be raised in light of the fact that the definition of culture, central to both concepts, is being challenged and changing. Culture has come to be seen as dynamic, contested, emergent and heterogeneous as opposed to stable, static and homogeneous (Bruner 1994; Clifford 1986b; Keesing 1974; Lutz 1993). It is upon the later conceptions of culture that the majority of models for study and discussions of culture transmission and learning (in the form of enculturation and acculturation) have been based. Particularly in light of
this concern, an emerging new definition of culture. It seems there is a need to reconsider culture transmission and learning and particularly the conceptions of acculturation and enculturation.

The impetus for this particular re-examination of the concepts did not come solely from the above critiques, however. It came as well from a concern generated by my own sense of the literature. As traditionally conceived, acculturation and enculturation are distinguished on three primary levels: level of study (group vs. individual); origin of information to be transmitted/learned, that is where transmission/learning is initiated, (inter-culturally vs. intra-culturally; adult vs. peer vs. child); and age at which learning is begun (early childhood vs later in life). What struck me in reviewing the literature, however, was an underlying similarity that had not as yet been fully explored: interaction⁴. I began to question whether these two concepts were indeed as distinct as we (anthropologists) had formulated them to be or if the similarity had been overlooked, after all, comparison was historically precluded both by definition and methodology. I determined to undertake a study that would explore this question by focusing on the specifics of each process, on interaction, the one similarity that I had identified in the existing literature. Likewise, a focus on interaction does not privilege either transmission or learning. Rather, it allows for exploration of both sides of the process. As a result, I began to comb the literature once again to determine if existing theories of interaction might be useful in my attempt to enhance the understanding of cultural transmission and learning.
A REVIEW OF INTERACTION BASED THEORIES

A focus on interaction is not new to anthropology nor to thinking on culture transmission/learning. Numerous theoretical perspectives that employ an interaction focus can be found and, in fact, many of these theoretical perspectives include explanations for the transmission and learning of culture, although they have not been applied in specific studies of acculturation or enculturation. The following discussion includes a sampling of such interactional perspectives thereby lending support to the approach being taken here. It is acknowledged that interactional perspectives may be found in a variety of disciplines, the discussion here, however, has been focused to include only anthropological and sociological perspectives.

Chapple and Coon

In 1942, Chapple and Coon published *Principles of Anthropology* in which they outlined their views on cultural anthropology as a discipline. While never widely accepted, interaction was central to their perspective. In fact, they state “interaction is the basis of human civilization” (Chapple and Coon 1942: 41). They define interaction as “the reciprocal relationship between two or more human beings or animals” (Ibid: 40). Interaction is further delineated by distinguishing between “pair events” (two individuals interacting) and “set events” (three or more participants to an interaction). Their method for the study of interaction includes the documentation of “origins of action” (initiation) and “responses” across both pair events and set events;
counts of frequencies of interaction; and notation of individual differences in interaction rates. Such a methodology allows patterns of interaction to be identified for individuals as well as across cultural institutions.

Also of central importance to their perspective is the concept of conditioning, a la Pavlov. They viewed conditioning as the "scientific" term for learning and freely apply it to human learning. Thus, they discuss cultural learning as conditioning that occurs via interaction. From this perspective, infants react initially to all sensations in an undifferentiated fashion through the autonomic nervous system. Their reactions are then "conditioned" by the activities of those with whom interaction occurs, that is generally the parents and primarily the mother. While placing this primary emphasis on infancy and the parents, Chapple and Coon do acknowledge that learning/conditioning is an on-going, life-long process for, from their perspective, if the stimulus/response relationship is not maintained, then the conditioning may be reversed.

**Symbolic Interactionism and Ethnomethodology**

Symbolic interactionism is another early theoretical framework that sought to understand human societies based on interaction. It is predicated on the belief that "human groups or society exists in action and must be seen in terms of action" (Blumer 1969: 6 original emphasis). Accordingly, "culture as a conception, whether defined as custom, tradition, norm, value, rules or such like, is clearly derived from what people do" (Blumer 1969: 6).
Symbolic interactionism is particularly interested in the role of meaning in interaction. According to Blumer (1969) there are three basic premises to this theoretical framework:

1. Humans act toward objects in their world according to the meanings associated with the objects.
2. Meaning is derived from interaction with others.
3. An interpretive process is used by the individual in all encounters.

The interpretive process consists of an individual who "selects, checks, suspends, regroups, and transforms the meanings in the light of the situation in which he is placed and the direction of his action" (Blumer 1969: 5) by initially making note to him/herself of the object(s) of action. As each individual engages in this interpretive process, his/her actions are fitted to the actions of others in any given situation, thus a sense of "joint action" is created. It is important to note that, particularly in the creation of "joint action", the creation of meaning and planning of action via the interpretive process toward a human object may involve taking the role of that human object. In this way, the study of cultural learning shifts "from being an effective internalization of norms and values to a cultivated capacity to take the roles of others effectively" (Blumer 1969: 77). This capacity is considered to develop through interactions ("joint actions") in which common meanings of objects are shared, confirmed, refined, etc. It should be noted that such a perspective emphasizes
individuals sharing common meanings. Culture, from this perspective then, must be defined ala Geertz (1973) as "webs of significance" which must be analyzed in search of meanings and not laws (5); as a publicly acted document (10).

The development of ethnomethodology was influenced in large part by symbolic interactionism and thus it too places emphasis on interaction as a means to understanding human groups. Ethnomethodology is used most commonly in sociological research. However, it has also been employed by anthropologists.

Leiter (1980) provides an excellent synopsis of ethnomethodology in which he states that ethnomethodology "is sometimes referred to as the study of commonsense knowledge" (3), of "how members of society sustain a sense of social structure" (94) and of "the methods people use to generate and maintain their experience of the social world as a factual object" (25). In fact, the concept of commonsense knowledge is key to ethnomethodology. Commonsense knowledge is viewed as consisting of three components: the stock of knowledge at hand, sense of social structure (or natural attitude of everyday life) and practices of commonsense reasoning. The stock of knowledge at hand is made up of the socially constructed rules, maxims, social types and definitions that are used on a daily basis. The sense of social structure is that which allows for a feeling of continuity (the existence of a past, present and future) in the world based upon personal experience. Finally, it is the practices of commonsense reasoning that allows the facticity of the world to be assumed (Leiter 1980). "It is through the use of commonsense reasoning that people create and sustain the sense of social reality as a factual environment" (Leiter, 1980: 11). While the "definition" of
commonsense knowledge outlined by Leiter implies a shared nature, Garfinkel (1963). One of the pioneers of ethnomethodology, is more direct in emphasizing this shared nature as he proposes that in considering the “normative order of events”, that is, commonsense knowledge, “a person’s assumption [is] that he, like his partner, is a competent member of the same community” (199).

The ethnomethodologists define social interaction as a negotiated phenomenon based upon the three concepts of common sense knowledge.

The ethnomethodological perspective stresses the methodic character of social interaction; it is a product of members’ methods. Social interaction is a negotiated product in its sequencing as well as its understanding. The negotiated or accomplished character of social interaction is due to indexical properties of talk and behavior. Because of indexicality, both the sequencing and the understanding of interaction are constructed by societal members. The flexibility of social interaction is also due to indexicality, for... one does not have to use the same context in order to achieve an understanding of social interaction (Leiter 1980: 224, citing Skinner 1975).

In this way, the interpretive process is seen as “the central process whereby social interaction is constituted” (Leiter 1980:231, citing Blumer 1969; Cicourel 1968,1973; Garfinkel 1967; and Wilson 1970).

The primary interest of the ethnomethodologists, and hence the primary questions asked, pertain to the actual use of this commonsense knowledge: how rules, maxims, social types, etc. are made meaningful as well as how they are subsequently applied. Ethnomethodology is not interested in prediction of how rules, maxims, social types, etc. will be employed, that is they are not seen as causal phenomena but rather as interpretive or sensemaking tools (Leiter, 1980). In addition, and of particular interest for this project, rules are seen as key to socialization.
Ethnomethodological studies of rule use are also studies of socialization. New members of a group or society must acquire a sense of social structure and the interpretive procedures to be able to locate the rules of the group (Cicourel 1973)...new members of society encounter rules in bits and pieces and must perform interpretive work to understand them. No one sits down and tells them all the rules of the game in one sitting. Furthermore, when people do describe such rules, it is usually after something has happened (Leiter 1980:235).

Ethnography of Communication

The ethnography of communication provides the primary framework for analysis as regards the role of interaction in culture transmission and learning within this dissertation. This framework allows for the identification of patterns of interaction by examining and comparing individual interactions within communicative settings and events.

The ethnography of communication framework began in the 1960's as the ethnography of speaking at the urging of Dell Hymes (see Hymes 1962). Hymes saw a need to look at language and communication as anthropologists looked at any other aspect of culture: to see how it manifests itself across cultures with no assumptions of universal function or use. Rather, Hymes proposes a working framework that supposes: “1. the speech of a group constitutes a system; 2. speech and language vary cross-culturally in function; 3. the speech activity of a community is the primary object of attention” (Hymes 1962: 218). In later works, the term “communication” replaced “speech” (Hymes 1964 and Gumperz and Hymes 1972). This terminology shift, however, was never wholly complete. The terms “speech” and “communication” are used interchangeably throughout the literature causing some confusion. In recognition of this, Hymes (1972) made explicit his use of the term
"speech" to include "all forms of language, including writing, song and speech-derived whistling, drumming, horn calling, and the like" (53). This definition broadened the apparent focus of the ethnography of speaking by including both verbal and non-verbal modes of communication.

The central questions asked by ethnographers of communication pertain most directly to the patterning of communication and therefore it may seem an inappropriate framework for this research. However, there is also interest in how language and communication relate to other aspects of culture, including enculturation. Sherzer and Darnell (1972) speak directly to this in their "Outline Guide for the Ethnographic Study of Speech Use". They introduce the section entitled "The Use of Speech in Education and Social Control" by stating "this section attempts to show how speech might be relevant to the description of socialization as well as how socialization might be relevant to the study of speech use" (553). In addition, the ethnography of communication "has in its development drawn heavily upon (and mutually influenced) sociological concern with interactional analysis...(and) the study of performance by anthropologically oriented folklorists" (Saville-Troike 1989: 1). As a result, the framework can be usefully applied to this study of culture transmission and learning.

The ethnography of communication calls for a new perspective on learning, particularly as regards language acquisition. Traditional studies of language acquisition are concerned with the learning of the language code itself, often in terms of developmental stages. Traditional studies are not concerned with the full range of
competencies that are considered from the ethnography of communication perspective. The ethnography of communication perspective on acquisition does not rule out or discount the developmental stages that have been identified in traditional studies, rather, it acknowledges that there are both cognitive (reflected in the developmental stages) and social aspects to the acquisition while focusing on the later (Hymes, 1962; Saville-Troike 1989). According to Saville-Troike (1989), “children are essentially participant-observers of communication, like small ethnographers, learning and inductively developing the rules of their speech community through processes of observation and interaction” (221, emphasis mine) resulting in communicative competence. Communicative competence is described by Saville-Troike (1989) as knowing not only the language code, but also what to say to whom, and how to say it appropriately in any given situation. [it] extends to both knowledge and expectation of who may or may not speak in certain settings, when to speak and when to remain silent, whom one may speak to, how one may talk to persons of different statuses and roles, what appropriate nonverbal behaviors are in various contexts, what the routines for turn-taking are in conversation, how to ask for and give information, how to request, how to offer or decline assistance or cooperation, how to give commands, how to enforce discipline, and the like – in short, everything involving the use of language and other communicative dimensions in particular social settings (21).

Saville-Troike sees communicative competence as wholly within the purview of cultural competence, that which must be known in common to function in a culturally appropriate manner across a range of settings, with variable participants, and so forth. In other words, cultural competence (along with communicative competence) is that which is learned during enculturation and acculturation.
The ethnography of communication also contributes several other concepts that are key to this dissertation. The first is the speech community, a concept that is somewhat difficult to define. It has been defined in as many different ways as "community" has been defined (Saville-Troike 1989). Definitions have been based on characteristics such as geography (those within a particular bounded area), frequency of interaction, and a commonly shared language, among others. While seemingly straightforward, exceptions can be found to each of the variable bases used in defining a speech community. Consider, for example, a commonly shared language. Speech communities can be identified in which multiple languages are used which may or may not be mutually intelligible. Likewise, situations can be found in which populations sharing a common language are not identified as a single speech community. Hymes (1972) tentatively defines the speech community as a social group that shares both rules for the conduct of communication and rules for the interpretation of one or more linguistic codes (languages). Compounding the definitional issue is the fact that individuals may participate in more than a single speech community. It is also worthy of note that Saville-Troike (1989) distinguishes between participation in a given speech community and membership in said community, thus further compounding the definitional issue. As a result of the definitional difficulties, speech communities are most usefully defined by employing one or more of the recognized characteristics of communities in conjunction with an emic perspective.
The communicative (or linguistic) repertoire must also be noted. The communicative repertoire of a speech community is made up of all the linguistic varieties that may be used. This includes not only separate and distinct languages, but also dialects, and modes of communication (written, spoken, sung, drummed, signed, and so forth), along with specialized codes such as those relating to particular settings (occupations, religious settings, secret societies, etc.) or to particular roles (gender, age, and so forth). “In addition, the communicative repertoire of a group includes the variety of possible interaction strategies available to it. These are most commonly used to establish, maintain, or manipulate role-relationships” (Saville-Troike 1989:50).

The third concept, which will be used most centrally throughout this dissertation as a framework for analysis, is Hymes’ discussion of the descriptive analysis of speech (or the components of speech). Hymes (1972) proposed that there were sixteen possible components of any given speech event (or, more inclusively, communicative event) that could be easily remembered using the mnemonic “SPEAKING”. The event (which, for purposes of clarity, will be conceived of as the communication event from this point on) may be defined as a bounded entity within which communication between interlocutors occurs (Saville-Troike 1989) and where rules and norms for the use of speech govern such communication (Hymes 1972). Hymes (1962) notes that communication events are culturally relative and that “one good ethnographic technique for getting at speech events (sic), as at other categories, is through words which name them” (198) within any given culture. Communication events are studied (described) then by looking at each of the sixteen possible
components. Within the mnemonic for the components, "S" stands for setting and scene including time, location, and culturally defined occasion; "P" for participants including speaker/sender, addressee, hearer and/or addressee; "E" for ends including purposes, outcomes and goals; "A" for the act sequence including message form and content; "K" for key which includes tone, manner or spirit; "I" for instrumentalities which includes linguistic variety and channel or mode; "N" for norms of both interaction and interpretation; and "G" for genres. Saville-Troike (1989) provides an excellent discussion of each component including specific questions that may be asked in their regard. Hymes notes that each component may not be necessary to the understanding of every communication event. In fact, in his opinion, the only component that appears to be necessary to the understanding of every situation is message form. It is also important to note that in terms of participants, the ethnography of communication recognizes that communication is not constrained to a minimum of two participants (a speaker and a hearer) as was Chapple and Coon's perspective. Rather, it allows for a single participant and self-communication.

While the components of "SPEAKING" are outlined for, and the theory based on, the particular and focused study of communication, I argue that it is also useful for the study of culture transmission and learning. As previously noted, there is precedence for the study of culture transmission and learning within the ethnography of communication. In addition, the framework allows for the identification of patterning in regards to types of interactions that cultural learners engage in. One can ask a number of questions to aid in the identification of said patterns: In what types of
communicative events do learners find themselves? Are there restrictions to participation in certain settings, events, and/or genres? With whom do learners interact? Does participation change over time or on other bases? Are certain genres more prevalent than others? What cultural content is available for the various events and genres? Is content form effected by participants? These are the questions that can be addressed regarding culture transmission and learning through the ethnography of communication. These are the questions that this dissertation seeks to answer in its exploration of the role of interaction in the learning of deaf culture.

**Practice Theories**

Another theoretical framework that looks at interaction and can be usefully applied to studies of culture transmission and learning is practice theory. Practice theories, particularly the theory of legitimate peripheral participation, provide another framework for comparison and discussion of patterns of interaction that are discovered across individuals thereby informing questions regarding the similarity/difference in the enculturative and acculturative experience.

Practice theory is not associated with any one individual or with any one line of thought. Rather practice theory is best conceived of as a body of work in which there is primary attention given to what people do, to their actions and interactions. “It is the routine character of activity, rich expectation generated over time about its shape, and settings designed for those activities and organized by them, that form the class of events which constitutes an object of analysis in theories of practice” (Lave 1988:15). According to Lave (1988), practice theories have their roots in the work of
Bourdieu, Marx, Sahlins and Giddens. Ortner (1984) also sees a tie to the symbolic anthropologists (Geertz, Turner, Bateson, etc.) who maintained an actor-centered perspective.

According to Ortner (1984), “what a practice theory seeks to explain...is the genesis, reproduction, and change of form and meaning of a given social/cultural whole” (149). This explanation is achieved through the study of the relationship between human action on the part of an individual or a composite social type (ex. women) and what she refers to as “the system”, in this case a culture. The relationship is seen as dialectic. The system is able to shape practice by constraining what an individual can see, feel and do. In so doing, practice reproduces the system through such processes as ritual, socialization and the practices of ordinary living. At the same time, practice may change the system when novel phenomena are approached in traditional ways that prove unsuccessful.

What is of primary interest for this work are the views on “system” reproduction found among practice theorists. The processes mentioned previously, particularly ritual (as seen in rights of passage), and socialization (which is often used coterminously with enculturation) are two processes also identified in the enculturation literature. The practices of ordinary living, or everyday activity, can also be translated into terms found in the enculturation literature. Hall’s (1959) concept of informal learning (to be discussed more fully below) seems to readily translate to everyday, ordinary activity. It also seems that some formal learning situations may be translated into the language of practice theory as practices of ordinary living. In fact,
Lave (1988) believes that “everyday activity is, in this view, a more powerful source of socialization than intentional pedagogy” (14). A similar sentiment can be found in the enculturation literature (see for example Whiting 1980, Weisner 1997).

One specific “practice theory” worth noting (and deserving closer examination) is legitimate peripheral participation. This theory was proposed by Lave and Wenger (1991) based on an examination of apprentice learning. According to them, “the concept of legitimate peripheral participation provides a framework for bringing together theories of situated activity and theories about the production and reproduction of social order” (47). Legitimate peripheral participation is experienced by newcomers as they seek to become full participants, or members, of a given community of practice by learning the ways of that community. Legitimate peripheral participation requires, and is defined by, limited access (increasing over time) to practice through participation. In order to participate in a legitimately peripheral way, and thus become a full participant, there must be access to a wide range of activities and practices, including access to “old-timers” and other members (relative old-timers in comparison with the newcomers and other newcomers); as well as reduced demands on time, effort, responsibility and accuracy through the practice of short, simple tasks. Motivation for learning in this manner is the desire to become a full, participating member of the community.

Learning through legitimate peripheral participation does not rely on any formal curriculum, official agenda or pedagogy, rather it privileges the structure of social practice (Lave and Wenger 1991). In this view, learning occurs regardless of
the existence or non-existence of an "educational" environment. Learning is not defined as imitation, or a simple process of information transfer leading to assimilation. It is rather the situated development of new practice and is primarily under the control of the learner. This type of learning is differentiated from learning through intentional instruction and a teaching curriculum ("constructed for the instruction of newcomers" (Lave and Wenger 1991:97)) in which the learning is mediated by an instructor. Learning is achieved as an individual moves toward full participation along the range of legitimate peripheral participation (becoming relative old-timers and finally old-timers) through mastery of knowledge and skill required.

As with practice theories in general, an assumption is made here that conflict is inherent to the learning process. The conflict results from the simultaneous need for the reproduction and continuity of the community of practice and the fear of individual displacement in that community (that is, masters or old-timers fear replacement by the up-and-coming newcomers).

As previously mentioned, this theory was posed based on the study of apprentice learning. The analysis of school learning was consciously avoided in order to "develop a view of learning that would stand on its own, reserving the analysis of schooling and other specific educational forms for the future" (Lave and Wenger 1991:40). Even had school learning been included, the theory has grown around small communities of practice. Its application to a larger cultural group as a whole has yet to be explored.
Nonetheless, legitimate peripheral participation seems an appropriate framework for exploring the transmission and learning of deaf culture. As will be discussed more fully later in this chapter, it is assumed that the transmission and learning of deaf culture occurs primarily outside of the structure of school learning (although within the confines of the residential deaf school), privileging social interaction with peers in much the same way that learning through legitimate peripheral participation as conceived by Lave and Wenger privileges social practice. In addition, learning through legitimate peripheral participation has been alluded to in the literature regarding deaf culture. The first such allusion can be found in references to "membership" in deaf culture, a status that is achieved rather than ascribed (see for example Baker and Padden 1978; Brien 1991; Padden and Humphries 1988; and Rutherford 1989). The literature also makes a careful distinction between "deaf culture" and the "deaf community", with the culture being at the "core" of the community. Baker and Cokely's (1980) model of avenues into the deaf community illustrates this well (see also Padden 1989). The model outlined four avenues into the community (audiological, political, linguistic, and social). Being considered a part of the core (where Baker and Cokely locate deaf culture) is achieved by participation in all four avenues along with possession of "the right attitude". Figure 1 has been adapted from Baker and Cokely's (1980) model, which represented each avenue as a circle of equivalent size (implying equivalent importance), to more accurately consider the variable weight associated with each avenue\(^2\). This model simultaneously
restricts access to the core (to deaf culture) and allows for participation in a peripheral way within the community by allowing for participation in the various avenues to varying degrees.

Figure 1: Avenues to membership in the Deaf community - Adapted from Baker and Cokely’s (1980) model

Legitimate peripheral participation as a theoretical framework allows us to ask in what way(s) legitimate peripheral participation is marked in American deaf culture? Further, we may ask if legitimate peripheral participation is experienced by all. What is required to move closer to full participation? Finally, we may ask who are the perceived masters?
Hall's work on types of learning provides yet another means for discussing patterns of interaction. This work intersects nicely with both the ethnography of communication and the theory of legitimate peripheral participation in answering the question regarding differences in the enculturative and acculturative experience.

According to Hall, "ultimately everything man does involves interaction with something else. Interaction lies at the hub of the universe of culture and everything grows from it" (1959:46).

Hall's work was an attempt to redefine culture in terms that were not only useful for scholars but also understandable to the lay person. Central to his redefinition is the belief that culture is a form of communication. In accordance with this belief, he draws heavily on linguistic theory in his redefinition. According to Hall, communication, and thus culture, employs 10 primary message systems (interaction, association, subsistence, bisexuality, territoriality, exploitation, temporality, learning, play and defense) at three possible levels. He labels these levels the formal, the informal, and the technical. The levels are differentiated based on degrees of access. The formal level is accessible to everyone (that which everyone knows and is capable of using). The informal is less accessible. It is known and used by some, but not everyone. It includes that which is situational and imprecise. The technical level is the least accessible and the most specialized. It is available to only a selected membership. The messages themselves are composed of isolates, sets and patterns (equivalents of phoneme, morpheme and syntax respectively).
In conjunction with this redefinition, Hall discusses three types of cultural learning that are particularly interesting for this study. These learning types coincide to some degree with his levels of culture. Formal learning is described as a two way process initiated by the learner. "Formal patterns are almost always learned when a mistake is made and someone corrects it... The details of formal learning are binary, of a yes-no, right-wrong character" (Hall 1959: 70 original emphasis). By its nature, formal learning is conscious learning. It is also a public form of learning, thereby making it accessible to all. Informal learning, on the other hand, is an unconscious process. This type of learning is also learner initiated as the learner selects a "model" individual to imitate (Hall does not discuss how such selection is made). It is, however, not a public type of learning, it is private, which makes it generally imprecise. With informal learning, "wide clusters of related activities are learned at a time, in many cases without the knowledge that they are being learned at all or that there are patterns or rules governing them" (Ibid, 70). The final type of learning is technical learning. Technical learning is "a one-way street. It is usually transmitted in explicit terms from teacher to student, either orally or in writing" (Ibid, 71). While Hall clearly distinguishes the three types of learning, he acknowledges that each type may actually be present in any learning situation with one of the types being dominant. In this way, that which is learned in an informal manner (that is, imprecisely) may be corrected through formal means when a mistake is made.
An underlying assumption in Hall’s conceptions of cultural learning is that the information that is learned is passed from adult to child. While such views have been criticized, Hall’s basic framework is easily adaptable by substituting more current views that learning may occur both from adult to child and child to adult, as well as peer to peer, for his assumption. Such a substitution need not affect the basic framework since no explicit specifications about the learner or the other(s) involved in the interaction are made in the definitions of the learning types.

This framework intersects nicely with that of legitimate peripheral participation in its application to this study. Legitimate peripheral participation, it would seem, occurs primarily within Hall’s realms of formal and informal learning as these two types of learning have been conceived as more learner initiated. Technical learning also applies to a study of legitimate peripheral participation, though its application has not been thoroughly explored to date. As noted above, learning through a curriculum (one form of technical learning), is legitimate peripheral participation but in a more highly restricted sense. Employing Hall’s concepts of formal, informal and technical learning along with legitimate peripheral participation provides an in-depth sense of the complexity of the learning process by demonstrating that legitimate peripheral participation is not a singular, homogeneous experience nor are Hall’s concepts outdated. It allows us to ask, again, if the experience of the periphery is similar, this time in terms of type of learning experienced.

Hall’s types of learning also intersect nicely with concepts from the ethnography of communication. The three types of learning lend themselves, to some
extent, to association with certain genres. For example, formal learning is associated, by definition, with correction. The learning types also allow us to inquire as to how the various types of learning are related to the participants. How does the learning type impact learned content? In addition, the degree of each type of learning employed in both enculturation and acculturation can be explored. Do they equally employ formal, informal, and technical learning? If not, what are the differences? This in turn generates a slightly "thicker description", ala Geertz, than either framework employed alone.

As demonstrated above, there is a great deal of precedence for an interaction-based approach to the study of cultural learning. Indeed, each of the discussed theoretical positions has contributed to our present understanding of culture transmission/learning. However, none of the perspectives alone provides a complete understanding of the process(es) involved. Thus this dissertation may draw on various parts of each of the interaction based theoretical frameworks discussed above as it seeks to explain both how deaf culture is learned in general and specifically whether there is a difference in the enculturative and acculturative experience in learning deaf culture. It will, however, draw most heavily on the ethnography of communication, Hall’s (1959) types of learning, and practice theories, specifically legitimate peripheral participation. These theories were chosen in lieu of the others above described because of their compatibility and utility in generating secondary questions addressing culture transmission and learning.
DEAF CULTURE

The theoretical exploration that I have posed is not possible without empirical evidence. This evidence comes from a focused ethnographic study of American deaf culture as it is manifest at a residential deaf school.

Does It Exist?

It is necessary to acknowledge that while it has become common place to refer to the existence of a deaf culture, such an existence is not universally accepted either in academia or within the deaf community itself (Padden 1996; Stewart 1992; Torres 1995; Turner 1994 (and subsequent discussion in Sign Language Studies vols. 83, 84, & 85)). This is not because the deaf population has previously not been viewed as somehow different from the majority culture. In fact, deaf people have long discussed "DEAF-THEIR", "DEAF-WAY" or the "DEAF-WORLD" as existing apart from the hearing world (Kyle 1990; Lane 1996; Padden 1996). Researchers and others interested in the deaf population have also noted differences; however, they have tended to view the population from a pathological perspective (Evans and Falk 1986; Torres 1995; Woodward 1982); as having an illness or disease which needs to be eradicated. It has also been common to consider deaf people as a disability group needing to be taken care of (see for example Brueggeman, in press; Lane 1992; Lane, et.al. 1996; Sacks 1989; Terstrieip 1993; Wrigley 1996). The shift toward a cultural view of the deaf population began in the 1960's with recognition of American Sign Language
(ASL), the language of the American deaf population, as a bonafide, legitimate language. As has been noted, however, this shift in perspective is not complete. The difficulty appears to lie in the definition of “culture” (see especially Turner 1994).

A precise and universally accepted definition of “culture” has eluded the field of anthropology and continues to do so. It should not be surprising then that the existence of a deaf culture is a point of contention. Padden (1996) clearly delineates two issues in the definition of “culture” in general that impact upon the recognition, or lack thereof, of a deaf culture: the degree of difference that must be exhibited and the number of (unique) “cultural institutions” that must exist. She states:

...the cultural definition continues to perplex many. If Deaf (sic) people are indeed a cultural group, why then don’t they seem more like the Penan of the island of Borneo, or the Hichol of Mexico? Deaf people lack their own burial rites (unless one counts the intensely personal testimonials that are the hallmark of a good Deaf funeral), do not wear traditional clothing, and do not have distinctive food (but they seem to engage in different eating behaviors). How can they be truly called “cultural”? (86)

She addresses other issues in the “culture” definition as she points out that the deaf population lives within the confines of the United States (even institutions established by deaf people, such as the deaf school and deaf club, “almost always exist within the control of the state” (Padden 1996:82)) and that there is no single geographic location where deaf people live (“There are no towns or even blocks or areas of a city entirely occupied by Deaf residents anywhere in North America” (Ibid,82)), rather they are found throughout the United States coexisting with hearing people15. These last two
issues have resulted in one view of the deaf population of the United States as an ethnic group possessing cultural characteristics rather than a separate culture (Johnson and Erting 1989; Padden and Markowicz 1976).

A closer look at what the literature identifies as deaf culture in relation to the variable definitions of "culture" will resolve this issue, at least for the purposes of this study. Throughout the literature arguing for the existence of a deaf culture the core issue is the existence of a unique language, American Sign Language (ASL). It is the existence of this unique language that is most often cited as the rationale for the claim of an existing deaf culture. This alone may be adequate to establish the existence of a deaf culture if we accept a "language equals culture" definition of culture. Hymes (1962), however, challenged this belief. Subsequent research utilizing the ethnography of communication has argued convincingly that there is no such simple relationship. Therefore, we need to look at other definitions of culture.

As previously noted, anthropological definitions of culture have been classified in a number of ways. One classification is cognitive, where culture is thought to reside in the minds of individuals. The definition of culture posed by Goodenough (1970) is an example of a cognitive definition: culture is "what one has to know to behave acceptably as a member" (110). This definition has often been employed in the literature on deaf culture. As previously mentioned, ASL is considered to be a core aspect of deaf culture. In order to be a part of the culture an individual must know ASL (see for example Kannapell 1989; Padden and Markowicz 1976, 1997).
There is also an abundance of information in the literature on additional norms of behavior that must be known to be a part of the culture (Kyle 1990; Moore 1997; Padden and Markowicz 1976, 1997; Padden 1989).

Symbolic definitions of culture have also been posed. These definitions focus on culture as shared meaning. Geertz (1973) describes culture in this way as "webs of significance" (5) which exist between individuals as social actors (publicly) rather than within their minds. Again, evidence for the existence of a deaf culture according to this definition can be found in the literature. As with cognitive definitions and the "language equals culture" definition, ASL is a core aspect, however, from this symbolic perspective we find ASL discussed as possessing specific meaning: the establishment of identity (Gregory and Hartley 1991; Padden and Markowicz 1976, 1997; Rutherford 1992). Padden and Humphries (1988) also discuss the meanings associated with labels of identification such as "deaf", "hard of hearing", and "hearing". Through an examination of the meaning of "hard of hearing" in particular, they establish a "deaf center" which is based upon identity rather than audiometric measures, quite different from the majority view.

A third means of defining culture is behavioral. Behavioral definitions of culture are employed far more often than any other definitions in the literature regarding the existence of a deaf culture (see for example Kyle 1990; Padden 1989; Parasnis 1996; Woodward 1982). Scholars who employ the ethnography of communication framework would be said to operate on a definition of culture that is more behavioral in nature, that culture is what people do and how they do it.
(specifically in terms of communication). As previously mentioned, there is a great
deal of literature on the norms of behavior among the deaf population. Stephanie
Hall's (1989) work on politeness norms at "Eastern Deaf Club" is an excellent
example of a study employing the ethnography of communication to delineate norms
of behavior. Other studies have outlined norms in regards to introductions (Dolnick
1993; Lane, et.al. 1996; Padden 1989), attention getting (Kyle 1990; Lane, et.al.
1996), "frank talk" (Lane, et.al. 1996:73), turn taking (Kyle 1990; Lane, et.al. 1996),
eye contact (Padden 1989), facial expressions (Padden 1989), touch (Kyle 1990; Lane,
et.al. 1996), leave taking (Kyle 1990), time (Kyle 1990), and endogamous marriage
patterns (Kyle 1990; Lawson 1991; Meadow 1972; Rutherford 1989, 1992; Woodward
1982).

Finally, we may also look at a more broad "definition" of culture. In
introductory cultural anthropology textbooks, we are taught to look for values, beliefs
and norms of behavior when studying culture. The literature on the deaf population
indicates that there are indeed values, beliefs and norms of behavior that differ from
the majority culture. Norms of behavior associated with deaf culture have been
previously noted. Moore (1997) argues that in fact much that is to be known about a
deaf culture has been overlooked in lieu of the wealth of information on greeting and
leave taking rituals, norms for introductions, etc (what she refers to as "surface
cultural differences" 21). As a result, in her study of national testing systems for sign
language interpreters, she begins to articulate a comparison of deaf values and
majority culture values. She concludes that deaf culture values a collectivist
orientation (the group is more important than the individual), high context relationships (requiring personal knowledge, shared experiences, and "connections"), reciprocity and obligations to group members, and ascribed positions of leadership (deaf children born to deaf parents and "deaf people who were born hearing, with hearing parents, who lost their hearing later in life, thus retaining their English-speaking abilities; these are "intercultural leaders" (Moore 1997:13)). The literature also reflects additional values and beliefs that are different from those of the majority American culture. According to the literature, deaf culture values deafness (Bahan 1989a; Dolnick 1993; Lane, et al. 1996; Wrigley 1996), residential deaf schools (Bahan 1989b; Dolnick 1993; Lane, et al. 1996; Padden and Humphries 1988; Woodward 1982), social opportunities (Lane, et al. 1996; Padden 1991; Rutherford 1992), storytelling (Padden 1991), the group (Hoffman 1976; Lane et al. 1996), self-determination (Bahan 1989c) and, as previously mentioned, American Sign Language. American deaf culture devalues speech (Lane, et al. 1996; Padden 1991; Padden and Markowicz 1976, 1997). In fact, it is believed that the use of speech identifies one as an outsider (Padden and Markowicz 1976, 1997). Other beliefs include the fact that a deaf identity is not a measure of hearing loss, but rather of attitudinal deafness (Padden 1991; Rutherford 1989; Woodward 1982; Wrigley 1996). There is also a strong belief that the residential deaf school is responsible for the transmission of deaf culture (Becker 1980; Cohen 1994; Dolnick 1993; Meadow 1972; Padden 1996; Padden and Markowicz 1997; Parasnis 1996; Preston 1994; Rutherford 1989, 1992; Van Cleve 1989; Woodward 1989; Wrigley 1996).
The issues in defining a deaf culture that Padden (1996) raised are not simply resolved, and admittedly they are not resolved here. A close look across the institutions traditionally described by ethnographers (social organization, economics, political organization, religion, etc.) has not been completed for this population. It is true that in many regards there is similarity between “deaf culture” and the majority culture. However, as Padden (1996) alludes to, the similarity is not exact. There are slight differences in funeral practices (employing very personal testimonials (Padden 1996)). Anecdotal evidence also indicates that within the deaf world balanced reciprocity is an expected practice, far more so than within the majority American population. There is research which also appears to indicate that deaf leadership is based on different characteristics than the general American population (see for example Lane, et. al. 1996; Moore 1997; and Stokoe, et. al. 1976). There is additional research which indicates differences in social organization, particularly in terms of the social hierarchy (Padden and Humphries 1988), and to a lesser extent the definition of family (anecdotal evidence suggests that deaf people have commonly viewed their peers from the deaf school and their deaf friends as more of a family than the biological family). Until such time as a complete ethnographic study across all the cultural institutions is conducted, ambiguity will remain in any attempt to establish the existence of a deaf culture. Likewise, ambiguity will remain until such time as there is agreement on a definition of culture. However, the applicability of a number of the various anthropological definitions of culture to the discussions of deaf culture in the literature, along with the scattered evidence regarding differences (albeit some slight)
in the various cultural institutions, and emic perceptions reflected in signs such as DEAF-WORLD, give ample credence to the existence of American deaf culture for the purposes of this study.

**Rationale for the Study**

Having established the existence of an American deaf culture, it becomes possible to study the transmission and learning of this culture. This focus on deaf culture was selected because it appeared to be particularly well-suited for addressing the theoretical questions regarding the concepts of enculturation and acculturation (raised previously in Chapter One and again in this chapter) within a singular population and setting. Ninety percent (90%) of deaf children are born into hearing families (Schein and Delk 1974). As a result, they do not learn deaf culture from birth rather they begin life learning "hearing culture". Nonetheless, by adulthood, the majority of deaf children participate in and consider themselves to be a part of deaf culture (see Lane, et.al. 1996). These children theoretically must learn deaf culture through the acculturation process (as traditionally conceived). The remaining ten percent (10%) of deaf children begin learning deaf culture at birth from deaf parents. This group of children is thereby learning deaf culture through the process of enculturation, theoretically. As a result, a study of deaf culture can be a study of both acculturation and enculturation simultaneously.

This is not the first study to investigate culture transmission and/or learning (either enculturation or acculturation) through a study of deaf culture (see for example Evans and Falk 1986; Johnson and Erting 1989; Meadow 1972; Padden and
Markowicz 1976; Reilly 1994, 1995; and Woodward 1982). It is, however, the first to attempt a direct comparison of enculturation and acculturation into deaf culture within a single study. It is also among the first that attempts to outline and discuss the processes by which this learning occurs (see also Reilly 1994, 1995) rather than the fact and/or location of its occurrence (i.e. the residential deaf school, among peers in the majority of cases, at home in the minority of cases).

CONCLUSION

An examination of the literature on culture transmission and learning via the concepts of enculturation and acculturation has demonstrated the need for re-examination of these concepts. It is from identification of this need that the questions explored in this dissertation have been raised and the analytic focus established. The literature revealed that traditional conceptions of enculturation and acculturation are currently being challenged, that enculturation and acculturation have been considered separate and distinct and thereby studied as such, that the processes involved in such culture transmission and learning have been largely neglected, and that similarities between enculturation and acculturation have been overlooked. As a result, this dissertation asks how is culture learned and is the acculturative experience different than the enculturative experience from an interaction perspective. The three primary frameworks for analysis (ethnography of communication, Hall's types of learning and legitimate peripheral participation) were chosen upon review of the existing literature on interaction. They were chosen for their complementarity and utility in providing a more in depth picture of culture transmission and learning than any could provide on
its own. They were also chosen for their utility in generating secondary questions (which have been indicated above) necessary in the identification of patterns which will be used to answer the primary questions of the dissertation.

The literature has also provided a forum for the study. The existence of an American deaf culture and its utility in addressing the enculturation/acculturation issue, and thereby the questions posed in this dissertation, have been established with allusions to cultural characteristics (such as attention getting and touch) but without much direct description of these characteristics. Such description can be found in Chapter Four where a comparison of the literature and findings from this study are discussed.

Having thus established the need for a study, a theoretical perspective, primary and secondary questions to be addressed, and a forum for the undertaking of such study, a discussion of the specific methods of data collection and analysis, including a description of the setting is in order.

---

1 This shift in the discussion occurred even though no clear and agreed upon definition had been reached. In fact, the term has largely fallen out of use, though the concept is still employed.


3 Hilger's model includes 17 categories such as sex (male, female), stages of life (young children, older children, adolescents), fears, temper tantrums. Questions regarding predicting the birth of twins (e.g. higccouching of two fetuses), prenatal food taboos, beliefs about atypical conditions and identification of the child's teachers are typical.

4 Behavioral approaches, particularly to the study of enculturation, can be found in the literature (see for example, Williams 1969; Whiting 1980; Shimahara 1970). These approaches, however, have focused on other, more specific behavioral aspects such as cuddling and feeding and not on generalized interaction. An exception is the work done by Johnson and Erting (1989) on the socialization (enculturation) of deaf preschool children. Here they identify three primary interaction types in the
linguistic socialization of the deaf children. And, again, it is important to note that no studies have been found that consider enculturation and acculturation comparatively, looking for similarity in process. All studies have been designed to address either enculturation or acculturation, separately.

5 Chappie and Coon were greatly concerned that anthropology be scientific. As a result, they sought concepts and methods that could meet scientific requirements of “functional dependence” along with an ability to be measured.

6 An object is defined according to this perspective as “anything that can be indicated, anything that is pointed to or referred to – a cloud, a book, a legislature, a banker, a religious doctrine, a ghost, and so forth” (Blumer 1969: 10).

7 See Garfinkel 1963 for an excellent discussion of method as well as an example of an ethnomethodological study of rules.

8 This intersects nicely with my own assertion that culture transmission and learning involve both a cognitive and a behavioral (social) aspect while focusing on the behavioral for the purposes of this study.

9 There is a seeming contradiction here as the mnemonic consists of only eight letters but is said to represent 16 components. Hymes, recognizing work in psycholinguistics which indicated that humans can remember classifications of seven to nine most efficiently, grouped his components so that they could be remembered in this way (Hymes 1972).

10 A community of practice is defined as “a set of relations among persons, activity, and world, overtime and in relation with other tangential and overlapping communities of practice” (Lave and Wenger 1991:98).

11 While learning through a teaching curriculum is distinguished in this way, the learning that occurs as a result of a teaching curriculum is considered to be legitimate peripheral participation. There is, however, a greater restriction of access to the range of practice activities. As a result, full participation may be impeded.

12 The data from this study clearly indicate that language carries the most substantial weight. However, the figure does not presume to represent a precise weighting as this was not the focus of the study.

13 As recent discussions regarding the existence of a “Deaf culture” have come into being, such terminology (DEAF-CULTURE) has been adopted into the sign language lexicon as well.

14 Alexander Graham Bell is possibly the most well known champion of this position. His “Memoir: Upon the Formation of the Deaf Variety of the Human Race” (1884) calls for the eradication of the “defective deaf race”.

15 See Wrigley 1996 for an interesting discussion of the lack of a geographical location within deaf culture.

16 See Chapter Four for a more complete description of deaf culture including norms of behavior.

17 They found that the phrases “a little hard of hearing” and “very hard of hearing” hold opposite meanings for deaf and hearing people. For deaf people “very hard of hearing” refers to an identity more aligned with hearing values and belief, it has nothing to do with an audiometric measure. For hearing people on the other hand, this same phrase means a great difficulty in hearing, an audiometric measure.
"Hearing culture" is a concept that exists among the Deaf population. Its existence has not been seriously studied to date. However, in remaining true to "native" conceptions, I accept its existence.

See also Lane et al. 1996 and Padden and Humphries 1988 for excellent descriptions of American Deaf culture.
CHAPTER 3

METHOD

In order to fairly and appropriately judge any research endeavor, it is important to know not only how the questions posed are related to and/or generated from the existing literature (see Chapter Two), but also the means by which the data were collected and analyzed around those questions. This chapter will provide such contextualization, beginning with the rationale for selection of the specific fieldsite and a description of the site as a speech community. It will then discuss the various ethnographic methods, both general and specific, that were used in the collection of data including a rationale for the use of each method. These collection methods were selected around the secondary questions “what does deaf culture look like” and “what is the role of interaction in the transmission and learning of deaf culture” and thus provide data in their regard. It is through the application of the three theoretical frameworks (ethnography of communication, legitimate peripheral participation, and Hall’s three types of learning) that the data are transformed in order to address the primary research questions (“how is deaf culture transmitted/learned” and “is the acculturative experience different than the enculturative experience in learning deaf
culture"). This chapter concludes, then, with a discussion of the methods of analysis including a discussion of how the theories were applied to the collected data.

FIELDSITE

Selection

Fieldwork for this dissertation was conducted during the 1995-96 academic year at a midwestern residential deaf school, akin to a private boarding school. A residential deaf school was chosen in part because it reflects the unique population composition of American deaf culture which allowed me to study questions of culture transmission/learning through the concepts of acculturation and enculturation in a single setting (see Chapter Two). In addition, the residential deaf school can be considered the "geographic territory" associated with deaf culture. As such, it serves as more than an educational facility. It is a gathering place, an informational referral place, and a place of employment for deaf adults. Finally, the residential deaf school is a highly valued aspect of deaf culture whose primary responsibility is seen as the transmission of deaf culture. It is commonly believed that learning deaf culture occurs at school, particularly for those from hearing families (Becker 1980; Cohen 1994; Evans and Falk 1986; Jankowski 1997; Moores 1987; Padden and Humphries 1988; Padden and Markowicz 1976; Preston 1994; Rutherford 1985; Schein 1989; Woodward 1982;). Likewise, children from deaf families (that is one or both parents are deaf), who are initially exposed to deaf culture at home, continue that exposure by enrollment at the residential school (Meadow 1972; Woodward 1982). It is important to note, however, that these beliefs have been recently called into question (Frishberg 1997b; Wrigley 1996). According to these authors, the residential deaf school is not
designed to promote and encourage the learning of deaf culture. This is due to the fact that the residential deaf school is typically under the control of the state, administered by hearing people with few deaf staff, and the educational curriculum is English literacy based. These challenges specifically address the residential deaf school as an educational institution. They do not address the residential deaf school as a social institution and “home”. It is the social and “home” realms that this dissertation addresses primarily and that are the basis for the widely held beliefs that the school is responsible for the transmission of deaf culture.

The Indiana School for the Deaf (ISD) was chosen as the specific fieldsite for the dissertation research in part because of its student population as mentioned above. During the 1995-96 academic year, ISD had approximately 300 students schoolwide (pre-school-12th grade). At present, this is considered to be a large enrollment for a residential deaf school\(^3\). Seventy-six percent (76%) of the student body had hearing parents and were introduced to deaf culture initially and exclusively through ISD. The remaining twenty-four percent (24%) of the students were born into deaf families (that is one or both parents are deaf).

ISD was chosen for two additional reasons as well. In order to learn culture through interaction, as is posed in this research, access to models of the culture is paramount. ISD has an abundance of such models at all levels. Deaf role models included the superintendent\(^4\), other administrative staff (43%), teachers (35%), dorm supervisors (54%), housekeeping staff, cafeteria workers and the alumni association, which is actively involved at ISD. Overall, 33% of ISD employees are deaf. In this
way, it counters, at least in regards to administration, the recent challenges to its function as cultural transmitter discussed above. In addition, ISD is well respected for its bilingual-bicultural (bi-bi) deaf education philosophy. It is nationally looked to as a model for deaf bi-bi education (ASL/English-deaf/hearing). The bilingual-bicultural program provides opportunities for exposure to deaf culture in addition to those offered by the presence of role models.

In this way ISD provides ample opportunities for learning deaf culture through each of Hall’s (1959) types of learning (formal and informal through the presence of role models, and technical through the existence of a formal bilingual-bicultural curriculum — see Chapter Two for a discussion of each type of learning). While some may argue that each of these types of learning is available in the mainstream, public school, in fact, informal learning of deaf culture is not possible in such a setting due to a lack of deaf adult rolemodels and a small number of deaf students (in some cases only a single student). Formal learning of deaf culture, while possible, is hampered in a mainstream, public educational system as well since the “teachers” are typically not members of deaf culture themselves. Finally, technical learning of deaf culture is not as readily available in either mainstream schools or residential schools that do not offer a bilingual-bicultural curriculum.

History

Founding

The Indiana School for the Deaf was the seventh residential deaf school established in the United States. William Willard, a deaf gentleman born in Vermont
and educated at the American School for the Deaf in Connecticut, is regarded as the school's founder. It was his semi-private deaf school, founded in 1843, that became the "Indiana Asylum for the Education of the Deaf and Dumb" after a bill to establish a state supported deaf school, introduced by William C. Bales, father of a deaf child, passed through the Indiana legislature on January 15, 1844.

"Although established and referred to as an 'Asylum for Deaf and Dumb,' following the nomenclature of the day and without adequate conception upon the part of its founders of its educational scope and future development, it is in no sense an asylum for the deaf nor a place of refuge for those who can not talk — neither is it a prison, a reform school, an almshouse, a children's home, nor a hospital. It is strictly an educational institution — a school in its widest and best sense, and a part of the common school system of the State, wherein all children of the State too deaf to be properly educated in the public schools receive an education as a matter of right, not as a matter of charity" (Whisman 1988:7).

The school has experienced a number of name changes over the years. It has variously been referred to as the Asylum for Deaf and Dumb (as above), The Indiana Institution for Educating the Deaf and Dumb, The Indiana Institute for the Education of the Deaf and Dumb, and most recently The Indiana School for the Deaf (ISD). While the later is still the official name of the school, during the year of the study, a number of informational materials regarding the school were noted to have been printed under the letterhead of the Indiana Deaf School.

In 1912, the campus was moved to 80 acres on East 42nd Street, its present location. The original location of the school, on East Washington Street, became city property that was converted into a public park. In honor of William Willard this park has come to be known as Willard Park, the site of the present war memorial.
The annual session of classes was suspended once in the history of the school. "There was no school on the campus for the 1918-1919 session because the campus was taken over by the War Department of the United States of America for the purpose of training our American soldiers in auto-mechanics, gun-smithing, truck-driving, etc., for oversea (sic) service" (Whisman 1988:43). During this time, coursework was accomplished via correspondence between ISD’s teachers and interested students. Instruction during this time was neither mandatory nor enforceable.

Leadership

At the time of the founding, Mr. Willard was appointed as the school’s principal and a board of trustees was established to oversee the institution. While Willard is popularly considered to be the first superintendent, James Brown was officially appointed to this position on June 30, 1845. At this time, it was believed that the superintendent ought to be a hearing individual, for a deaf person “by his infirmity he would be separated at a great distance from the talking community, and thereby in a great measure disqualified for transacting successfully and with dispatch the miscellaneous business of an Institution like this” (Whisman 1988:12). In total, the school has now seen 11 superintendents, 9 of whom have been hearing. The first deaf superintendent was appointed in June 1992, Eddy F. Laird. Superintendent Laird resigned in 1995 and was replaced again by a hearing person.

Throughout its history, ISD has consistently employed deaf individuals as academic and vocational teachers. Deaf individuals have also been employed in the
other departments of the school such as dietary (cafeteria staff), maintenance and dorm supervision. A number of the deaf individuals on the employment rosters have also consistently been graduates of ISD.

**Enrollment**

At the founding, enrollment was sixteen students (7 males and 9 females). “The first mention of graduation was the Class of 1858 with 13 graduates” (Whisman 1988:16). According to Whisman’s history of the first 100 years of the school, the largest enrollment was 483 during the 1940-41 academic year. The largest enrollments in the full history of the school were found as a result of the rubella epidemic in the 1960’s. “Rubella babies”, as they are sometimes called, raised enrollment to a maximum of 700 with an average of roughly 500 (Judith Carson, personal communication). The largest graduating class was 1984 with 120 graduates. The population began to decline in the late 1980’s. It was at this time that the school was experiencing “growing pains” as it struggled with new ideas of deaf self-determination. Unfortunately, during this time, many hearing parents were made to feel disenfranchised and as unwelcome outsiders in their children’s lives, which may explain in part the declining enrollments.

At the founding, enrollment was limited to students between the ages of 10 and 30. In 1846, legislation was passed making Indiana “the first state in the United States to provide free education for its deaf children” (Whisman 1988:9). Age of enrollment...
was lowered in 1886 to 6 years for a new kindergarten program. Pre-school classes were introduced during the 1937-38 academic year. These classes were for 4 and 5 year olds.

**Course of Study**

The school's original course of study required five years attendance in order to earn a certificate. The original course of study appears to have been purely academic, though no good records of the actual courses taught were able to be located. Some courses that have been taught throughout the history of the school include: spelling, reading, writing, arithmetic (of all types), geography, grammar, philosophy, chemistry, astronomy, physiology, articulation (speech or, as it is presently referred to, communication), ASL, Deaf culture, sociology, biology, American history, American literature, Latin, Spanish, civics, and Bible study. In addition, art and music have been a part of the curriculum.

In the seventh year of the school, the vocational program was added. The first vocational class taught was agriculture as the school was located on, owned, and operated a farm. Other vocational courses that have been taught include: shoe making and repair, coopering, auto body shop, tailoring, gardening, cabinet-making, printing, book binding, desk top publishing, photography, electricity, drafting, cooking, typing, sewing, and barbering. The vocational program was seen as a most valuable part of education in that it allowed students to secure employment upon graduation.
The graduating class of 1930 was the first class which required twelfth grade education. Ten years later, the State Board of Education commissioned the Indiana School for the Deaf as providing education equivalent to that provided by other public schools in Indiana.

As with deaf education in general, the Indiana School for the Deaf has utilized a number of different teaching philosophies during the course of its history. When the school opened, instruction was done in sign language. By 1894, the oral philosophy had made its way to ISD, at least in part. As a result, the school was divided into Manual and Oral departments, where instruction occurred in sign language or spoken English respectively. This philosophy continued through the 1910’s. In the 1950’s oralism, instruction exclusively through spoken English, became the dominant teaching philosophy. In the mid 1960’s sign language made a return to middle school and high school classes. Oralism, however, remained the means of instruction in the pre-school and elementary levels. Oralism was officially replaced in the fall of 1969 by a movement known as Total Communication which allowed for any and all methods (sign language, spoken language, writing, demonstration, role playing, etc.; whatever was necessary to achieve understanding) to be used in the instruction of deaf students. At this time, the school began to offer sign language classes for both parents and staff. The bilingual-bicultural approach was first explored in the mid 1980’s and implemented during the 1987-88 academic year.
Extracurricular Activities

According to Whisman (1988), the first sports team on campus was the boys' baseball team. This team played its first three games in 1886-87. Football appeared the following year. Basketball was first mentioned in Whisman's history during 1905-1906. However, a formal athletic program did not exist until 1920. At this time, athletics for girls began with a basketball team. Later, boys' and girls' track, soccer, and boys' wrestling were added to the program. The first Central State Schools for the Deaf (CSSD) basketball tournament, a regional tournament, was sponsored by ISD in 1924. This tournament has become an annual event with sponsorship rotating between the five member schools.

ISD has also been home to a number of clubs and associations for boys and girls. These have included the Boy Scouts, the Girl Scouts, literary societies, theatre clubs (the White Rose club for example), the Christian Endeavor Society and the Junior Christian Endeavor, and Campfire girls.

The 1200 Club is a fondly remembered gathering place for the deaf community (students, alumni, and others living in Indianapolis). The club was located in Beecher Hall and featured a soda bar and jukebox. The 1200 Club was closed when asbestos was found in the building.

Off-campus excursions were also common. “Brass buttons with the Indiana State Seal emblems stamped on the buttons were used to secure free admissions to the
circus and other local shows” (Whisman 1988:26). Students also went to town to see motion pictures and go shopping. The degree of supervision occurring with such off-campus excursions is unclear from historical documents.

Contemporary Description

The school currently sits on 80 acres surrounded by a chain link fence. A main entrance road divides campus. To the east of this entrance road, the preschool and elementary levels (classrooms and dormitories) can be found. The health center and assessment center are also located on the east side of campus. The west side of campus is home to the middle and high school levels (classrooms and dormitories) as well as administration offices. Each side of campus has its own cafeteria.

Two campus buildings are no longer in use. Both the old girls’ dormitory and Beecher Hall are closed due to the finding of asbestos. Both buildings, along with the main school building, are on the National Register of Historic Places. The school is, therefore, interested in restoring them. There is also an interest from the deaf community and alumni to restore Beecher Hall, home of the 1200 Club, in hopes that the club can be restored as well. Negotiations have been undertaken with the State of Indiana and two Indiana colleges for the restoration of the buildings. As part of these negotiations, it has been proposed that the colleges may be able to hold classes and/or establish satellite offices on the campus of ISD.

Campus is also home to a branch of Vincennes University. Vincennes teaches American Sign Language classes, Deaf culture and a number of other courses required for a degree in American Sign Language Studies at this branch. The majority of their
students are hearing. In addition, Ball State University offers a field experience course through ISD in which Deaf Education majors live on campus, are placed in a variety of classroom situations and volunteer some of their free time to assist ISD. In conjunction with this program, a number of Ball State courses are taught after regular school hours on the ISD campus. Finally, ISD serves as a placement site for student teachers from various colleges, predominantly Western Maryland College.

Leadership

The Indiana State Department of Health now oversees the school. Primary responsibility for the daily operation of the school including the hiring and firing of personnel resides with the superintendent. At the time of the study, the superintendent's position had been vacated and was held in the interim by George Stailey. Administration during the time of this study was composed of 43% deaf individuals.

Enrollment

Any student with a documented hearing loss is eligible for enrollment at ISD. Students may enroll at ISD from birth through the age of 21 at any stage of their education. They need not attend from pre-school age. They may also enter at any time during the academic year, though ideally they enroll in the autumn semester. Enrollment is discouraged during the last two months of any academic year.

As mentioned previously, enrollment during the year of this study was approximately 300. Of this 300, roughly 90 were high school students, 52 middle school, 102 elementary and 45 preschool. Though specific data were not kept by the
school. Discussions with intake personnel revealed that approximately 24% of students schoolwide come from deaf families (that is one or both parents is deaf). This percentage of deaf students from deaf families is not representative of the general deaf population in which only 10% of deaf children are born to deaf families (Schein and Delk 1974). This may be due in part to the value placed on the deaf school experience by deaf adults, particularly those who have shared such an experience.

Twenty-one (21) students began the 1995-96 academic year as new students. Throughout the course of the year, an additional 7 students were admitted to ISD for the first time. Of these, 8 were high school students, 2 middle school, 10 elementary and 8 preschool. Seventy five percent (75%) of these new students came from hearing families.

Course of Study

The course of study during the year of this research was very broad and highly representative of a typical course of study in the American educational system. Courses in reading, writing, arithmetic, science, and American history were core. Vocational courses were available at the high school level in home economics, accounting, art, photography, desktop publishing, etc. In fact, the Indiana Department of Education accredits the school in exactly the same way as all other schools in the state. It is also accredited by North Central Association of Colleges and Schools and the Conference of Educational Administrators of Schools and Programs for the Deaf. What set the ISD course of study apart from the traditional course of study was the absence of music courses (band, choir, orchestra) and foreign language courses.13.
The ISD course of study was further set apart from the traditional course of study due to the school’s bilingual-bicultural philosophy (bi-bi).

"Following this philosophy, the program provides for early language acquisition and facilitates the development of two languages, American Sign Language and English. For most Deaf (sic) students, American Sign Language is the accessible, dominant language used for communication and thinking, while English is learned as a second language. By fostering competencies in these two languages and by providing an academically and culturally enriched learning environment, Deaf students have the opportunity to develop a sense of identity within the Deaf community. They also have the opportunity to develop knowledge, skills and attitudes necessary to function effectively with members of the Hearing community" (excerpt from the school’s philosophy statement).

In keeping with this philosophy, three unique courses were offered at ISD. Courses in American Sign Language were offered to all students for credit. At the elementary level, the ASL course was required for all students. At the high school level students had the option of taking an ASL/Deaf Studies course in which ASL, deaf history and deaf culture were explored. In addition, a communication course (traditionally thought of as a speech/articulation course) was required of all elementary students and was optional for high school students.

**Extracurricular Activities**

Sports are the major extracurricular activities on campus. The school offers a sports program throughout the year. The year of this research, the school had a football team (the previous year there were not enough boys who were interested to field a team), a girls’ volleyball team, and a cross country team in the fall; boys’ and girls’ basketball, cheerleading, and wrestling in the winter; and boys’ and girls’ track in the spring. Many of the students participate in a sport each season.
There are also a number of different clubs listed as having sponsors and available for extracurricular activity. These clubs include: Student Council, Junior National Association of the Deaf (Jr. NAD), Junior Black Deaf Advocates (Jr. BDA), Adventure Club, Boys’ Club, Girls’ Club, Cub Scouts, Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, Brownies and Young Astronaut Club. Few of these clubs were observed to be active. At the high school level, Jr. NAD was in existence but not very active (one activity was sponsored but very poorly attended). Jr. BDA sponsored a single activity on Martin Luther King Day. The most active group at the high school level was the Student Council. At the elementary level, clubs appeared to be more viable. This may have been due to a lack of competition with sports. The “ROCKET” club (Young Astronaut Club) was a club of aspiring astronauts that met after school hours on a regular basis. None of the scouting groups were observed to be active. In addition to these clubs, a Bible study was attempted at the high school level. However, due again to conflicts with sports, this was a short-lived endeavor.

At the elementary level, a monthly extracurricular event was scheduled. This event was known as the Big Adventure Tuesday. All elementary students, both residential and day, were invited to attend. Day students who stayed for Big Adventure Tuesday were picked up by their parents at 6:00 p.m. Big Adventure Tuesdays were activities such as picnics, holiday parties, and dances. At the high school level, dances and other parties were also fairly regular occurrences, scheduled around holidays and other special events such as Superbowl.
In addition to formally organized and structured extracurricular activities, less formal and less structured activities occurred. These typically involved students of a particular dorm area (known at ISD as a pod) and were referred to as off-campus (O-C) activities. Such activities included trips to local shopping centers, parks, and restaurants. There was also a monthly open-captioned\textsuperscript{14} movie in a local movie theatre that was sponsored by the local chapter of the Indiana Association of the Deaf, the local chapter of the National Fraternal Society of the Deaf and Vincennes University. High school students who wished to attend the films were transported by bus each month. All off-campus activities were supervised. At the high school level, an exception to the supervised nature of off-campus activities was possible if parents granted permission in writing.

**THE SCHOOL AS SPEECH COMMUNITY**

The difficulties inherent in defining a speech community have been discussed in Chapter Two. However, because the deaf school is a bounded social group, and it is identified by those involved to be a unique language using environment, it is being defined as a speech community for the purposes of this study.

This speech community is made up of the deaf students (at all levels), college students (both hearing and deaf), teachers, dorm supervisors, school administrators, cafeteria employees, maintenance and grounds crews, and a small police force. Periodically, students' parents and siblings, guest speakers, alumni, and hearing students and their parents would be present for sporting events, lectures or other brief visits. The teachers, dorm staff, and school administrators were all able to
communicate in American Sign Language (ASL). Sixty-two percent (62%) of teachers and administrators, as well as forty-eight percent (48%) of dorm staff could also communicate in spoken English. A small number of cafeteria employees as well as maintenance and grounds crew were deaf monolingual ASL users. The majority of the cafeteria, maintenance and grounds crews, however, were hearing monolingual spoken English users. The police force was entirely hearing and relied almost exclusively on spoken English for interactions. The college students and other visitors had varying degrees of proficiency in both ASL and English.

Participants in this speech community had the opportunity to interact across a range of settings and communication events. Communication events ranged from very formal and structured (e.g., classrooms, meetings) to informal and unstructured (e.g., evening free-times). The majority of events were adult directed, although a few were peer directed. While many settings are segregated by age, interactions were not completely age dependent. All students had the opportunity at some point, though not necessarily on a daily basis, to interact with students of the same age, students who were older and those who were younger, as well as adults. Interaction was also not (officially) limited due to hearing status. All students had the opportunity to interact with both deaf and hearing individuals, although it may be important to note that all the hearing individuals on campus were adults. Interaction with hearing individuals was limited when a language was not shared.

ASL was the official language of instruction at the school. It was also the predominant language observed in use by students and adults (both hearing and deaf)
schoolwide and across all settings for personal interaction. However, in keeping with the school’s bi-lingual philosophy, English (written, spoken and signed) was also found in use at the school. Written English, in the form of textbooks, assignments, tests, bulletin boards and flyers, was the most common form of English in use. All students and adults could be found using written English. Its use, however, was generally restricted to the classroom and the TTY (a device that allows deaf individuals to communicate by phone through typed discourse). Spoken English was used primarily by the hearing adults and college students on campus. Spoken English might also be highly relied upon, even exclusively relied upon, by deaf students from hearing families who were new to the school as they were generally unable to effectively use ASL at the time of enrollment. While not entirely absent, spoken English was not very widely used by the established deaf students or deaf adults. Those established deaf students and deaf adults who did use spoken English were generally audiometrically considered hard of hearing. Signed forms of English, much like spoken English, were used by hearing adults, college students and the new deaf students. These signed forms of English were used by the established deaf students in jest but generally not for serious interactions. They were generally only used for serious interaction by the established deaf students as a means to accommodate the hearing adults and college students who were not proficient in ASL.

STUDY GROUP

The study focused on students at the elementary and high school levels because they had the highest numbers of newly enrolled students at the beginning of the school
year. Interaction occurred with all the residential (dorm) students. Interaction with
day students (those who commute) was primarily limited to special events (ex.
sporting events, elementary Big Adventure Tuesdays) and occasional meals. Of these
students, 20 high school and 12 elementary students were relied on more heavily than
the others while seeking data. Twelve students (six each in the elementary and the
high school) served as the primary sources of data (key informants). Key informants
were selected for a variety of reasons. Rashad, for example, was a relative newcomer
to the school. The year of the study was his third full year in attendance (he had
originally enrolled in February 1993). Prior to this he attended a residential deaf
school in another country. Having cross-cultural experience, he had considered and
possessed good insights into American deaf culture. He was also able to provide some
cross-cultural comparison. Another key informant, Brandi, had been enrolled at the
school for 10 years. She has hearing parents and prior to her enrollment at ISD,
attended a mainstream, public school program for the deaf. For the most part, she
chose me rather than my having chosen her. Nonetheless, she was an excellent
informant as she enjoyed setting me straight and was willing to do anything that I
asked of her (though not in the presence of others). A third key informant at the high
school, Arron, was enrolled for his second year at the school after 10 years in
mainstream education. His family is also hearing. He provided key insights into
American deaf culture via comparisons between what he had learned in each setting
(hearing and deaf). Unlike Rashad, for whom the comparisons were conscious, Arron
often provided his comparisons of the two cultures unconsciously. Elementary key
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informants were selected based on their willingness to be involved answering my
questions and participating in formal data collection methods. Each of them had been
enrolled at ISD for more than a year. All key informants, both high school and
elementary, were residential students. The 20 others who were heavily relied upon
included those who were new to the school, those from deaf families and day students.

While the primary focus of this study is deaf students, the presence of seven,
female college students was seen as a unique opportunity to study acculturation which
could not be passed by. These students were undertaking a practicum in their Deaf
Education course of study. They were to spend a full academic year on campus
experiencing a variety of different classrooms across all the levels of the school. Each
student had been required to complete a single American Sign Language class before
coming to campus. Thus, they arrived with minimal signing skills. Six of the seven
had never independently interacted with a deaf person\textsuperscript{17}, child or adult, before arriving
at ISD. This was to be their first real exposure to American deaf culture. They would
be submersed in the culture much as those newly enrolled deaf students from hearing
families were being submersed. As a result, their experiences were included in the
data collection as well, though not with the same degree of intensity and not always
utilizing the same methods as that of the deaf students. This provided me with the
opportunity to ask a third research question, something of a sub-question to the second
primary research question: is the acculturative experience of a deaf individual different
than that of a hearing individual?
DATA COLLECTION METHODS

As noted in the introduction, this study is ethnographic in nature. It would most appropriately be described according to Hymes (1977) as a topic oriented ethnography, that is a focused ethnography seeking specific information pertaining to a particular topic, in this case the transmission and learning of culture. Regardless of whether ethnographic research is comprehensive (seeking to describe all), topic oriented or hypothesis oriented (Ibid), it can be discussed in general terms. Hymes (1977) describes ethnographic research generally as the study of people, typically those other than ourselves, characterized by methods that are not typically experimental nor entirely quantitative. Zaharlick (1992) and Zaharlick and Green (1991) emphasize that the process is interactive-reactive in nature, that is, hypotheses are generated in situ, questioned, assessed and re-assessed, and perhaps even re-formulated as need be (see also Spindler and Spindler 1987). The methods of ethnography are therefore varied and eclectic in order to fit each particular study at any point in time (Zaharlick 1992). As a result of this somewhat fluid nature and ambiguous definition, the validity and reliability of ethnographic research may be called into question. However, it is this fluid nature and the ability to use varied means to investigate a single question that upholds the very validity and reliability that are questioned.

In order to ensure the validity and reliability of this study, and in keeping true to ethnography (in its general sense), multiple methods were used to collect the data. Some of the specific methods and techniques that were used in this study were
developed in situ in response to the uniqueness of the setting, others are widely used in ethnographic research. As essentially two sets of data were necessary in order to answer the primary research question (how is deaf culture transmitted/learned), deaf culture data and interaction data, some methods were particular to one or the other data set. Other methods were used for the collection of data in both sets. In addition, it was necessary to collect data across a range of settings and communication events further insuring validity and reliability.

Regardless of specific method or technique used, this research was conducted in a manner remarkably true to the bilingual situation and the speech community in which it occurred. American Sign Language or sign with speech were used in all interactions with deaf students or adults, depending upon their own language choice. Interactions with hearing adults or the college students occurred in ASL, sign with speech or spoken English depending on the particular setting and other participants involved. Field notes were written in my own native language English, not only for my own ease but also due to the lack of a written form of ASL. Ironically enough, though not due to any forethought and indeed only recognized upon completion of the fieldwork, this pattern of language use reflects the patterns of language use found within the community. While this may be a respectable means of conducting ethnographic research as it avoids many of the pitfalls accompanying interpreter use (see Boas 1911; Kluckhohn 1945; Berreman 1968; and Sherzer 1994), it did pose some methodological and analytical issues. These issues will be discussed as they become relevant throughout the remainder of the chapter.
As previously noted, data was collected across a range of settings. Each setting was variably accessible, thus they were not utilized equally. Figure Two reflects the major settings in which data collection occurred and the frequency with which they were noted in the fieldnotes. Primary interest and focus for this study was placed on extra-curricular settings. These included the dorm, outdoors, vehicles, and the various off-campus settings. Within the dorm, access to common areas was unrestricted and utilized on a daily basis. Access to pod areas was more restricted. I did not have access to pod areas in the boys' high school/middle school dorm, therefore, no data from this setting exists. Access to pod areas in the girls' high school/middle school dorm was limited based on individual supervisor's cooperation and/or pod activity (again, at the discretion of the supervisor). The same was true for access to the elementary dorms, both boys' and girls'. Outdoor settings were limited based on student restrictions. Students were permitted outdoors only at certain times, generally under supervision, and dependent upon the weather. As a result, a limited amount of data comes from this setting. That which is available in an outdoor setting comes largely from the elementary school. Vehicles were the setting for various travels to off-campus settings. Again, collection of data in this setting was restricted to those times when students were travelling for field trips, monthly movie outings, and sporting events.
Curricular settings were the most restricted. Requests for access to classrooms were repeatedly denied. This was ultimately resolved by scheduling monthly observations through the supervising teacher in consultation with me and in accordance with those teachers who were likely to be cooperative. Observations were

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SETTING</th>
<th>ACCESSIBILITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classrooms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school</td>
<td>Generally as scheduled by supervising teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>As granted by teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cafeteria</td>
<td>Open access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>Open access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museum</td>
<td>By request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditorium</td>
<td>Limited by occurrence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gymnasium</td>
<td>Generally open access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hallways</td>
<td>Open access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration offices</td>
<td>Controlled access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorm</td>
<td>Variably controlled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common areas</td>
<td>Open access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pods</td>
<td>Controlled by supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>Controlled by supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoors</td>
<td>Open access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicles</td>
<td>Controlled access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off Campus</td>
<td>Limited access due to infrequency of occurrence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theatre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stores</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other schools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deaf club</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing home</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2: Major Settings and Accessibility for Research
not conducted in every classroom, however, a representation of courses was achieved. Likewise, both deaf and hearing teachers were observed in equal numbers. Exceptions to the scheduling requirement were found in the larger, more public settings associated with school, that is, the cafeteria, auditorium and gymnasium. I had no difficulty with access to the events that occurred in these last three settings. In fact, the cafeteria became a rich and valuable source of discussion and thereby data.

The range of communication events was far greater than the range of settings, as each setting may be “home” to more than one event. This study includes data across the range of events reported in Figure Three. As with Figure Two, the events reported are the major events. They have not been broken down into each individual event due to space constraints. Again, no claim is made that this is the full range of possible communication events, rather, this reflects the range of events that I was given access to. Emphasis here was on those events that occurred in the extra-curricular settings and the cafeteria. Formal data collection and consultation with staff regarding the research (included under the larger heading: Formal meetings) are the only two events that were not naturally occurring, that is, these events existed purely as a result of this study. However, I believed that it was important to acknowledge their place within the range of communication events found on campus during the year of the study.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMUNICATION EVENTS</th>
<th>ACCESSIBILITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educational Events</td>
<td>Controlled access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assemblies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sporting Events</td>
<td>Open access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Games</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Events</td>
<td>Open access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorm</td>
<td>Controlled access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>Open access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>Open access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Open access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freetime</td>
<td>Open access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meals</td>
<td>Open access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chores</td>
<td>Controlled access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>Limited access due to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>infrequency of occurrence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Meetings</td>
<td>Controlled access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>As granted by staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trainings</td>
<td>As granted by trainer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>As granted by sponsor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chance Meetings</td>
<td>Open access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Data Collection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3: Range of Communication Events and Accessibility for Research

General Ethnographic Methods

A number of general methods exist for the conduct of ethnographic research. These methods are typically utilized regardless of the specific focus or design of the project. The two primary methods associated with ethnographic research are participant observation and interviewing. In addition, observation and recording
(typically of interviews, though in this case also video recording of events) are recognized general methods that were utilized in this study. These methods were used to collect both data sets for this study (Figure Four).

As mentioned, a central ethnographic method is that of participant observation. Participant observation requires that the researcher be both observer and participant, however, not as exclusionary roles. Rather, participant observation requires the researcher to be both observer and participant simultaneously whenever possible. To this end, I cheered along at sporting events and pep rallies, played house after school, rollerbladed in the elementary dorm hallways, played four square and euchre with the high school students during free time, watched television or a video in the dorm pod area, decorated for the homecoming dance (high school) and the Cinderella ball (elementary), traveled off-campus on the "fan bus" to the volleyball tournament, went off-campus to watch captioned films, sold tickets at the door for the regional basketball tournament, and joined in a host of other activities.

While participant observation was most highly relied upon for data collection, it was not always possible. Some occasions required that only the role of observer be taken. I acted in this capacity in the classrooms, at various meetings and assemblies. Likewise, I occasionally acted only as observer during free time events when my presence, as an adult, a hearing person, and/or a researcher, might disrupt the natural flow of the event (ex. a high school game of "truth or dare", or when students were videotaping each other with my equipment). This method, too, was employed quite frequently (second only to participant observation).
Another key method used in ethnographic data collection is the interview. Fetterman (1989) considers the interview to be “the ethnographer’s most important data gathering technique” (47). Two types of interviews were used throughout this research: formal and informal. The formal interviews occurred in a room that was set with two chairs facing each other and three video cameras (one on the face of each individual and one with both individuals in the frame) for recording purposes. Formal interviews were conducted with an initial, fixed, set of questions (see Appendix B ). These questions were posed individually to students during a one-on-one pre-arranged meeting with me. Formal interviews were used at the beginning of the project with both the ISD students and the college students. The intention was to establish some personal background as well as to establish their views and understandings of deaf culture at the outset of the project. Formal interviews were also used near the end of the project with the college students to allow a comparison with earlier data that might demonstrate a change in knowledge, attitudes, or beliefs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>METHOD</th>
<th>FOCUS</th>
<th>GROUP SIZE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participant</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>One-on-one, small, large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation</td>
<td>Elementary, high</td>
<td>Small, large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>One-on-one, small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal</td>
<td></td>
<td>One-on-one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video recording</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Small, large</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4: General Ethnographic Methods Utilized
The formal interviews with ISD students were discontinued after a short period of time and a very few interviews. Scheduling proved to be quite a bit more difficult than anticipated. Students’ schedules were very tight and they were not particularly eager to trade social time for an interview. In addition, students who did agree to a meeting would often forget the agreed upon time or would find themselves in trouble and confined to their pod area, thus unable to make the meeting. Therefore, I discontinued these interviews in favor of a more productive method.

Informal interviews were much more successful with the ISD students. They proved to be very valuable with the college students as well. Informal interviews differ from the formal interviews both in terms of the questions and the setting. Informal interviews occurred at any time and in any place. I often utilized this method during meals and free time conversations. In this way, the interview was perceived as casual conversation rather than a question and answer session. In addition, informal interviews did not have a fixed set of questions, though they might have a pre-conceived, broad, initial question or topic of discussion. For example, one evening I set out to determine who students considered to be a part of deaf culture. I then asked a number of students, individually or in groups, questions such as: “if I am deaf and use sign with speech, am I part of deaf culture?” “if I am hearing and use ASL beautifully, am I part of deaf culture?” Informal interviews also occurred with less preconceived structure following the lead of the student(s). The majority of interview data reported in this dissertation was collected in this informal fashion. I believe that the reason for the success of this method is best exemplified in the comment made by
a female senior who upon seeing me working with another student on a card sort
several months into the study said ‘so you are finally doing research’. This statement
demonstrates that the informal interviews which had been occurring all along were not
perceived as part of the research thus eliminating, or at the very least, reducing, any
possible concerns about presenting “correct” responses and/or discomfort which
accompanies being “on the spot”.

The recording of interviews is a technique now commonly used in
ethnographic research. Such recording allows for a more in-depth analysis of data,
particularly in regards to language use. It also allows the researcher to be more
directly involved in the interaction and less involved in note-taking. Recording in
ethnographic research is typically done on audiocassette. However, in this situation
where a visual rather than an auditory language is used, it was necessary to record on
videotape (the first methodological issue generated by the language in which the study
was conducted). In this study, video recording was used for all the formal interviews
with deaf students. In this case, three stationary cameras which ran continuously
throughout the interview were employed: one providing a full frontal view of myself,
one a full frontal view of the student and the third a broader view that captured both of
us in one frame. This set up was used so that language use could be clearly recorded
(through the two full frontal shots) at the same time that the dynamics (and details) of
the interaction could also be recorded. Video recording was also used to capture
special events such as assemblies, presentations, sporting events, parties, dances, and
some evening free time activities as it is a productive and useful means for the study
of interaction (Erickson and Wilson 1982). In the case of recorded events, a single camera was used. Most often the camera was not stationary but rather was held by the recorder who maintained manual control. As a result, recordings made in this manner are generally discontinuous and depict what the recorder was interested in at the moment of recording.

I did the majority of the recording myself. In addition, I trained two female students (one a senior, the other an eighth-grader who lived with the freshmen due to her age) to assist me with camera operation. They accompanied me to various events and recorded both what they saw as interesting and/or important and what I directed them to record. For example, an assistant accompanied me to the elementary school Cinderella Ball. At the Ball, she recorded largely as she saw fit while I occasionally requested that she record a particular group of students sitting chatting, dancing, the crowning of the king and queen, etc. Having the student assistants also allowed me to record some of the informal interviews that would otherwise have gone unrecorded and to collect some data I may otherwise not have had access to. For example, one evening I sent an assistant out with a camera to collect ABC and number stories (genres of folklore that are unique to ASL) and jokes. The students were willing to tell her the "dirty" jokes that they would not have been willing to tell an adult, in fact they sent her back to be sure that they would not get in trouble for telling them. Video recording was, however, not used to the exclusion of audio recording. Audio recording was used in all interviews with the college students. In this way, both populations were interviewed and recorded in their native language.
While use of video recording afforded me the luxury of a record in the students’ own language, it did pose a number of concerns (see Fetterman 1989; and Erickson and Wilson 1982 for discussion of additional issues related to video recording in fieldwork). The first concern was in regards to the camera’s influence on the students. It was suggested to me that the camera would change students’ behaviors. While I can not claim that this did not occur (students did like to “act” for the camera), such an influence was not ever present. In fact, the presence of the video camera was useful in the elicitation of data on several occasions. By making use of the students’ interest in the camera, I was able to entice them to “perform” (participate) thereby eliciting jokes, storytelling and games. The students’ interest in the camera was also used to collect data directly from their perspective. I made the camera available for the students (other than those trained to record for me) to use on a variety of occasions, especially dances and parties. Students taped whatever they found to be of interest and/or importance. This provided me with a unique opportunity to see parts of the world directly through their eyes. It also provided me with a unique opportunity to observe visual “narration” by the camera operator. Finally, knowing that I was recording various events, on a number of occasions students informed me that something was occurring or was about to occur that I should be sure to videotape as it was “deaf culture”.

Other concerns that arose with video recording were related to practical aspects. One such concern was regarding the availability of equipment. Even though an 8mm camera (which is much smaller and lighter weight than a VHS camera) was
used, the equipment was heavy and awkward to carry continuously. Therefore, there were unanticipated moments when I found myself desiring the ability to record but without my equipment. As a result, much of what was recorded comes from anticipation and planning. That which was unanticipated yet recorded was the result of student taping. A second concern is in regards to the actual act of recording. As mentioned previously, during the formal interviews with deaf students, three cameras were used. Each was on a stationary tripod. This kind of clear, high quality recording, however, was rare. Far more common were situations in which the participants were moving or were not facing the camera (had their back’s or side’s turned toward the camera). The quality of recordings was also effected by others walking past the camera lens, lack of control of lighting (especially for example during dances when the lights were turned down low), and unsteadiness holding the camera for long periods of time.

The use of audio recording was not without issue as well. While this is a far more established technique in ethnographic research, it is not fool proof. At issue in this particular study was the quality of the recordings. This was effected in large part by the recording instrument itself. As I was not planning to do audio recording, a micro-cassette recorder was purchased for my own dictation purposes. It ended up being employed for interviews with the college students. Two problems presented themselves as a product of the sensitivity of the microphone. When placed between myself and the interviewee, the microphone favored one speaker over the other as it was not a multidirectional microphone. As a result, I became conscious to place the
microphone closer to the interviewee since the majority of my own questions had been scripted and could be filled in as need be. I was also careful to remind the interviewees to speak clearly and with adequate volume. The second problem was the presence of a mechanical hum (believed to be the heating/cooling system on the roof) which was undetectable to the unaided ear but clearly within the recording range of the microphone. There was no apparent resolution to the hum as I was unable to relocate for the interviews and adjustments on the recorder itself were of no help. As a result, transcription of these tapes was a cumbersome, though not impossible, task.

These above discussed general ethnographic methods resulted in data that would ultimately be used to answer both primary research questions, though they were actually aimed at two of the secondary questions ("what does deaf culture look like" and "what is the role of interaction in culture transmission and learning"). Participant observation and observation, together, allowed for collection of the majority of the data on interaction. These two methods also provided a validity check for the data that was collected through the use of interviews and other reporting methods (such as the scrapbooks, discussed below) by comparison of actual behavior, values and beliefs to that which was reported. The interviews, both formal and informal, provided data primarily in regards to deaf culture. Recording of events proved to be a most valuable method in that it provided data regarding both interaction and deaf culture. At the same time, through close (and repeated) observation of recorded behavior in relation to reported behavior, values, and beliefs, recording, provided a validity check for the deaf culture data.
Each of the above discussed general methods, as well as the specific methods discussed below, was supplemented by the use of fieldnotes. “Fieldnotes are accounts describing experiences and observations the researcher has made while participating in an intense and involved manner” (Emerson, Fretz and Shaw 1995:4, original emphasis). Fieldnotes were written on a daily basis. Initially these were written by hand, as I did not have access to a computer early in the fieldwork. The final five months of fieldnotes were written on a computer. Writing of expanded fieldnotes (employing complete sentences and descriptions which were as complete as possible) occurred predominantly at the end of the day (when the students were in bed) or the following morning after breakfast while the students were in class and I was not scheduled to observe. Expanded fieldnotes were written based on brief notes (jottings) which were taken during interviews and other events, as it proved feasible. On some occasions these jottings were nothing more than a word or two that would serve as a memory jogger for writing the expanded notes after the fact. On occasions where I was acting only as an observer, more complete notes were taken as the observation was occurring. As previously mentioned, the fieldnotes (at both stages, jottings and expanded) were written in English, my native language, rather than in ASL which has no written form.

This manner of operating generated additional methodological issues. All notes that indicate ASL dialogue appear in the fieldnotes as a translation rather than as direct quotes. This difficulty could be overcome to a degree in those instances when interactions were videotaped, in which case direct transcriptions utilizing conventions
within the field of sign language linguistics were possible. However, reporting them in print remains problematic, as one must decide between either the complex transcription or a translation. The translation difficulty is not an issue unique to this study. Berreman (1968) and Sherzer (1983) discuss similar issues for spoken languages. Sherzer resolves the issue in his own work by presenting both the native terminology (in brackets) and the translation within single quotes. "In this way the reader is reminded that 'chief' stands for [sakla] and that the connotations of the English word do not operate for the Kuna" (1983:19). Berreman (1968) prefers to admit that the translation problem is unsolvable and to strive for the best possible approximations. While Sherzer's approach is appealing and successful for spoken language, my own resolution of the problem in this study follows Berreman more closely. Where quotations from students are presented, they are acknowledged as translations and enclosed with single quotation marks. This solution is a practical one.

As previously mentioned, my fieldnotes were written in English. They were written primarily after the fact and do not include direct quotations recorded according to conventional transcription (which requires an immense amount of time and close study). As a result, it is not possible for me to represent a great deal of my data in this more precise manner. Secondarily, this study is not designed to be highly linguistic in nature. It is designed to address interaction of all sorts. While language is certainly a part of the vast majority of interactions, it is not necessary to the questions posed by this study to look closely at the specific linguistic structure of the language as it is used. With this in mind it is unnecessary to do more than make the acknowledgement
suggested by Berreman (1968) for even a simplified version of the conventions for representing ASL discourse is quite complex and awkward for the reader. In addition, the use of a simplified version of the conventions, while perhaps slightly less lacking than a simple translation, is still lacking.

Specific Ethnographic Methods

Along with the general ethnographic methods discussed above, some specific methods were used (Figure Five). In the gathering of data pertaining to deaf culture, two specific ethnographic methods were used: maps and semantic domains. Social networks were used in the collection of data regarding interactions. Ethnographers commonly use each of these specific methods. In addition to these, a number of methods were generated in response to the specifics of this research setting. These included a language/identity stimulus videotape, a photography “assignment”, scrapbooks and the showing of a videotaped student theatrical production with a follow-up discussion. Each of the methods generated on site were aimed at the collection of deaf culture data.

Maps are very commonly used in ethnographic research. In this study, maps were made of the general layout of the campus. These maps indicated a division of campus based on age segregation. In addition, maps were made of the specific layouts of classrooms, meeting rooms, dorms, cafeterias, playgrounds, etc. These specific layouts were reflective of the importance of clear sightlines within the culture as they show seating arrangements in circles or semi-circles.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>METHOD</th>
<th>FOCUS</th>
<th>GROUP SIZE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maps</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnographic Interviews (Semantic Domains)</td>
<td>High school, college</td>
<td>One-on-one, small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language/Identity Videotapes</td>
<td>Elementary, High school, college</td>
<td>One-on-one, small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photographs</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photographs</td>
<td>high school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scrapbooks</td>
<td>Elementary, college</td>
<td>Individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student theatre production</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>Small group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Networks</td>
<td>Elementary, high school</td>
<td>One-on-one, small and large groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection of printed materials</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5: Specific Ethnographic Methods Utilized

The second specific method used follows Spradley’s (1979) book, “The Ethnographic Interview”. In this text, Spradley advocates for the use of a particular type of interviewing designed to elicit terms people use to describe their world. Relationships between the terms that are elicited are then established through further interviewing. These relationships become the basis for a discussion of semantic domains, or group classifications, that are employed by the people. In this way, the worldview and systems of meanings of a culture can be discovered. I utilized this type of interview on a limited scale using terms identified in my fieldnotes that appeared to be unique to this culture. These interviews began in December and continued through February. All of the possible terms and domains were not included as the original
interviews were based on data collected prior to December, that is, within the first three months of the study. In order to maintain comparability in responses, the terms were not updated as the research progressed.

This type of interviewing proved to be a bit difficult. When inquiring as to meanings or relationships in ASL, it was not uncommon for me to be given the English spelling of terms rather than the meaning or relationship. This may have been caused by a number of factors including my hearing status and awkwardness at asking these types of questions in ASL. As a result, the interviews were begun using English (in a written form) rather than ASL. The terms (as I would translate them into English) were written on index cards and presented to the students. The students were asked to sort the index cards into piles of similar terms. Upon completion of the sort, students were interviewed, in ASL, as to why they created the groups they did, how they would label each group, and, when appropriate, what separated one group from another (what were the boundaries).

While the results of this interview technique were useful for understanding aspects of deaf culture, it was not entirely successful in this, its original goal. Nonetheless, additional valuable data did result due to an interesting phenomenon that occurred during the conduct of these interviews. As the students completed the task, they were interested in how other students would do the sort. With a student’s permission, those who had completed the task would stay close to observe subsequent sorts. My explanation of what to do became unnecessary in these instances as the students took over this responsibility. The interesting part was in how the explanation
was done. ASL makes use of a great deal of examples when explaining a task. As a
result, those who were doing the explaining would give examples of the types of piles
that might be used. While it is true that their appropriate use of the language made for
a much clearer explanation than my own, it also appeared to have an effect on some of
the choices that were made. Those categories that were suggested during the
explanation almost invariably appeared in the subsequent sort. Another interesting
phenomenon that occurred was reflective of the emphasis placed on the group in deaf
culture. Again, in situations where others were permitted to observe, it was extremely
common for group discussions to occur while the sort was going on. Discussions
revolved around why a particular card was placed where it was, where it might belong,
and what the term on the card meant (what was the sign for it). These last two topics
of discussion occurred primarily when the student doing the sort was unsure as to the
meaning of the word on the card. The observers, rather than the student doing the sort,
initiated the first topic of discussion. On a few occasions discussion did result in a
new placement of the card (group consensus). While this did not wholly satisfy the
original goal of the activity, and, in fact, likely skewed those results, it provided
opportunity for the collection of additional data on interactions. This additional data
came through observation: of the explanation of the task, the interactions involved in
the playing out of the task, and the "teaching" that occurred in the discussions.

A third specific method, recording of social networks, was used particularly for
the study of interaction. Social networks are defined as the variable interpersonal
contacts that an individual has. Social networks can be used not only to identify the
range of individuals with which one interacts but also preferred relationships and frequency of interactions. Social networks at the deaf school were recorded through observation (of live events and recorded events). Seating choices were recorded at meal times. Playmates and cliques were observed and noted during freetimes and special events. Sweethearts were also noted. These associations were monitored for change over time, if any.

Methods Generated "On site"

In keeping true to the interactive-reactive nature of ethnography discussed above, a number of methods were generated on site and in response to the specifics of the culture.

In both the literature and in my fieldwork experience, ASL was named as a central, defining characteristic of deaf culture. In fact, I observed (and was subject to) judgments about an individual’s hearing status and place within the culture that were made at first meeting based solely upon ASL usage. Over time, however, I began to question the efficacy of such judgments. I also began to question what ASL was conceived to be. My questioning of the efficacy of ASL usage as a predictor of hearing status was prompted in part by my having been incorrectly judged. Upon first meeting Rashad, a male senior, he was certain that I was deaf and in fact felt discombobulated upon finding out that I was not. In addition, there were a number of times when I would ask a student about a visitor’s hearing status and the student was unsure. Likewise, the question “are you deaf?” is a common part of the ritual upon meeting someone for the first time if it is absent from the introduction in other ways
(such as identification of school affiliation). My questioning of student definitions of ASL was also prompted by their discussions with me about individuals who were competent ASL users. I noticed that some of the individuals identified by the students did not use language that fit my conception of ASL (a linguistic, academic conception).

In order to explore these questions further and to understand these aspects of deaf culture from a more emic perspective, I developed two language/identity video stimulus tapes. Each tape consisted of six (6) individuals telling stories. Each of the storytellers was given free-reign as to story selection and length. Likewise, they were given no instruction that the telling must occur in ASL. Half of the storytellers were deaf and half were hearing. The stories were recorded in a random order. Students were shown the tape (requiring about 30 minutes of time) and asked to identify each storyteller as deaf or hearing. They were also asked to identify the language that was used. Students were questioned after each story regarding the bases for their choices.

The language/identity stimulus video was used with the elementary and high school students, as well as the college students. Students were highly interested in whether they were right or wrong in their answers. They were told that I could not answer as to who was using which language because that was what I was learning from them, however, I did reveal hearing status for each storyteller. The greatest drawback to this method was the time involved. Thirty minutes is a long period of time when it is taken from the only hour and a half of free time available to students. As a result, fewer students were willing to take the time and watch the video than I
would have liked. In addition, it was intended that one tape would be used early in the study and the other near the end of the year, in order to see if the criteria used for identification had changed over time for any of the students, particularly those who were new to deaf culture. Only the first tape was used with the ISD students. The second was not used due to the fact that the time issue was compounded as the school year came to a close accompanied by numerous special activities. Nonetheless, the second videotape was used with the college students prior to the end of their field experience.

A second method generated on site was used only with the elementary students and the college students. This method was designed to determine what each of these groups of students thought of when they thought of deaf culture. Students were each given a scrapbook and asked to include in it drawings, pictures, stories, etc. of things that deaf people cherish. This activity was described to dorm supervisors and parents so that they could encourage the students to complete it. When the scrapbooks were completed, each student was interviewed about its contents. Two of the girls' dorms completed the activity, as did the college students. I was unsuccessful, however, in getting this type of data from the elementary boys.

Rather than ask the high school students to do scrapbooks, I was given permission from the photography teacher to give his class an “assignment”. I asked them to take photographs of people, places, things that represent deaf culture for them or that deaf people cherish. They were given class time to complete the assignment and equipment that could be borrowed from the school. The class consisted of ten
(10) students. Unfortunately, this assignment was given near the end of the year when the students were busy trying to complete prior assignments and a major project for the schoolwide open house. Only three students provided me with photographs. Again, these students were interviewed as to their choices.

The final method that was unique to this setting was used only with the college students due to scheduling difficulties for the ISD students. In 1993, ISD students wrote and preformed a play entitled "PAH-side Story", an adaptation of "West-side Story". The play depicts conflicts between deaf and hearing cultures. The play was so well received that it was recorded for possible national distribution through Dawn Sign Press, a publishing company that specializes in sign language and deaf culture materials. I was fortunate enough to have access to a copy of the video from ISD's own files. I showed this video to the college students and then held a group discussion regarding their reactions to the portrayal of deaf culture (and hearing culture). I had intended to host a similar event for the ISD students, however, I was unable to arrange a time with the Dean of Students.

DATA ANALYSIS

Due to the variable methods used in collection, data existed in a number of forms. The majority existed in the form of daily fieldnotes. There also existed inventories of photographs; a collection of scrapbooks; worksheets of responses to the ethnographic interview (semantic domain card sort) and responses to the language/identity video stimulus; cafeteria seating charts; maps; and numerous audio and videotapes.
These various forms of data created the need for some pre-analytical work. Initially, beginning in the field and continuing throughout the research, all of the data was cataloged. This was particularly important in the case of the videotapes that contained numerous events. As data was collected, individuals were given either a coded number or a "name" for association purposes within the fieldnotes. During the analysis, and in preparation for writing, these identifications were altered so that pseudonyms, used throughout this writing, were assigned to each participant. While the school was not particularly ethnically diverse, care was taken to respect the diversity that did exist when assigning pseudonyms. In addition, each of the audio and videotapes needed to be transcribed. Transcription of the audiotapes was fairly straightforward. Complications were found due to the quality of the recordings (discussed previously) and occasional code switching from spoken English to ASL, which was reflected in silence on the audiotape. These switches had been noted during the interview and so it was possible to fill them in as appropriate.

Transcription of the videotapes was more involved due to the lack of a written form of ASL (also previously discussed). As a result, each videotape was initially interpreted onto audiotape in spoken English. These audiotapes were then transcribed. Full ASL transcriptions were not employed as the linguistic specificity they provide was not deemed necessary for this study (see prior discussion). All tapes were preserved, thereby allowing for full ASL transcriptions at a later date if necessary.
Two primary research questions were posed for this study. Each was
accompanied by secondary questions which were themselves accompanied by tertiary
questions that were generated by a specific theoretical framework. All of the
questions posed are interrelated (see Appendix A). The secondary questions posed
around the first research question (how is deaf culture transmitted/learned) are key for
they lay the groundwork for answering each of the other questions. As a result, the
methods of data collection (discussed above) were determined in regards to the
secondary questions, “what does American deaf culture look like” and “what is the
role of interaction in culture transmission/learning”. Likewise, analysis began with
these two questions. The second of these questions was explored through application
of the ethnography of communication as a framework for analysis. The “answers” to
these two questions in turn allowed for an “answer” to the first primary research
question. The second primary research question, comparing the acculturative and
enculturative experiences, is addressed entirely at the analytic level. Once “answers”
were found to all questions related to the first primary research question, the second
primary research question could be addressed using the same body of data but
applying new questions generated by the legitimate peripheral participation framework
and Hall’s types of learning. Thus, analysis proceeded in stages of question
“answering”.

In each stage, analysis proceeded the “old-fashioned” way, by hand. Index
cards were created with a code indicated on one side of each. On the reverse side,
each instance of occurrence in the notes, video, etc. was recorded. A set of cards was
created for deaf culture data and each component of SPEAKING that was being closely explored (settings, events, participants, and genres). In each set, the coded cards were subsequently grouped into similar “content” and relational trees were generated. The cards could then be manipulated, physically, for comparison purposes. The index cards were color-coded (a different color for deaf culture and each component in the SPEAKING mnemonic) for ease in this comparison. The instances of occurrence recorded on the back were also color-coded based on the source of the data (ex. notes, video) which also provided ease in comparison, location of the occurrence in the notes, and opportunity for triangulation, a validity test comparing multiple sources.

In determining if there is a deaf culture and what it looks like, data from participant observation, observation, formal interviews, informal interviews, scrapbooks, and photographs were initially examined. Coding identified material culture, behaviors, beliefs, values, adaptations to the “deaf” environment (that is a visual, rather than auditory, environment), social organization and hierarchy, political organization, cultural representations, and identity and boundary marking. Patterns revealing three primary components (identity, language and the visual nature of the culture) and two secondary components (the role of sound and the tactile nature of the culture) were identified in the relational trees (see Chapter Four for a more in-depth discussion). These findings were upheld by the results of the ethnographic interviews.
(semantic domains). The index cards used in this stage of analysis were later manipulated and used in the analysis of interaction to identify what was being learned (content).

As interaction is the larger focus of this dissertation, the analysis of interaction data was more involved. The data was first coded according to key components of the mnemonic SPEAKING from the ethnography of communication framework as reflected in the tertiary questions I posed (communication events, setting, participants, act sequences (content), and genres). Communication events and settings noted throughout the fieldnotes and videotapes were coded initially. Settings were grouped in three different manners: formal vs. informal, adult vs. child directed and based on group size (one-to-one, small group, large group). Next, the various genres and participants were coded. Genres were identified and coded according to the students’ signs for various types of interaction. They were noted on the index cards and reported in this dissertation, utilizing the best English translation possible. The index cards used in the analysis of deaf culture data were employed here as act sequences (content).

Once coded, the index cards were manipulated in order to explore the tertiary questions. In some cases this was a fairly straightforward process requiring no manipulation of cards. For example, the types of communication events that learners found themselves in were easily established by reviewing the index cards. A chart listing the various events and the relative frequency of their occurrence was readily created. In most cases, however, the data set required additional sorting and multiple
manipulations of the cards. For example, questions regarding participation (and restrictions to such) were explored by manipulation of the participant cards.

Participant cards were first re-examined to supplement and confirm social network data. They were then sorted into “message sender” and “message receiver” groupings so that an individual’s role in interactions could be explored along with participation in general. In addition, they were grouped according to degree of experience at the school (new deaf, established deaf, and college students). The participant cards, both as representing individuals and as grouped above, were crossed with communication events and settings to determine if any patterns of restriction to participation existed.

Participant cards were also crossed with the genre cards to determine the types of interactions experienced by each group of students, as well as by individuals. Finally, participant cards were crossed with the deaf culture cards to determine if there were any patterns associated with the content each group of students was exposed to.

Similar comparisons were made for each of the various card sets looking for patterns of relationships in regards to the tertiary questions. For example, tertiary questions regarding genre were explored by crossing the genre cards with the event cards, the deaf culture cards, and participant cards.

Charts, frequency counts and/or relational trees were produced as a result of each manipulation of the cards (some of which will be subsequently presented in association to relevant discussion). As a check to reliability and validity, patterns that were identified through one data collection method were compared for similar patterns found through other methods throughout the analysis. For example, patterns noted in
the photographs taken by high school students were compared with patterns noted in
the elementary scrapbooks and with interview data, etc. In this way, it is with greater
confidence that I can speak of cultural patterns while at the same time identifying
exceptions or divergent views.

These multiple manipulations were essential to exploring the second primary
research question, determining similarity and difference in the enculturative and
acculturative experience. To explore this question, the data was re-analyzed through
two additional sets of secondary questions. One set organized around the concept of
legitimate peripheral participation. The other, organized around three types of
learning. A set of cards was created that coded interactions according to each type of
learning. These cards were then crossed with the participant cards which had been
coded by groups resulting in a chart indicating the relative frequency of each type of
learning associated with each group. Similar charts were generated by comparison of
type of learning with genres and culture content. Questions regarding peripheral
participation were explored largely through a second analysis of participants looking
closely at changes in participation over time, restrictions (to events, settings,
interlocutors, genres, and content).

The same process was used to explore the question of similarity and difference
in the acculturative experience of deaf and hearing learners as was used to address the
second primary research question. In this last stage, the same questions were asked,
however, the groups were hearing learners and deaf learners rather than groups based
on experience with the school.
Having thus established the theoretical and methodological background for this study, it becomes possible to discuss and critically examine the findings. The patterns that appeared as a result of analysis are reported in the pages that follow. Where applicable, excerpts from the fieldnotes and interview transcripts have been included to provide support for the validity of the reported findings.

1 The deaf club is another "geographic territory" that can be said to be associated with deaf culture (see Hall 1991). Deaf clubs can be found in most major metropolitan cities with large deaf populations. Residential deaf schools can be found in most states. Also see Wrigley (1996) for a discussion of the "geographic territory" of deaf culture.

2 This may occur at any level of schooling (elementary, secondary, or post-secondary). State residential deaf schools typically provide elementary and secondary education. Students may enroll at any age level. Post-secondary education is not considered directly to be responsible for enculturation/acculturation, however, it is not entirely unusual for a deaf individual to "discover" and "learn" deaf culture at Gallaudet University, the world's only liberal arts university exclusively for the deaf.

3 The past two decades have seen a decline in enrollment at residential deaf schools. The decline may be accounted for by a general trend in deaf education that began in the 1970's, mainstreaming. Mainstreaming, that is enrollment of students with various disabilities in the local public schools, became something of a standard practice as the result of legislation, specifically Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 and Public Law 94-142 (the Education for All Handicapped Children Act, 1975 - this law was re-authorized in 1990 as Public Law 101-476 and is referred to as the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)). Such legislation calls for education in the "least restrictive environment". Interpretation of the law as it regards the "least restrictive environment" for a free, and appropriate education, has often been seen as an endorsement for mainstreaming deaf children rather than enrolling them in the residential deaf school (The Commission on Education of the Deaf 1988; National Center for Law and the Deaf 1984). Increased availability of interpreters for educational settings has also been a contributing factor in this decline.

4 The superintendent of the school at the time of consideration and selection was deaf. The summer before fieldwork commenced, he stepped down from the position being replaced on an interim basis by a hearing man. The position remained interim throughout my research. As of September 1996, the interim superintendent has been appointed as the official superintendent of the school.

5 It is widely accepted in local lore that William Willard was the first superintendent of the deaf school and therefore the first deaf superintendent. Historical documents, however, show that he was never officially appointed superintendent although he provided leadership in such a capacity during the first year of the school's existence (Whisman 1988). Those who would count Willard as superintendent would count 12 superintendents in the school's history, 9 of whom have been hearing.

6 Other general factors for declining enrollments have been previously noted.
This change in philosophy was influenced by action taken at the World Congress on the Education of the Deaf in Milan, Italy, 1880. At that Congress, it was determined that deaf education ought to be done through spoken rather than signed language.

It is important to note that during the oral period at the school, sign language continued to be used in the upper most grades. It was also always used in the dorms. The only exception that was noted was the elementary dorm in which signing was not permitted. In fact, a separate elementary dorm was constructed in order to keep the young students from interacting with those who signed. (Judith Carson, personal communication).

Sign Language classes for parents were first offered through the PTCO (Parent Teacher Counselor Organization) as early as 1963. It was not until the introduction of Total Communication as the official educational philosophy that the school, itself, endorsed and sponsored sign language classes.

This rough outline of educational philosophies was determined through personal communication with Bill Coffey, ISD parent-infant coordinator and school history “expert” and Judith Carson, former ISD teacher and coordinator of the Vincennes University Sign Language Studies program.

Enrollment past the age of eighteen is possible only if the student is showing benefit from the program.

The figure remains approximate due to fluctuations during the year. It is possible for a student to enroll or withdraw at ISD any time during the year. Naturally, enrollments in the last month or so of the year are discouraged. As a result of this flexible enrollment option, the exact number of students could fluctuate on any given date. This figure is also approximate due to the school’s own data keeping. I was unable to easily access information on enrollment figures or other demographic information that I considered to be important such as parental hearing status.

Note, however, the exception that was discussed above in the earlier history of the school.

The experience of an open-captioned movie is much like that of a sub-titled foreign film. The dialogue is presented in written form across the bottom of the screen.

Signed forms of English became popular in the 1970’s. There are a number of different signed forms of English: Seeing Essential English (Anthony 1971), Signing Exact English (Gustason, et al. 1972), Linguistics of Visual English (Wampler 1972) and Signed English (Bornstein 1975). All of these systems use ASL signs as their base and follow English syntax. The various systems differ from each other in the amount and type of modification made to the ASL signs that are used as a base. Students refer to these signed forms of English collectively as “sign with speech”.

Another exchange student, Maureen, was also able to provide some cross-cultural insight, though to a lesser extent.

I define “independent interaction” as that which occurs outside of the classroom, particularly in a “deaf environment” such as the deaf club, deaf school or a deaf sponsored event where a multiple number of deaf individuals are present. All of these students did have deaf ASL instructors. As a result, their experience had been limited to interacting in a controlled environment with a single Deaf individual who was very adept at handling interactions with hearing individuals who are just beginning to sign.
This was possible due to my fluency in the languages of the community. Fluency was gained prior to the onset of this particular research through college training, socialization with deaf people, and work as a sign language interpreter.

Note that this range of settings is not the full range of possible settings as there were those to which I was not admitted. Likewise, the table indicates the major settings. These have not been broken down into specifics, such as which particular classroom, however this data is accessible.

Others have also found the informal interview to be particularly valuable (see for example, Fetterman 1989).

It is probably worthy of note that while interactions with the deaf students were all recorded on video, the microphone on the camera was never turned off. As a result, there is an accompanying audio portion to the videotape that allows for some examination of the use of sound within deaf culture.

I was anticipating using the recorder to "jot" notes to myself and to record the "interpretation" of videotapes as one part of the transcription process.

The following is the description required to allow the reader to make sense of the simplified version of conventions used by Johnson and Erting (1989). "The occurrence of a sign is represented by a simple gloss in upper-case. This gloss is not a smooth, syntactically well-formed translation into English but merely a label in English for the sign that occurred. If several variants of a sign are used in an exchange, subscripts distinguish them. An underscored upper-case gloss indicated the occurrence of a sign from an English signing system, for example, Is. Glosses preceded by # are signs that have been lexicalized from fingerspelling. Upper-case letters separated by hyphen indicate fingerspelling. Speech is indicated by text in italics. If speech co-occurs with signing, it appears directly below the signed text. Parenthetical notations provide additional descriptions of ongoing events, for example, the occurrence of gestural deictics. Square brackets are used to enclose clarifications of particular signs. Finally, translations of the signing appear directly below the signed text and are framed by single quotation marks. These accompanying translations into well-formed or fluent English sentences are intended to complement the more abbreviated sign glosses, which make the actual linguistic events appear impoverished. What we observed was, in fact, rich with nonmanual grammatical markers, inflections, located signing, and other features difficult to represent in written textual format" (71). It is these last features that are left out of the transcription which account for this being a simplified version. In a full, formal transcription, these would be indicated on a line above the sign gloss. A third line located above this would indicate accompanying mouth movements (see Lucas and Valli 1992).

Note also that during those first three months I was unable to collect data for two and a half weeks due to illness.

In the event that a student was unfamiliar with the English term, I would demonstrate the sign that I had associated with the term. This happened on rare occasion.

Writing was also selected for this activity because I was particularly interested in the students' perceptions of the distinction between "deaf" and "Deaf" found in the literature. The cards were then used to elicit any difference in the sign for the two written versions of "deaf".

This was of particular interest, again, in the labels used for groups of people: deaf, Deaf, hard of hearing, hearing impaired, and hearing.
Originally a numerical code was developed to identify individuals. The code for students involved three digits that would identify parental hearing status and number of years enrollment at the school. A similar code was employed for adults, however, the initial digit would reflect the hearing status of the individual rather than his/her parents. This system quickly gave way to abbreviated “names” (such as GS, DJ, and Queen) as the numbers were unnatural and thereby difficult to remember. It should also be noted that the “names” assigned in the working fieldnotes were not simply the initials of individuals, but rather my own type of mnemonic.

As a nationally certified interpreter (through the Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf, Inc.), I did the interpretations myself.
CHAPTER 4
DEAF CULTURE: A DESCRIPTION

Prior to addressing the primary research question "how is American deaf culture transmitted/learned", it is necessary to explore the culture of interest in greater depth and to answer the secondary question "what does American deaf culture look like". Thus, this chapter expands upon Chapter Two's argument for the existence of an American deaf culture by providing a more detailed ethnographic description of its particularities. The chapter seeks to emphasize the particularities of deaf culture as it manifests itself at the Indiana School for the Deaf (ISD), while presenting relevant literature on the culture in general. It is acknowledged that American deaf culture is not homogeneous and that, based on the age range of students, exposure to every aspect of the culture does not occur at school. What follows, therefore, is a somewhat concise overview of American deaf culture, again, with emphasis on its manifestation at ISD.

American deaf culture has been described in numerous ways and indeed in book length monographs. I have chosen to present this description in concise form following the framework for discussion of culture that is commonly found in introductory cultural anthropology textbooks: outlining values, beliefs and norms of behavior. This is not to
discount other ways of describing a culture or to privilege any specific definition of culture. This framework was chosen because it seemed to most clearly organize a great deal of information in a succinct, readable and readily understood manner.

Three key components were identified in my data as central to an understanding of the culture: identity, language and the visual nature of the group. I argue that these three components reflect the primary values of deaf culture. Norms of behavior, beliefs, and material culture revolve around these key components (values). Two secondary components, the role of sound and the tactile, were also found in this research. Norms of behavior were found to be associated with the secondary components, however, neither beliefs nor material culture were found in association with these components.

KEY COMPONENTS

Language

I begin with language, as it is most prominent both in my own findings and in the literature. Language, in this case American Sign Language (ASL), is a key marker of identity. Use of ASL is the basis for judgments regarding in-group/out-group status. As such, it is also fundamental to the experience of legitimate peripheral participation (see Chapter Six). The importance of ASL is underscored by its status at ISD, as the official language of instruction. In addition to being the language of instruction, it is the predominant language used in interpersonal interactions (see Chapter Three). Finally, there are a number of beliefs about American Sign Language that are held by members of the culture (see below).
While the prominence of ASL noted here is consistent with findings in the literature on American deaf culture (see Chapter Two), it is important to reiterate that, as is true with spoken languages (see Gumperz 1982:21), the perception and labeling of ASL that I found on campus is not entirely congruent with linguists’ descriptions and labeling of the language. The earliest linguistic research on ASL described it in terms of cheremes, allochers, morphochers, and syntax, where cheremes and allochers were the visual equivalent to phonemes and allophones (Stokoe 1960; Stokoe, et.al. 1965). This early research also provided a system for writing signs modeled after the phonetic alphabet of linguistics. In Stokoe, et.al’s (1965) cheremic model, place of articulation is indicated by the tabula or tab, while manner of articulation is indicated by a combination of designator (dez - the active hand) and signation (sig - the action made by the hand). Additional diacritics are used to make the writing more explicit, for example to indicate repetitive movement, or two active hands. Their discussion of the syntax of ASL identified such features as directional verbs, time indication as “sentence or utterance rather than a verb matter” (Ibid: 282), and general to specific sequencing. While this early research was designed to highlight the differences between spoken and signed languages, subsequent and current research have adopted traditional linguistic terminology. American Sign Language today is described according to phonology, morphology, syntax and semantics (see Valli and Lucas 1995). Valli and Lucas (1995) detail additional linguistic features of the language such as the morphology of location (use of space), classifiers, and topicalization (“placement of the object at the beginning of the sentence...is very common in ASL” (Valli and Lucas 1995:132)). In contrast, the
students used a different, overwhelmingly non-linguistic, set of criteria in making judgments regarding the language being used by storytellers\(^3\). They identify signing as ASL based on fluidity of signs, speed, and lack of mouth movement. Ease of understanding, vocabulary (i.e. specific signs), facial expressions, and role switching were also reported, though only a single instance of each was noted\(^4\). This difference in means of identifying ASL should not, however, be misconstrued to invalidate or discount the existence and importance of this language to deaf people.

The function of ASL as determinant of in-group/out-group identification is of paramount importance. This function was reflected in comments such as ‘we use ASL here’; implying that if one wants to be part of the “we” one will use ASL. The most telling example of this function can be found in a previously cited interaction, my meeting of Rashad. I joined a conversation already in progress between him and Amy, a hearing college student. Amy introduced Rashad and myself, however, not being fully versed in the norms for introductions, Amy neglected to mention or provide clues to my hearing status. Rashad made a judgment based on my ability to converse in ASL. He determined that I was deaf. A while later in the conversation he discovered that I was in fact hearing. He was taken aback and stated that he ‘felt discombobulated’. He further stated that he thought we shared a commonality (ME-SAME-YOU, was the sign that he used) based on language use, however, knowing now that we did not share this commonality he felt he could no longer trust me\(^5\). This was a key moment in our relationship that he would reiterate to various others throughout the year. He and I would also return to this moment for discussion on several occasions. This example is
far richer than it appears at this point for it conveys a great deal of cultural content.
marks my peripherality, is used as a baseline by which to measure movement towards
full participation, and establishes a boundary that I can not cross. Thus, I will return to
this example several times in subsequent discussions.

Accompanying the predominance and value of ASL are a number of beliefs
about the language itself and its relationship to English, particularly spoken English.
The first belief is that ASL is a bonafide language. In fact, it is believed to be the
natural language of deaf people. As a result, it should be learned first, ideally from
infancy, with English being a second language. In concert with this belief is the belief
that education for deaf children should be done in ASL. These beliefs were reflected in
pins being sold at basketball games. The pins declared "The DEAF'S first language
ASL". These beliefs are also reflected in a profile of the school that was inserted in
prospective student information packets. This profile explained the school's philosophy
in the following manner: "For most Deaf (sic) students, American Sign Language is the
accessible, dominant language used for communication and thinking, while English is
learned as a second language" (emphasis mine). In addition, the profile states that "the
school and dormitory staff are committed to providing a Bilingual/Bicultural
environment where the language of instruction is American Sign Language (ASL)
(emphasis mine)."

In terms of its relationship to English, as has been alluded to, it is believed that
ASL is better or, at least, more important for deaf people. Therefore, speech is
inappropriate as is sign simultaneously accompanied by speech. Moreover, in a
conversion of the popular (hearing) wisdom that if you sign to a deaf child the child will not learn to speak, it is believed that if you speak to an individual learning ASL they will not be able to learn the language. This belief is demonstrated by an admonition given to me by a dorm supervisor while I was attending a sporting event with one of the hearing college students early in the year. We were using sign accompanied by speech to converse with each other. I noticed the dorm supervisor watching us from across the gymnasium. He was shaking his head negatively. I asked “WHAT”? He responded that this form of communication was forbidden because ‘hearing won’t learn sign’ in this manner, they will rely on speech and hearing. He continued and informed me that if I wanted to teach her well then I should “TURN-OFF-VOICE”. A similar sentiment was relayed between two deaf dorm supervisors later in the year. In this instance one of the supervisors is communicating to a hearing college student by voice (speech). He is admonished by the other supervisor not to do this because ‘she must learn’. This conversion is also reflective of the “deaf center” (as compared to the majority “hearing centered” perspective) which Padden and Humphries (1988) describe.

The aforementioned value and beliefs regarding ASL result in a diglossic situation in which ASL is the norm for all in-group personal interactions and English, primarily written English, is reserved for the classroom, telephone communication (via TTY), written communications and interactions with hearing people⁶. An exception to the norm calling for the use of ASL in personal interactions is found if the interlocutor is deemed an “outsider” (either deaf or hearing). In this case, the norm is to maintain in-group boundaries by code switching to some form of English⁷.
Identity

The second key component of deaf culture is identity. This too, is a component of the culture that is frequently found in the literature and was quite prominent in my own study. As with any discussion of identity, there is a great deal of complexity to be found here, only the basics of which I will touch on in this discussion. Part of the complexity is due to the fact that a deaf identity is neither simply ascribed nor achieved. It is rather a combination of the two, with perhaps greater emphasis on the achieved aspect. In addition, as with identity in general, one's own perceived identity and that attributed to one by others may be dissimilar, again as a result of the achieved nature.

This aspect of the culture is often broken down into, and discussed as, an overly simplified deaf-hearing dichotomy. This dichotomy is only the tip of the iceberg, so to speak. It is the broadest, most apparent manifestation of identity: one is either deaf or one is hearing. At this level, identity is ascribed. It is dependent upon the existence of a hearing loss. If such loss is present then one is deaf, otherwise, one is hearing. While this distinction is overly simplified, it is functionally a very important one for the culture as it is the point of reference for a great many judgments and value decisions. Again, I turn to the example of my first meeting with Rashad. While I was identified as deaf, there was an assumption of similarity, of shared values and beliefs. The interaction was comfortable. Upon discovery of my true identity as a hearing person, there was a shift in assumptions. I became untrustworthy, suspicious, and uncomfortable due to a lack of shared experiences, values and beliefs.
Within the broader deaf identity there are several more specific identities. These identities include the culturally deaf (STRONG-DEAF, or DEAF (with puffed cheek), often represented in the literature with a capital D - Deaf), deaf of deaf (GENERATION-DEAF), hard of hearing (LITTLE-BIT HARD-OF-HEARING, meaning a little hard of hearing or STRONG HARD-OF-HEARING, meaning very hard of hearing), and THINK-HEARING\textsuperscript{9}. These identities are related along a continuum of sorts that, returning to the larger deaf/hearing distinction, is based on the distance from a hearing identity. The further from a hearing identity, the more positive, the more culturally deaf. Judgments such as these are what Padden and Humphries (1988) speak of when describing a “deaf center”.

Identity at this level, that is within the broader deaf identity, is achieved. It is based on behavior and attitude rather than on hearing loss per se. Appropriately deaf behaviors and attitudes include the use of ASL, value of ASL over English, use of TTY, support of all things deaf, attendance at a residential deaf school, participation in deaf social events, political activism for deaf rights, having deaf friends, marrying deaf, etc. Hearing behaviors and attitudes are said to include the use of speech, value of English (especially spoken English) over any signed language, use of a signed form of English, seeing one’s self as superior to deaf people, attending public school (a mainstream education), use of the telephone (by voice), having hearing friends, marrying hearing, etc. The more hearing behaviors and attitudes an individual possesses the further from a culturally deaf identity he/she moves along the continuum and the closer to a hearing identity with accompanied loss of status.
Because identity is achieved in this manner, even finer distinctions of a deaf identity can be found along with conflicting identities as perceived by oneself and as attributed by others. These finer distinctions are based on how deaf one is perceived to be\(^\text{10}\). For example, in conversation with one deaf elementary school teacher I was asked if I had experienced any resistance from the "REBEL" deaf contingent on campus. Based on his description, this identity is bestowed upon those who fight voraciously for deaf rights and are opposed to any involvement by hearing individuals, those who are "very" deaf. In his words, 'they feel like deaf people should not help hearing people, that deaf people should charge $50/hour for consulting fees'. At the other extreme, and as in other minority communities, it is possible to be deaf, though not deaf enough. This was reflected in a discussion about the trials experienced as the school began to explore implementation of the bilingual-bicultural philosophy. It was reported to me that at that time concern was expressed about the deaf studies/ASL teachers being "deaf enough". Two individuals were mentioned. Both had hearing parents, had attended residential deaf school, and used ASL. One had married a deaf spouse, the other a hearing spouse. While neither were considered truly "deaf enough" because of their parents, the individual who had a deaf spouse was more acceptable ("deafer", so to speak) than the other individual as a deaf studies/ASL teacher. For the second deaf studies/ASL teacher, marrying a hearing person belied a truly culturally deaf status in the eyes of others.
This last example is also an example of the potential conflict between self-perceived and other attributed identity. Both of the individuals presented as not quite “deaf enough” consider themselves to be truly, culturally deaf. Another example of the possibility for such conflict is reflected in the statement of Andrea during a panel presentation regarding deaf culture. In a discussion regarding the term “hearing impaired”, Andrea noted that other attributed identities were often based on stereotypic characteristics (‘can speak, uses hearing aid equals hard of hearing’) which may be contrary to how a person identifies him/herself.

The continuum of identities noted above is somewhat reflective of status within the culture. The specifics of the social hierarchy have not been detailed in the literature. Nonetheless, some aspects of status are implicit in Padden and Humphries (1988) chapter entitled “A Different Center”. Reading their chapter reveals that, in its most basic sense, deaf is afforded higher status than hard of hearing, which in turn is of higher status than hearing. Within the deaf identity, higher status is afforded to those from deaf families and those considered to be educated. The lowest status is associated with “peddlers”, those who earn a living by selling small objects (during war time, these objects were Band-Aids, I have personally seen pencils) with an attached card illustrating the American manual alphabet for donations. Within the (lower status) hard of hearing identity, higher status is afforded to those referred to as “deaf but really hard-of-hearing”, for while they are audiometrically hard of hearing their attitudes and behaviors are more closely aligned with the deaf center. In addition, those who are “a little hard of hearing” have higher status than those who are “very hard of hearing”. 11
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Two additional terms of reference are afforded particularly low status: ORAL and THINK-HEARING. "The label HARD-OF-HEARING involves discussion about having characteristics like hearing people, but being called ORAL is a stronger accusation...ORAL represents a misaligned center, the results of having made wrong choices in life" (Padden and Humphries 1988:51). "A trendier accusation...is THINK-HEARING. Its literal meaning is ‘to think and act like a hearing person’” (Ibid: 53).

Aside from its relation to status, identity functions, as does ASL, for boundary marking and maintenance. It effectively delineates the in-group from the out-group, be that deaf from hearing or culturally deaf from “not deaf enough”. At the same time, it works to maintain an acceptable degree of conformity within the in-group. For if one does not conform, then one's status may be lowered and one may become “not deaf enough”. In addition, the fact that a deaf identity carries a strong achieved component allows for the possibility that legitimate peripheral participation is experienced at some time by all, not only those from hearing families (who come to the culture initially as outsiders).

At ISD, there appeared to be a greater emphasis on the over-simplified deaf/hearing identity dichotomy within the communicative realm of the students. This dichotomy was reflected in several projects/assignments. One occasion that I witnessed involved the Honors English class. They were doing an art project in conjunction with their literature readings. The art project was to design a symbol that could be made into a woodblock print. During discussion of symbols, the teacher noted that deaf and hearing symbols existed and wanted to begin a dialogue about these. The degree of
(over) emphasis on this identity dichotomy as perceived by one student was reflected in her comment, “I’m so tired of the deaf/hearing thing”. In another example, a fifth grade language arts project involved writing an acrostic poem utilizing the letters of “Thanksgiving”. One student wrote “hearing idiot” to accompany the letter “h” in his poem. This statement is not only reflective of the existence of the dichotomy but also of an accompanying belief. This same fifth grade class completed another language arts project that required them to create a “Wanted” poster. Included in the vital statistics on each “wanted” individual was hearing status (deaf or hearing). Discussions of the more complex range of identities involved the adults rather than the students. The earlier example of teachers who were not “deaf enough”, for instance, was reported to have taken place during staff meetings, outside of the realm of the students. This may explain, at least in part, the seeming emphasis on the simple deaf/hearing dichotomy among the students.

The social hierarchy among the students at ISD also appeared to be a bit different than that reported in the literature and described above. An established/new student dichotomy appeared to be more salient than a culturally deaf/deaf/hard of hearing differentiation. Status was afforded to established students over new students. Status was further differentiated based on ability to use ASL and attitude. This is most clearly reflected in an interaction where a new student was told by an established senior that he would be popular the following year, after he learned to sign well. I also observed that those who demonstrated attitudes that were considered to be more hearing (and thereby “anti-deaf”) were afforded a lower status within the hierarchy. This can be
seen in the case of Arron, an established student in attendance for three years, who was vocal about his beliefs that it was inappropriate to shout for someone’s attention, that because some students did not wear hearing aids they did not know how loud and inappropriate they were, and that all the students at the school were ‘pea-brains’. Whenever students discussed Arron with me, they tended to speak disparagingly, reflecting his low status.

A deaf identity, however, was not the sole basis for status within the social hierarchy at the school (nor do I suspect that is the case for the wider deaf culture, though this is how it appears in the literature). Status at ISD was also achieved by prowess in sports. To a lesser extent, status could be achieved (or enhanced) by association with “the right group”. This was demonstrated by Maureen. Maureen came to ISD from a school that emphasized speech over signing. As a result, she used sign with speech for interpersonal interactions (a behavior that is devalued and seen as an alignment with a more hearing identity). She was shunned by the majority of students. They made fun of her mouth movements when she signed. They ignored her if she used speech with no sign. However, her status was enhanced during the course of the year by association with the cheerleaders.

It is possible that the different manifestations of identity and social hierarchy found at ISD and in the literature may be explainable based on the means by which a deaf identity is achieved and the limits to such means associated with the school. The subtler culturally deaf/deaf/hard of hearing differentiations of identity may be overshadowed by the fact that all of the students are affiliated with the residential deaf
school. In addition, the students are, in large part, unknown to each other outside of the deaf school community. Within the community, they are known to have deaf friends and to attend deaf social events (those sponsored by the school). Opportunities to demonstrate a "misaligned center", that is, to align oneself with a more hearing identity, to socialize with hearing people rather than deaf ones, is limited by attendance at the school. Likewise, opportunities to be politically active, in support of deaf rights, are limited as students. Thus, their association with the residential deaf school community puts them on relatively equal footing in terms of the various means for achieving a deaf identity as noted in the literature. The one means of achieving identity that remains variable at the school, language use, is employed, however, it is used as a status marker within the social hierarchy rather than for basic identity.

Regardless of the specific manifestations of identity and social hierarchy, there exist several basic beliefs about and norms regarding both in-group and out-group identities. A basic belief is that deaf is different from hearing. This is abundantly evident at the school – in the school’s very existence; in the profile of the school, which clearly identifies key leaders based on their hearing status; in the examples of language arts projects previously described; and in the school museum, which displays a poster of an ISD theatrical production based on conflict between deaf and hearing worlds. Accompanying this is the belief, contrary to hearing beliefs, that deaf is good. In fact, deaf is believed to be superior to hearing with deafness seen as an advantage in some instances. The belief that deaf is good is seen in the existence of Padden and Humphries’ “deaf center”. It can also be seen in Rashad’s wish that I was deaf. Several
months after we met, he tells me that he wishes there were a way to open me up and replace what is inside of me so that I would be deaf\(^5\). The belief that deafness is an advantage is seen in jokes, particularly those involving encounters with the police. One such joke (in translation) goes something like this:

A deaf driver picks up a hearing hitchhiker on the side of the road. The deaf driver speeds off down the highway. Before long they are pulled over by the highway patrol for speeding. The police officer approaches the car and asks the driver to see his license. The driver indicates by pointing to his ears and shaking his head that he is deaf. The police officer nods and indicates by way of an outstretched arm that the driver is free to go. Again, they head off down the road. After many hours, the driver is tired so the hearing hitchhiker offers to drive. They switch places and the deaf man gets to rest as the passenger. After a while, they are again pulled over for speeding. Remembering the actions of the deaf man in getting out of the issuance of a ticket, the hearing man decides to try the same thing. When the police officer asks for his license, he, too, points to his ears and shakes his head to indicate that he is deaf. Unfortunately for him, this police officer is capable of signing and he gets the ticket regardless of his effort to impersonate a deaf person.

One evening, the telling of this joke generated similar personal anecdotes about experiences where being deaf was an advantage in getting something desired or in getting out of something undesirable.

As previously noted, the majority of deaf children (90%) are not born to deaf families; thus, it is believed that deaf role models are vital to the children’s development. This entails the responsibility of deaf adults to care for deaf children (regardless of the children’s biological parentage). This is reflected in Jorge’s comment that when the parents are hearing and the children are deaf, deaf adults will tend to refer to these children as “their” children. Likewise, Marie comments that in the event that the parents are hearing, the deaf school has a good pre-school program (that can compensate).
The beliefs about out-group identities are more extensive. General beliefs that I identified included the fact that all hearing people enjoy music, are English experts, and can hear everything (that is, no sound is too quiet, far away, garbled, etc.). These beliefs are reflected in two occurrences at dances. In the first, the Dean of girls addressed two of the college students to check the volume of the music. She comments that all hearing people should be knowledgeable about and enjoy music. In the second occurrence, Rashad is talking with Amy and Claudia (hearing college students). He comments that the bass in the music makes him feel good. He then asks Claudia about the words in the song. She is unable to understand the words and tells him so. He is surprised by this. Examples of hearing people as English experts can be found in my role as "editor". I was asked on several occasions to review written materials for students and, on occasion, for dorm staff. Likewise, I was asked to define English terms on several occasions. There are also several beliefs about hearing identities in relationship to deaf identities. Hearing people are believed to be oppressors of deaf people. During one of the recounts of our meeting, Rashad most clearly demonstrates this belief. In the telling, he states that when he found out I was hearing he felt the need to protect himself. I inquired what he meant, from what did he need to protect himself. His response, oppression. Hearing people are also believed to act in judgment of deaf people and deaf culture. Several examples of judgment regarding deaf voices were noted. In one example, Susan, a senior, tells her sister and a group of other students that hearing people think deaf voices sound like 'donkeys'. In another example, a dorm supervisor admonishes Louie, a sophomore, that hearing people don't
understand his voice. He continues further to remind Louie of the time he used his
voice in public and all the hearing people stared at him. In addition, hearing people
can’t be trusted and are said to simply not understand or to be unable to understand deaf
people and deaf culture. The belief that hearing people don’t or can’t understand deaf
culture was reflected in my being told that my research was doomed to fail due to my
hearing status. It is also reflected in a poem entitled “You Have to be Deaf to
Understand”16 which was posted on a bulletin board in the girls’ dorm during Deaf
Heritage Week. In a more positive light, it is believed that there are hearing people who
do understand deaf people and deaf culture, however, these hearing people are rare.
Association with deaf people and involvement in deaf activities is believed to be
evidence of understanding and acceptance17.

Because identity is a key aspect of this culture and no doubt because it is largely
achieved, norms for personal introductions are important. Introductions are used to
outline an individual’s achievement of the various aspects of identity. Introductions
typically include some mention of the school an individual attended (residential or
mainstream), position(s) held within the deaf social structure (e.g. deaf club president,
hearing parent of a deaf child, hearing child of deaf parents), or some noted affiliation
with a known deaf person (e.g. friend of..., wife of ...). If the individual being
introduced knows a foreign sign language or very little sign language, this may also be
mentioned in the introduction. In the event that this norm for introductions is not
followed, as when the introducer is unfamiliar with the norm (e.g. my own experience
meeting Rashad) or perhaps because the introducer is unaware that the parties have not met, then direct inquiry into hearing status (as well as the other achievements, especially school attended and connections to the community) becomes the norm.

In order to maintain an individual established identity as well as to maintain in-group/out-group boundaries, additional norms exist. These include some of the behaviors that were noted previously in the discussion on achieving identity such as use of ASL and supporting deaf endeavors (political, social, and economic). Support of political endeavors, though not seen with the students on campus, includes activity in politically oriented organizations (such as the state association of the deaf and/or National Association of the Deaf), participating in political rhetoric around various issues, and perhaps making contact with the larger American political system to voice opinions. Support of social endeavors includes not only attendance at deaf functions but also membership or activity in social organizations (such as the local deaf club and sports associations) as well as cooperation, as needed, in ensuring that communicative events are successful (see further discussion below). Support of economic endeavors includes patronage of deaf owned businesses (such as Dawn Sign Press or DeafNation) or purchase of deaf generated products (such as Deaf Life Magazine) as well as reciprocity in the provision of services.

Visual Nature

The third key to understanding deaf culture, particularly as it manifests itself at ISD, is its visual nature. I include the visual nature of deaf culture as one of the key components of the culture because it is the basis for a central value of the group. In
addition, an abundance of norms of behavior and adaptations reflected in material
culture can be found associated with this component of the culture. Unlike the former
two components, however, I did not observe any specific beliefs that were associated
with this component.

While not the cornerstone of the culture, it is true that all members of the culture
share the experience of a hearing loss. Thus, interaction in an auditory mode is affected
to varying degrees dependent upon the degree of hearing loss. The visual nature of this
culture is an adaptation to this "fact of life" (see Figure 6). As a result, the eyes and
vision become highly valued as they are the source of information. This value was
reflected in the emphasis on eyes found in some artwork (see Figure 7).

The school is full of material culture that specifically adapts that which is
auditory to this visual environment. Fire and storm alarms flash brightly. Alarm clocks
vibrate under pillows or flash lights to awaken students. Lamplights flash to indicate
that the phone is ringing. A teletypewriter (TTY) sits near the phone in order to place
or answer calls. The television is equipped with closed captioning capabilities.

A number of norms of behavior also adapt that which is (typically) auditory into
something visual. In this way, applause becomes the waving of both hands (arms
extended upward) in the air. Likewise, cheering or rooting on the favorite team is done
through the waving of both hands in the air. Attention getting for personal interaction
purposes is achieved by two visual means: lights may be flashed (to get the attention of
all those present or a single individual who is the only one present but across the room
or upstairs) or an arm may be extended with the hand flapping (degree of extension of
Figure 6: A Page from Theresa's Deaf Culture Scrapbook

Figure 7: Eyes as Represented in Artwork
the arm is relative to distance between the individuals, speed of hand flapping is relative to urgency). Two additional visual adaptations of sound were observed at the deaf school. The first, what I describe as a "sound level meter". I have neither seen nor read about elsewhere. The "sound level meter" was observed during a pep rally in which there was a spirit competition. Spirit was demonstrated by shouting and the stamping of feet. The "judges" (hearing, adult staff members) shook pom-poms to indicate the level of loudness for each group: the louder, the more rapid the shaking. The second was a form of video narration. Where a hearing video camera operator may describe what is being recorded or ask questions of those being recorded from an off-camera position, this is not possible for a deaf camera operator. Two strategies were thus used: employing another to act as narrator or extending the free arm around to the front of the camera and fingerspelling or signing into the lens. This adaptation is also not found in the literature. Likewise, this was my first experience with it. Each of these adaptations was witnessed on only a single occasion, thus it is unclear the degree to which these may be considered norms or unique occurrences. Therefore, these last two visual adaptations, while noted, will not be considered in subsequent discussions of the transmission and learning of deaf culture.

Norms of behavior also exist in order to be more visually accommodating. Norms to make the physical environment more visually accommodating include having appropriate lighting and clear sightlines. Appropriate lighting includes having an adequate level of lighting in general or focused directly on the speaker (in the case of spotlight use). The necessity of this was demonstrated repeatedly during assemblies in
the auditorium when the presenter was on stage and would step out of the "good" lighting. Inevitably, someone from the audience would request that the presenter reposition him/herself to be seen under "good" lighting. While seemingly straightforward, appropriate lighting has a number of requirements. Lighting must be bright but not so bright as to create a glare, shadows, or cause squinting of the eyes in order to see. Artificial lighting can be controlled through manual means. Natural lighting is a bit more challenging. Natural lighting that is too bright is avoided.

Conversations are not held with one conversant's back to a window, as the glare is too bright (unless a shade can be pulled). I was reminded of this norm one afternoon when I joined a group of dorm supervisors chatting in the co-ed lounge of the dorm. I chose a seat where vision was impaired due to sunlight. I moved to a second location to remedy the situation but did no better. Finally, one of the supervisors showed me where to sit in order to have appropriate lighting.

Clear sightlines require that no physical barriers exist. As a result, classrooms are predominantly set up in a semi-circle so that all participants can be easily seen. Table decorations (centerpieces) are intentionally small (if designed by deaf folks so that they may be seen over) or they are moved to the side or removed from the table so that there is no obstruction between individuals. If it is impossible to be seated in a circle or semi-circle, as in large group presentations, then efforts are made to raise the speaker so he/she can be seen by all or to hold the event in an arena where there is auditorium style seating (tiered seating). This was demonstrated on a regular basis as announcements were made during the lunch hour. All such announcements were made
while the announcer stood on a chair in order to be seen. Clear sightlines also require that “visual noise”, that is anything visually distracting or tiring, be avoided whenever possible. In this way, striped wallpaper as a background to a lecturer is avoided. As are other highly patterned wallpaper designs (such as flowers) and mirrors. The most pleasing background is a plain solid color. On occasion, such as when presentations will be long, a backdrop in a solid (usually dark) color may be employed. Flashing lights may also be considered “visual noise”. A good example of this occurred when Brian was having a conversation with two of the college students in the dorm hallway. A student was taking pictures with a flash camera nearby. Brian momentarily stopped his conversation to ask her to stop because it was bothering him.

Cooperation is a vital expectation in ensuring visual accommodation. In making the environment visually accommodating, those present cooperate in a number of ways. In the case of lighting, those present may inform each other or whomever is in charge that the lighting is inadequate (as in the example previously given of a presenter on stage). Likewise, cooperation is employed in clearing sightlines. This may involve moving objects or asking individuals to reposition themselves. Such requests may be either direct or indirect. An indirect request was exemplified one evening while a number of students were sitting in the co-ed lounge chatting. When a student blocks Susan’s view of the conversation, she pushed on his upper thigh in the direction that she wanted him to move. No words were exchanged as he moved to clear her sightline. In large groups, cooperation is employed in establishing attention before proceeding. This is done by asking that those who are attending inform those nearby who are not that it is
time to proceed. Cooperation is regularly employed in relaying information as well. In
the event that an individual has turned away and missed information or is unable to see
(due to unclear sightlines, for example), such information will be passed along by one
who was able to access it. This form of cooperation was observed frequently when
announcements were made at meals.

A final norm in relation to the visual nature of this culture is as regards eye
contact. Since the majority of interaction is visually based, eye contact is vital. As a
result, extended eye contact is the norm. It is impolite to look away during
conversation. This is clearly demonstrated by Brandi’s reaction to Stephanie who was
frequently looking away as Brandi tried to talk with her. Brandi tells her to stop
looking everywhere and focus on her. Breaks in eye contact during conversation are
brief and utilized by the speaker in grammatical ways (to indicate shifts in character or
topic, for example). This is reflected in ISD’s American Sign Language Draft
Curriculum lesson on eye contact. Objectives for this lesson included: (1a) make and
maintain eye contact with another person on one to one basis when that person is using
facial expressions or signs to communicate a simple message; (1b) shift eye gaze from
one person to another when following a conversation between two people; (3) look
towards an object or person present in the room when a signer makes reference to that
object or person.
SECONDARY COMPONENTS – TACTILE AND SOUND

As previously noted, there are two secondary components that are key to an understanding of deaf culture. These are its tactile nature and the role of sound. Again, I have considered them to be secondary because they are neither a part of the value system nor do they have accompanying beliefs. However, they are key to an understanding of deaf culture because a number of norms of behavior are associated with them.

This culture takes advantage of both touch and vibration as tactile phenomena. Touch is used as a sound adaptation. For example, rather than the calling of a name, touch is used for attention getting (see Figure 8). Norms for this use of touch indicate acceptable locations for the touch (shoulder, upper arm, a knee is acceptable if seated) and how to touch (tap gently but firmly to get immediate attention, tap only twice then await the response, hold the touch so as not to interrupt conversation and to allow the individual to look at their discretion). These norms are clearly demonstrated in an interaction between a student and a teacher during a basketball game. The teacher is watching the game. The student wants her attention and so she taps the teacher on the arm repeatedly. When the teacher finally grants her attention, she corrects the student’s repeated tapping by saying that this action will create a dent in her arm. In addition to its function as a sound adaptation, touch is used in conjunction with cooperation in establishing clear sightlines. To move an individual to a new position without interrupting a conversation, the hand is placed on the shoulder or upper arm and held
Figure 8: Use of Touch For Attention Getting. Photo from Lori's Deaf Culture Photography Project

Figure 9: Use of Vibration For Attention Getting. Photo from Lori's Deaf Culture Photography Project
there while applying slight pressure in the direction of the move (as in a previously noted example). A similar use of this touch may be to move an individual who is conversing so that another may pass by without interrupting.

Vibration is also employed as a means for attention getting and to experience and enjoy sound. Attention getting is accomplished by stomping on the floor or pounding a fist on a table creating vibrations (see Figure 9). Stomping is used if the floor is one which will vibrate (cement and tile floors do not vibrate well, in this case, another attention getting strategy must be employed). Stomping creates a generalized vibration, it is therefore used to get attention of all those who are present. Likewise, pounding a fist on a table creates a generalized vibration so it will get the attention of all who are in physical contact with the table.

Vibration is also a means to experience and enjoy sound, for, contrary to common belief, this is not a silent culture. Sound is a potential source of enjoyment. Sound, in the form of music, was enjoyed in a number of ways that allowed students to feel bass vibrations. Some students carry portable stereo systems, “listening” (feeling bass vibrations) through headphones. Some students had stereos in their dorm rooms which were played at sufficient volume to be “heard”, again through vibration. This personal “listening” to music, though not explored in depth in this study, did not appear to be correlated with hearing aid use or with degree of hearing loss. Public “listening”, such as at dances, was possible as a result of vibration inducing volume. I also observed enhancement of the vibrations by either sitting up against the speakers or holding balloons.
Aside from its enjoyment function, sound is both experimented with and used for attention-getting purposes. Neither of these functions is well documented in the literature. Experimentation with sound took three forms that I was able to observe. The first type of experimentation occurred in small spaces, either naturally occurring (such as the stairwell and the recession of the elevator) or created (by positioning oneself very close to a wall and cupping the hands around the mouth). In this type of experimentation students yell within the small space to experience the sound. One student was observed to do this repeatedly across different surfaces along a wall (in the elevator recess, on the bulletin board, on the wall proper, on a door, etc.). The other types of experimentation involved more than one individual and were very much like tests of reactions to sound. One of these types required that one individual yell into the ear of another. When done on a hearing person (myself or the other college students), the startled reaction became a source of amusement. The other form of experimentation with reaction to sound was observed when one person was placed on the opposite side of a closed door and yelled to through the door.

Sound is also used for attention-getting in deaf culture. This may seem counterintuitive and even contrary to what has been presented about adaptations of sound to visual forms. However, remembering that a deaf identity is not determined by degree of hearing loss, deaf people have varying abilities to "hear" sound. I commonly observed students taking advantage of these abilities and employing sound for attention getting. Sound was used for attention getting in two basic ways: generalized sound or name calling. Name calling was used when trying to get the
attention of a hearing person or a deaf person who was capable of discriminating his/her own name. Generalized sound, a shouted “ha” or “ho”, may also be used to get the attention of a hearing person or a deaf person who is capable of discriminating his/her own name. It is also used to get the attention of those who can not make such discriminations but can identify and respond to sound. The use of the generalized shout was far more common at ISD. Norms associated with this function of sound focus on appropriate use: under what circumstances can one shout for attention and to whom does one shout. My observations at ISD and my years of experience with deaf culture lead me to conclude that shouting for attention takes place in-group, that is, only in “deaf environments” (the deaf school, the deaf club, deaf social events, etc.). It is not employed in “hearing environments” (out-group). Those who wear hearing aids are commonly shouted for. Others who have been noted previously to respond to sound are also shouted for.

CONCLUSION

This representation of American deaf culture is incomplete for sure. Nonetheless, it provides a necessary and adequate glimpse into the culture, thereby allowing for discussion of its transmission and learning. Culture transmission/learning can only be accomplished by making the content of the culture, that is the values, beliefs, norms, and material culture, available to those who are expected/expecting to learn. It is my premise that this occurs, that is that culture content is made available and reinforced, through interactions with others and the environment. During these
interactions, the values, beliefs and norms of the culture, as they are understood by the
transmitter, are shared either explicitly or implicitly. Chapter Five will explore this
premise more closely.

1 In fact, a number of definitions of culture can be gleaned from this writing. Symbolic, cognitive,
behavioral and adaptive definitions of culture are present and closely interwoven in the description that
follows.

2 See Stokoe, et al. 1965:289 for a description of these features.

3 These identifications were made based on a video stimulus of six storytellers that I created (described in
greater detail in Chapter Three).

4 Further analysis of the results of this activity is called for and will be reserved for subsequent work. It is
also worth noting here the results of the hearing college students‘ judgements in this same activity. They
too used an abundance of non-linguistic characteristics in judging language use. However, they also used
a number of linguistic characteristics that the deaf students did not. These included grammar (including
facial grammar), use of classifiers, spatial organization, directional verbs, indexing, and redundancy. I
shall argue in Chapter Six that this difference may be explained by differences in the enculturative and
acculturative experiences of the students.

5 While the identification ended up incorrect in this example, it should not be seen as evidence that such
use of the language is faulty. It is, however, a clear example of the degree of reliance upon and the
powerful nature of this function of the language. This was far more meaningful for Rashad than a simple
misunderstanding.

6 An exception may be made here for hearing people who are conversant in ASL and those who are
learning ASL.

7 See for example Lucas and Valli (1992).

8 By comparison, the hearing perspective simply ascribes a deaf identity. For example, Moores (1987),
following definitions adopted by the Conference of Educational Administrators Serving the Deaf (an
organization with a predominantly hearing membership), reports that “a deaf person is one whose hearing
is disabled to an extent (usually 70dB ISO or greater) that precludes the understanding of speech through
the ear alone, with or without the use of a hearing aid. A hard-of-hearing person is one whose hearing is
disabled to an extent (usually 35-69dB ISO) that makes difficult, but does not preclude, the understanding
of speech through the ear alone, without or with a hearing aid” (9).

9 These identities are not always mutually exclusive. For example, an individual may be GENERATION
DEAF as well as HARD OF HEARING.

10 Finer distinctions of hearing identities also exist. These are based on how deaf friendly one is
perceived to be.

11 This corresponds with earlier research by Stokoe, Bernard, and Padden (1976) in which they found that
educated deaf individuals were an integral part of the “elite group” in deaf society.

12 This distinction has been previously discussed in Chapter Two.
While these details imply a status hierarchy of sorts, its actual form remains somewhat ambiguous. For example, it is unclear in Padden and Humphries' narrative if the deaf "peddler" has higher, lower, or equal status than the "deaf but really hard of hearing" individual. In addition, this hierarchy appears to mix achieved and ascribed characteristics without indication of priority.

Maureen was accepted by the cheerleaders because she engaged in other behaviors that they approved of, such as consumption of alcoholic beverages.

Rashad's wish could be seen as an ironic reversal of the hearing desire to "fix" deaf people by making them hearing via hearing aids, cochlear implants, speech classes, etc. Here Rashad desires to "fix" me of my hearingness as to be deaf is a better state of being.

This poem was written by Willard J. Madsen. It can be found in Gannon 1981:380.

Note that the evidence of a hearing individual's understanding and acceptance of deaf people and deaf culture is in concert with two means by which a deaf person establishes a culturally deaf identity. Note also, that hearing children of deaf parents (CODAs) are generally exempted from these more negative beliefs. They are considered to have been raised in the culture and thus to share values and beliefs. They too, however, have to achieve their ultimate identity and status (see Preston 1994).

The visual nature of the culture calls into question the place of deafblind individuals. The literature on deaf culture does not typically address the place of deafblind individuals. Lane, et al. (1996), however, do present a cursory discussion of deafblind individuals who became blind after having an established identity within deaf culture, speaking of them as a minority within the culture much like Black Deaf Americans, Native American Deaf, Hispanic Deaf, Gay and Lesbian Deaf, and so forth. They do not note variability in the etiology and onset of deafblindness which compounds the issue. Much as is the case with deaf people and deaf culture, this issue is further clouded by the fact that not all deafblind people are considered a part of deaf culture and there exists a general dissimilarity between the individual and the family of origin. Adequate research into the issue is still lacking, thus, the question remains.

I should note that the volume on the personal stereo systems was often sufficient for me to hear the music while the headphones were in place on the student.

The stereo used by ISD for dances was referred to as the "boom-boom machine". It was accompanied by speakers that were four feet tall. In the elementary school it was used in a rather large room, the gymnasium. In the high school it was used in the second floor co-ed lounge, a room that was not very large. I was able to hear the music in my room on the third floor with the doors (mine and the lounge) closed.

It is important to note that by ability to "hear" sound I do not intend ability to discriminate speech sounds. What I intend is ability to identify and respond to the presence of sound.

Hearing aids are an example of material culture which are used to enhance the ability to respond to sound and, in some cases, to discriminate speech sounds. Hearing aids have not been included in this description of deaf culture because they are not highly valued by deaf people and are commonly considered more a part of hearing culture (a reminder of the medical/pathological views of deaf people). This view is confirmed by findings from my semantic domain analysis. None of the deaf students from deaf families identified hearing aids as a part of deaf culture. Similarly, seventy percent (70%) of deaf students from hearing families identified hearing aids as a part of hearing culture. Eight percent (8%) of deaf students from hearing families associated hearing aids with school, which has been argued to be a hearing establishment. An interesting contrast, and clear example of the differing worldviews of deaf and hearing people, is seen in the results of the semantic domains for hearing aids with the college students.
Seventy percent (70%) identified hearing aids with deaf culture. Only a single college student identified hearing aids as a part of hearing culture. Unfortunately, the semantic domain activity was not re-administered to the college students at the end of the year so I am unable to comment on any specific changes in perspective that may have occurred as the result of the acculturation process.

CHAPTER 5
LEARNING BY INTERACTING

With the preceding description of American deaf culture in mind, this chapter seeks to more directly address the primary research question “how is American deaf culture transmitted/learned” through an examination of the role of interaction in culture transmission and learning. This is accomplished by utilizing the components of the mnemonic SPEAKING from the Ethnography of Communication (Hymes 1972) as the analytical framework in exploration of the following specific questions: what relationships exist between settings, events and genres; are there restrictions to participation based on setting, events, and/or genres; in what types of communicative events do learners find themselves; are certain genres associated with particular communication events; what cultural content is available from the various events and genres; are certain genres more prevalent than others. Little concern will be paid, at this point, to the characteristics of participants. Such concern will be exercised in the following chapter that seeks to address similarities and differences in the enculturative and acculturative experience.
PATTERNS OF INTERACTION

The reader is reminded that it is my premise that culture content is made available and reinforced, through interactions with others and the environment. During these interactions, the values, beliefs and norms of the culture, as they are understood by the transmitter, are shared either explicitly or implicitly. Several examples of interactions that convey culture content were presented in the preceding description of American deaf culture (Chapter Four). The examples, however, may be somewhat misleading in that they were presented (most often) in association with a single component of the culture. In reality, any given interaction may convey multiple components of the culture for these components are, after all, not separate but complexly intertwined. I remind the reader of my initial meeting with Rashad. This meeting was reiterated as an example of the function of language as in-group/out-group marker, assumptions and judgements relating to the deaf/hearing dichotomy, and beliefs that hearing people are oppressors as this range of cultural values, beliefs and norms are present and intertwined in the interaction. In addition, a great many interactions include not only explicit content but also underlying/implicit cultural information that can be accessed by some while overlooked by others. The relationship between what is presented explicitly and what is implicit reflects the relationship between various aspects of the culture. For example, explicit comments on language use are often accompanied by implicit statements on identity, thus reflecting the relationship between language and identity. Numerous examples of interactions reflecting multiple and intertwined aspects of the culture and the explicit/implicit nature of interactions can be
noted. Unfortunately, while this type of data is a more accurate representation of the complexity of culture transmission/learning through interaction it is not conducive to identification of patterns. This creates a dilemma in terms of representation and the discussion of interaction patterns in the transmission and learning of culture. I will try to compensate for this dilemma by accompanying the subsequent discussion of interaction patterns with a variety of examples, at least some of which remain true to the complexity of the actual interactions.

Chapter Three provided a glimpse into ISD as a speech community. In order to understand the patterns of culture transmission and learning at ISD, it is necessary to examine more closely how this speech community contextualizes communicative interaction. As noted, this will be accomplished by following Hymes' (1972) SPEAKING framework for examining communication (see Chapter Two) looking specifically at setting, events, genres, and participants, as well as the relationships between these components. Subsequently, the relationship to specific culture content will be explored.

Hymes' framework was developed to allow for close examination of the communication event. In this framework it could be said that each component is something of a “building block” which when put together results in/creates the specific communication event of interest. In order to identify patterns of interaction, however, Hymes' framework must be employed beyond the single, specific communication event. This does not require major revision of the model, rather it requires a different perspective of the relationship between the “building blocks”. As I envision it, these
"building blocks" are not simply laid side-by-side but are in some sense embedded within each other. For example, within any given setting there may be a range of communication events that are possible. In turn, each communication event may be "home" to a range of genres. Thus patterns of relationship between settings and events, events and genres, etc. can be identified. It is from this embedded view of the components ("building blocks") that the remainder of this dissertation is written.

Settings

The broadest of the components in the analytical framework is the setting. Hymes defines the setting as time, location, and culturally defined occasion. Figure Two (Chapter 3) presented the five general settings found on ISD’s campus. Three of the five settings were primary to this study: the school, the dorm, and outdoors. These settings were defined for research purposes in two ways. Initially, they were defined as the students and staff at ISD labeled them. While maintaining those emic labels, I subsequently defined them according to observed characteristics. Those settings which are labeled “school” are located in buildings characterized by use patterns associated with time of day and participants. School settings are used primarily between the hours of 7:30 a.m. and 3:00 p.m., although these settings are periodically also used after these hours. For example, the school gym is used for sporting events in the evenings. Likewise, the cafeteria, which is associated with the school, is used for the evening meal. The school is also characterized by participation restricted to those referred to as teachers, aides, students, cafeteria workers, and special guests. The dorm is also characterized by time of use and participants. It is used at all times other than school
hours by those referred to as students, dorm supervisors, college students, and visitors. The distinction between school and dorm settings is further indicated by the fact that the middle school/high school dorm is physically set apart from the school setting (see Appendix C – building 8). The elementary dorm (Appendix C – hallways 2 & 4), while physically connected to the school by hallways, are clearly separate settings based on time of use and participants. Finally, outdoors includes all those areas, signed as OUTSIDE, that are not enclosed by buildings, especially playground areas (represented on the map in Appendix C by unnumbered dots).

Within the three primary settings, age segregation was readily identifiable. While all students regardless of age are said to attend a single school, ISD, there are essentially two schools on campus: the pre-school/elementary school and the middle school/high school. As briefly noted in Chapter Three, the two schools are physically separate from each other, the pre-school/elementary school being located on east campus and the middle school/high school on west campus (see Appendix C). Each has its own main office, principal and supervising teacher. The existence of this separateness was reinforced for me in the comments of an elementary teacher who told me ‘the pre-school and elementary programs are far ahead of the high school program at ISD’ in terms of the bilingual-bicultural curriculum. Likewise, the dorms and outside areas are segregated by age. The elementary dorm divides the pre-school and elementary wings of the building. The middle school/high school dorm stands alone on
west campus. Students are assigned to a “pod” or dorm area based on age. Playground areas were associated with each dorm, thus coinciding with the age segregation established by the dorm.

In addition to age segregation, the dorms were segregated by sex. In the elementary dorm, boys’ and girls’ rooms were assigned in two separate halls. In the middle school/high school dorm, a boys’ wing (consisting of three floors) and a girls’ wing (also three floors) were separated by a common area which included lounges on each floor and a gymnasium on the first floor. Thus, interlocutors were restricted by setting to peers of similar age and the adults associated with the particular setting (e.g., teachers in the school, supervisors in the dorm and outside areas).

Events

Within these three settings, a range of communication events occurred (See Figure 3, Chapter 3). The communication event has been defined by Saville-Troike (1989) and Hymes (1972) as a bounded entity within which communication between interlocutors occurs and where rules and norms for the use of speech govern such communication. Hymes believed that communication events could be identified ethnographically “through the words which name them” (1962:198). Thus, I again, identified specific communication events based on the labels students and staff used to talk about what was/had/or would be occurring. I grouped them into the six reported categories using my own etic distinctions. Educational events included those in which interaction occurs in pre-determined, static, semi-homogeneous groups led by an identified adult. Groupings are based on similarity in age, intellectual functioning,
and/or demonstrated academic achievement. Social events, on the other hand, are planned, often advertised, special events that occur in groups which are fluid and not pre-determined. Leadership in these events was also more fluid. In some cases leadership is assumed by an adult, while in other cases it is assumed by a student. Social events are differentiated from freetime and meals (which are also social in nature) by the planning and advertising. Freetime is scheduled daily at a pre-determined time outside of school hours. It is characterized by unstructured activity either on an individual or group basis (fluid groups). Group leadership in freetime is also fluid, however, it is always assumed by a student. Meals are scheduled daily at three pre-determined times (morning, afternoon, and evening). This event is characterized by (fluid) group consumption of prepared foods and drink. Sporting events are characterized by organized preparation for physical competition or actual competition with non-ISD groups. Formal meetings are group interactions organized around the discussion of a specified topic or topics (usually identified by a pre-planned and announced agenda) within a specified time frame. While there is an identified leader who determines who may speak and in what order, all participants in formal meetings generally have equal opportunity to voice opinions. The exception to equal opportunity to participate is found in the specific formal meeting known as a “training” where participation by those other than the leader(s) is restricted. Leadership positions in formal meetings may be assumed by students (for example, during a class meeting) or adults (for example, during accreditation meetings) depending upon the nature of the meeting.
The above described segregation created by settings was somewhat tempered by the students' ability to participate in a variety of communication events that cross-cut settings. A number of events allowed participation by individuals of all ages. For example, elementary, middle, and high school students were frequently seen in attendance at various sporting events. In addition, these "public" events also drew adult participants (alumni and other deaf community members) thereby increasing opportunities to interact with adults as well as fellow students of all ages. Other events that allowed for interaction among students of all ages included PTCO day (a fundraiser for the Parent-Teacher-Counselor Organization), some pep rallies, and family storytelling night (a special event coordinated by the outreach department). These "public" events also allowed for interaction between sexes. Other events that allowed for interaction between sexes, though not across ages, included meals, the majority of instruction, various parties, elementary Big Adventure Tuesdays, and daily freetime.

The school provided the widest range of communication events to students. Communication events in five of the six primary categories (educational, social, freetime, sporting events and formal meetings) can be found within the common rooms of the school, that is, the auditorium, library, and gym. The cafeteria is the exclusive domain of meals. Classrooms are reserved for educational events and class meetings. Within this wide range of events, educational events are the most prominent, however, there is a relative balance among the various events in the school setting.
The dormitory setting provided a more restricted range of communication events. Those events that occurred in the dorm were predominantly social and freetime events. In addition, sporting events were noted with relative frequency due to the presence of a gymnasium in the high school/middle school dorm. These sporting events were largely competitions and practices of the middle school teams (the high school teams used the school gymnasium). Educational events in the dorm were limited to study hour and the occasional assembly that was held in the gym. Additionally, the junior class held its class meetings in the second floor lounge of the high school/middle school dorm. Finally, trainings, that were not accessible to students, were held in the dorms. These trainings included parent meetings (support group meetings and orientations) and orientation trainings for the college students who were living on campus.

The most restricted range of communication events was associated with the outdoor setting. Of those events which occurred outdoors, freetime was the most common. Freetime outdoors occurred regularly, weather permitting, at the elementary level. It occurred far less frequently at the high school level. A single social event, fall homecoming, occurred outdoors. Likewise, fall sporting events (football and cross country) were part of the outdoor setting. Finally, two educational events (a special assembly for the ground breaking of a wetlands project and filming of a public service video) also occurred outdoors.
Genres

A range of genres can be found embedded within each of the various communication events. Hymes (1972) defines genre as "categories such as poem, myth, tale, proverb, riddle, curse, prayer, oration, lecture, commercial, form letter, editorial, etc." (65). He continues stating that "genres often coincide with speech events, but must be treated as analytically independent of them" (65) because any given genre may be found in several different communication events. In addition, it should be noted that any given communication event may include a number of different genre which flow rapidly and easily into one another, often in established relationships. For example, an inquiry requires some response that may take the form of an explanation, a statement of opinion or belief, a demonstration, etc.

As with all of the components of communication, I followed closely the labels used by the students and staff for the various genres that were noted. These genres were subsequently grouped according to my own determinations of similarity in characteristics. The primary characteristic that was employed for categorization purposes was direction of information flow. Thus, there are four categorical genres: information exchange, information transmission, information seeking, and reinforcement. I considered interactions to be information exchange when two or more individuals were actively involved and there was reciprocity in information sharing. Information exchange included specific genres such as discussion, chatting, and argument. I considered interactions to be information transmission and seeking when there was a unidirectional intent with regard to information, that is, when a single
individual was actively searching for or sharing information but reciprocity was either not present or not desired. Information transmission included specific genres such as lecture, explanation, and declaration of opinion or belief. Information seeking included specific genres such as indirect request, direct request, and direct inquiry. Those interactions that I classified as reinforcements appear to further foster and/or allow for the refinement of what was transmitted and learned via the other three categorical genres. Reinforcements included specific genres such as practice/rehearsal, teasing, and correction.

While a direct comparison of range of genres based on frequency of use can not be accomplished here, an examination of the distributive frequency (noting the occurrence of both categorical genre classifications and specific genres across the range of events) reveals patterns of interest (See Figure 10). All four categories of genres were noted in each of the six primary communication events. However, the overall range of specific genres varied somewhat across events. This appears to be affected primarily by the degree of formality (defined by degree of structure) associated with any given event and secondarily with the locus of control and direction (adult vs. student controlled events). Freetime events, which employed the greatest overall range of genres, were informally structured and under student control. Formal meetings, which, as implied by my chosen label, were very formally structured and generally under adult control employed the most restricted overall range of genres. Educational events, social events, sporting events and meals, while seemingly disparate, fall between the two extremes of formality and employ a very similar overall range of
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INFORMATION TRANSMISSION</th>
<th>EDUCATIONAL EVENTS</th>
<th>SOCIAL EVENTS</th>
<th>SPORTING EVENTS</th>
<th>FREETIME</th>
<th>MEALS</th>
<th>FORMAL MEETINGS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstration</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecture/presentation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Announcement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declaration</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Command/direction</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance/indication</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complaint</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFORMATION EXCHANGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chat</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private talk</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argument</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reminiscence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFORMATION SEEKING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct request</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect request</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inquiry</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REINFORCEMENTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praise</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teasing</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mocking</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imitation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shunning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ignoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correction w/out explanation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correction w/ explanation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punishment</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice/rehearsal</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roleplay</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiment</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storytelling</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joketelling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contest</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Games</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual games</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal games</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical games</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound play</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Call and Response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 10: Event/Genre relationships
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genres. Each of these three events allows for a range of formality, from formal to semi-formal. In addition, while a predominant locus of control could be identified, there is a degree of shared control to be found in each. For example, social events, such as the homecoming party/dance, are organized by adults, however, within the events there is a certain amount of student control. At the homecoming party and dance, adults prescribed the general time and location of the event as well as the specific planned activities that would occur (see Figure 11). The students, however, were in control of when or if the specific planned activities occurred as well as those unplanned activities which occurred. In the case of the homecoming party, the adult scheduled pep rally, introduction of teams, team pyramids game and “pass the football” dance did not occur. In addition, participation was not determined by the adults but rather by the students. Similarly, meals were conducted under adult supervision, however, the students determined with whom they would sit and about what they would converse, etc.

Finally, while adult control can readily be identified as the predominant locus of control for educational events, students do share control, particularly at the high school level, in that they are actively involved in determining their academic schedules (that is, students select the courses they will take each year). I also observed a degree of student control within the classroom where, for example, a test date was rescheduled (delayed) due to student desire or where an elementary ASL class spent a day engaged in storytelling (the re-telling of movies, joke-telling, miming) rather than on the planned lesson (numbers).
HOMECOMING PEP PARTY AGENDA

7:00 p.m. - 7:30 p.m.
Social with Boom Boom* Music

7:30 p.m. - 8:00 p.m.
Pep Rally - "Let's Go Orioles"
Introduction of Teams
Team Pyramids Game

8:00 p.m. - 8:15 p.m.
"Pass the Football" Dance

8:15 p.m. - 8:45 p.m.
Serve Refreshments

8:45 p.m. - 9:15 p.m.
"Musical Partners" Game

9:15 p.m. - 9:45 p.m.
Dancing to "Boom Boom" Music

9:45 p.m. - 10:00 p.m.
Pitch in to clean up!!

10:00 p.m.
RAH! RAH! RAH!
Have a Great Game!!!!!!

Figure 11: Established Homecoming Party Agenda
A closer look at the variation in range of specific genres also reveals some particular associations with specific events. A number of genres appear in association with only a single event (indicated on Figure 10 by X). Intuitively, these apparently limited associations feel misrepresented. For example, it seems likely that complaints occur in events other than sporting events. Likewise, reminiscence seems to lend itself well to those events where alumni and old friends interact, such as social events. It is my suspicion, therefore, that these apparent associations are the result of sampling errors due to the inability to be part of every event and every interaction. Thus, these misrepresented genres can not be usefully employed in a discussion of patterns of relationship between genres and events.

Other particular associations, again, appear to be influenced by the locus of control. Within the information transmission genre, it was noted that lecture/presentation was associated only with formal meetings and educational events where the locus of control was predominantly adult. Announcements were associated only with social events and meals but were under adult control (permission to make an announcement had to be granted by an adult). On the other hand, where the locus of control was largely with the students (freetime, meals, sporting events), a greater range of reinforcements are found, including teasing, mocking, shunning, and ignoring. Joke-telling, verbal games, and roleplay as reinforcements also appear only in events where student control is possible, either exclusively (all occur during freetime) or in part (roleplay and verbal games are also found in educational events, joke-telling is also found in social events). In addition, information seeking is employed with greater
distinction in student controlled events. For example, at meals and during freetime, students were observed to use requests to seek the use of a specific language, interpretations, or for the identification of a specific sign. Likewise, they employed inquiry to clarify that which was missed or misunderstood, and to learn the meaning of a sign or an English word.

Although some degree of differentiation has been noted above, genres are overwhelmingly shared across events. In large part the differentiation noted was dependent upon control, that is, it was dependent upon who was making use of the genre rather than on event per se. Thus, I contend that it is an understanding of genre which is key to understanding culture transmission/learning in American deaf culture for it is at this level that the clearest differentiations in accessibility of cultural information and participation can be noted (see Chapter Six for a complete discussion of participation patterns). By accessibility of information I am referring to the degree of explicitness of information within an interaction.

Figure 12 presents a very generalized view of the relationship between genre and culture content. It should not be surprising that all aspects of language (values, beliefs and norms) are found in conjunction with all four genre classifications for as previously noted (see Chapter Two and Chapter Four) language is the most central component of this culture. In addition, it is a visible aspect of the culture, thereby making it readily available as a topic of interaction. Identity and the visual, while key components of the culture, are not visible and thus there is a marked difference in information seeking regarding these two as they are less readily topics of interaction. In
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Identity</th>
<th>Visual</th>
<th>Sound</th>
<th>Tactile</th>
<th>Material Culture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INFORMATION TRANSMISSION</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Beliefs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Norms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFORMATION EXCHANGE</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Beliefs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Norms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFORMATION SEEKING</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Beliefs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Norms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REINFORCEMENTS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Beliefs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Norms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Norms</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
addition, beliefs and norms about the visual are not found as topics of information
exchange. The patterns evidenced in this generalized view also indicate that norms for
the secondary components of sound and the tactile\textsuperscript{10}, as well as for material culture, are
present in interaction genres.

Additionally, though not reflected in Figure 12, I noted that while exchange
interactions convey values, they most frequently conveyed beliefs associated with said
values. Furthermore, exchange interactions regarding identity were most commonly
found to be “outsider” identity, seemingly to thereby create a sense of solidarity and
identification by detailing who “we” (deaf individuals) are not. Likewise, identity
information found in reinforcement interactions was focused around “outsider” identity.
Also of note, information seeking interactions were nearly all language related. Only a
few seeking interactions were noted to convey information regarding identity and the
visual.

If we consider each primary component of the culture to have three aspects
(values, beliefs, and norms), we could then consider a total number of primary aspects
of the culture. Bearing in mind that the visual has no beliefs associated with it, this
would lead us to conclude that the culture includes eight primary aspects. Using this
logic, eight specific genre (marked on Figure 13 with an asterisk) were identified as key
in terms of overall content for they made available six of the eight (6/8) possible aspects
of the primary cultural components. An exception was made to this criteria for the
inclusion of observation as a key specific genre. This exception was made based on the
assumption that the extent to which observation played a role in culture
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LANGUAGE</th>
<th>VALUES BELIEFS NORMS</th>
<th>VALUES BELIEFS NORMS</th>
<th>VALUES BELIEFS NORMS</th>
<th>VALUES BELIEFS NORMS</th>
<th>VALUES BELIEFS NORMS</th>
<th>MATERIAL CULTURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INFORMATION TRANSMISSION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation*</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading*</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstration</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanation*</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecture/presentation*</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Announcement</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declaration*</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Command/direction</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance/indication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complaint</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFORMATION EXCHANGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greeting</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion*</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chat*</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private talk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argument</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reminiscence</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFORMATION SEEKING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct request</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect request</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inquiry*</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REINFORCEMENTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praise</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teasing</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mocking</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imitation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shunning</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ignoring</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correction w/out explanation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correction w/ explanation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punishment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice/rehearsal</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roleplay</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiment</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storytelling</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joketelling</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Games</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual games</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal games</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical games</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound play</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheering</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Call and Response</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 13: Specific Genre/Content Relationships
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transmission/learning was likely underrepresented in my data as I neither asked about it (directly or indirectly) nor did I intentionally note the numbers of folks who appeared to be participating in this more passive fashion. I base this assumption on the fact that observation is a fundamental method employed by anthropologists for the learning of culture, thus it only seems logical that it may serve a similar function for others learning a culture. In addition, numerous communication events on campus made possible this passive kind of participation. For example, one could attend a sporting event, such as the basketball homecoming, sit alone and simply observe thereby learning about visual norms in the manner in which physical arrangements are made for awards presentations, about identity in the “overhearing” of a conversation regarding the pros and cons of having deaf or hearing children, about language norms by watching the manner in which the players communicate amongst themselves, with the hearing officials, and with their deaf or hearing coach, and so forth. It is these eight specific genre with which I will be most concerned.

Observation, then, is defined as seeing and noting something personally. It is a passive form of interaction that I classified as transmission because of its one-way nature and passivity. As noted in the example above, a great deal of cultural information can be transmitted/learned through this genre. Something of a sub-genre of observation is reading (signed as READ). Reading requires observation of printed language. While textbooks and novels may readily come to mind when thinking about reading, especially considering that this study occurred on a school campus, this is not the only form reading takes. In fact, a great deal of cultural transmission/learning
through reading can and does occur in the form of bulletin boards, flyers, and handouts. Appendix D includes three examples of flyers and handouts that transmit deaf culture content. The first is a subscription advertisement for a newly published newspaper. This single advertisement contains a great deal of identity information. The flyer clearly illustrates the value of a deaf identity. The newspaper's title, DeafNation, is a strong statement of the "deaf center" previously discussed in this dissertation and of solidarity. Also, in rather large typeface, this flyer announces that the newspaper is "of, for and by the Deaf". A third indication of the value of a deaf identity and all things deaf is the emblem in the bottom right corner reiterating that this is a deaf owned business. In addition, norms for identity marking are reflected in the bottom right of the subscription information where individuals are asked to label themselves. To some extent beliefs about the relationship between the identities can also be inferred as "Deaf" is listed first, followed from right to left (as English reading conventions dictate) by "hard of hearing" with "CODA" (although the acronym stands for Children of Deaf Adults, it actually refers to hearing children with deaf parents) in a subordinate position, yet, in front of "hearing" which is listed last. Aside from the cultural information regarding identity that is present in this flyer, there is also information about language at a more implicit level. The flyer is printed in English, as the newspaper will be, indicating a place for written English within the culture and the "natural" state of bilingualism for deaf people in America.
The second example found in Appendix D is a handout used in a college level deaf education course that is held on the deaf school campus. The reader will note that it is a seven (7) page document entitled “Deaf and Hearing Cultures”. The document provides both definitions (of culture and of the aspects of culture to be demonstrated) and a comparison of the two cultures. This document is chock full of information regarding each component of the culture along with many accompanying values, beliefs and, most notably, norms. It, like the newspaper subscription flyer, says much about identity, in fact an entire section can be found entitled “identity”. Further, identity information is clearly indicated in the title of the document which reflects two commonly employed identity labels along with the belief that deaf and hearing are different. Again, it can be noted that “hearing” always appears subordinate to “deaf” (in the title, in all references to “deaf and hearing”, and in the arrangement of columns for comparison) reflecting a greater value on deaf identity and the social hierarchy from the “deaf center”. Cultural information on the visual is found in a number of the sections including “materialistic aspects” noting visual adaptations, “attention getting”, again, noting visual adaptations, “eye contact” outlining norms for eye contact, and “the environment” which speaks to the value of the visual and additional norms. Language, like identity, has a designated section in the document. The “language” section details a number of discourse norms. In addition, the value placed on the language is indicated in the section entitled “status” which notes that “Deaf people place a high value and status on those who are skilled users of ASL...”.
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The final example of a reading genre is a handout that was used during an orientation for hearing visitors who were part of an accreditation team. The handout includes “a brief orientation to deaf culture” and tips on “how to use an interpreter”. The orientation to deaf culture includes only 6 points, however, a great deal more cultural information can be found implicitly. In fact, the very existence of this handout designed to “orient” hearing people to deaf culture implicitly reflects the belief that deaf and hearing are different, as well as the belief that hearing people don’t understand deaf culture. The first point on the handout is about identity. It, too, indicates commonly used identity labels of deaf and hard of hearing. Implicitly, it again reflects the social hierarchy and the value placed on a deaf identity through the superordinate position of “deaf”. The second point on the handout addresses the bilingual nature of the culture. Once again, at a more implicit level, the relationship between the two languages and the value of ASL is reflected in the order of presentation. The third and fifth points present visual aspects of the culture. One point indicating a number of alerting systems as visual adaptations to sound, the other outlining the value of the visual through the importance of lightning. The fourth point makes note of cultural differences in norms for introductions, although it does not elaborate on this statement, it further conveys the belief that deaf and hearing are different. The final point on the handout notes various ways to initiate conversation, both visual and tactile.

The reverse side of the handout begins its description of working with an interpreter by comparing visual and spoken languages. This description once again highlights the importance of the visual, both in its discussion and in its order of
presentation. The comparison also notes the value of ASL. At a more implicit level, this discussion speaks to the relationship between ASL and English through its emphasis on the recognition of ASL as a “natural language”, a “true language with its own unique grammar and syntax”. Likewise, the difference between the languages is present in the fact that interpretation is necessary.

Explanation (EXPLAIN) was also identified as a key genre for the transmission/learning of deaf culture. Explanation occurs when one individual provides another or a group with detailed, supported information, generally from a single perspective, around a topic. Explanation of values can be found in the data, however, beliefs and norms predominate. A good example of an explanation occurred during lunch one afternoon. Maureen, Tonya, and Susan were sharing a table. Maureen attempted to converse with Tonya using both sign and speech simultaneously. Tonya began her explanation by telling Maureen that ‘this is not an oral school’, therefore she must pick either sign or speech. If Maureen wants to use speech she should not sign (Tonya demonstrated this by placing her arms behind her back and making mouth movements in imitation of speech). If Maureen wants to use sign then she should do it with “ZIPPED-LIPS”. Tonya continued the explanation by providing a rationale - if Maureen uses sign and speech simultaneously, it is disjointed and can’t be understood. This interaction explicitly addresses norms for language use. Implicitly it addresses identity and identity marking. By using sign and speech simultaneously, Maureen has been marked as an outsider. If she wants to be considered an insider, she must not continue this behavior.
A second example of explanation came as a response to an inquiry. In this instance, I had been chatting with Jorge and Lori. In a previous interaction, Jorge had told me that deaf people did not trust most hearing people. I inquired now as to what made some hearing people trustworthy. Jorge provided an explanation. He reiterated that it is rare to find a deaf person who really trusts a hearing person. He went on to say that the way to earn trust as a hearing person is by socializing. He added that supporting and encouraging deaf needs will also earn a hearing person trust. On the other hand, he noted that deaf people are not very trusting or interested in those hearing people who say they are just learning to sign or can just fingerspell. In this example, Jorge conveys the belief that hearing people are not trustworthy very clearly. As he tells how to earn trust, he speaks of socialization, political activism for deaf rights ("supporting and encouraging deaf needs"), and language use as identity markers. The reader is reminded that these behaviors are similarly important markers for deaf individuals to achieve a culturally deaf identity (see Chapter Four). Implicitly, then Jorge is stating that in order for a hearing person to become trustworthy, he/she must accept and abide by deaf norms which reflect the values of language and identity.

A lecture (PRESENTATION) can be conceived of as an explanation given by an authority or master to an audience. Lectures were quite common in educational events and in trainings. For example, the monthly parent group meeting had a full slate of lectures throughout the year. During the year of this research, the majority of parent group lectures pertained to reading and reflected the relationship between ASL and English. A typical such lecture occurred in November when Helen, an elementary
teacher, presented findings from her research regarding strategies used by deaf mothers who were reading aloud in ASL from children's books (written in English) to their deaf and hard of hearing children. She accompanied her presentation with videotaped examples of mothers using the six specific strategies that she described (sign placement (utilizing the book), text paired with signed demonstration, real world connection between text and child's experience, attention maintenance, physical demonstrations of character changes (using body posture and facial expressions), and non-manual signals (facial expressions) as questions)\(^{13}\). Parents were also given strategies for developing their child's interest in English by connecting the text with signs and particularly fingerspelling. In addition, parents were advised to develop their child's ASL skills completely so that would more readily understand the structure of a second language, English. This lecture included information about all three key components of the culture. Most clearly it conveys the value of ASL and the belief that ASL should be learned before English. It also presented a number of ASL discourse strategies (usage norms). Norms regarding the visual nature of the culture were also present (signing directly on the book, holding the book so that the child can see the pictures and text, maintaining eye contact (attention maintenance)). Finally, though quite implicit, the belief that deaf is different from hearing is present in the very undertaking of the study.

Another example of lecture occurred during the Central States Schools for the Deaf (CSSD)\(^{14}\) basketball tournament opening ceremonies. Two presenters, both former ISD graduates, were invited to reminisce about their own CSSD experiences. Both presenters spoke of the importance of the tournament for the deaf community.
One presenter stated that the first year he attended a CSSD tournament, as a fan, he didn’t realize the importance, however, after that first experience he was struck that it really was a big deal for deaf schools. He told of his subsequent experiences as a player including the rivalry that developed with a player from a deaf school in another state. It was this rival that became his roommate at Gallaudet University for three years. He also acted as the best man at the “rival’s” wedding. He concluded his presentation by stating that ‘CSSD always holds a special place in my heart as it will for you’.

The second speaker began her presentation by stating that she had never experienced CSSD as a player because the tournament was not in existence at the time of her enrollment at the deaf school. Nonetheless, she noted that ‘the deaf school is my home’. After four years of college she ‘came home again’ to teach and become the basketball coach. It was as the coach that she experienced CSSD. She noted that CSSD was important for a number of reasons. Twice she noted its importance to friendship: it was ‘a place to meet new friends and renew old friendships’, it was the ‘best place to make friends and maintain old friendships’. In addition, she noted that CSSD was important because of ‘identity – deaf pride’, that when the tournament was over, the students would not leave hating each other, but loving each other and maintaining contact through written correspondence. Both of these presentations convey identity information. The value of a deaf identity is found explicitly in the statement that CSSD was important because of ‘identity – deaf pride’. CSSD, though a sports tournament, was also identified as an important place for socializing (making and maintaining friendships) which in turn is an important norm for the establishment of a culturally 173
deaf identity. Finally, it is notable that both speakers graduated from residential deaf schools, one referring to the school as “home”. This transmits the value placed on the school and its role in achieving a culturally deaf identity.

Another key genre, perhaps even the single most important genre based on number of aspects conveyed (8/8), is the declaration (INFORM). Declarations are singular statements of opinion or belief. Declarations are generally not backed up by supporting or detailed information. Because of their nature as statements of opinion or belief, declarations are often very explicit in terms of content. For example, during a special presentation by a hearing poet, Susan comments to the poet and her fellow students that ‘ASL poetry is more beautiful than written poetry (read as poetry in English, hearing poetry)...and everyone thinks sign language is so beautiful’. Her value of ASL and belief that ASL is superior to English is very clear.

Another example of a declaration, though not so explicit, occurred during dinner a week and a half into my study. I was ill and had lost my voice nearly entirely. I commented to Kelly, a dorm supervisor, that I found it ironic that I had come to live at the deaf school (where speech is not highly valued) and lost my voice. A male dorm supervisor who was seated with us declared that this was “sweet justice”. In his declaration, he is confirming that speech is not highly valued. His comment can also be interpreted as a reflection of the value of a deaf identity while commenting on oppression since hearing people have long taken away, through suppression, the language of the deaf (sign language). Now the tables had been turned, the deaf school had taken away a hearing person’s language (speech).
The fifth genre that is key for the transmission/learning of deaf culture is the discussion (DISCUSS). Discussions involve the expression of ideas and/or opinions from several individuals around a single topic. Turns within discussions are generally clear cut, that is, there is little to no overlapping talk (an exception may be heated discussions). As with explanation, beliefs and norms are predominant in this genre.

An excellent example of a discussion occurred during a senior class meeting. During this meeting, the class was to decide on a graduation speaker. The class sponsor began the discussion by asking for suggestions. Tonya suggested Frank Turk, who was unknown to some of her fellow students. The sponsor, who had also thought Frank Turk would be a good choice, explained that he is a well-known deaf leader and had served in many professional capacities. The sponsor went on to ask if there were other suggestions for deaf speakers. She then qualified the statement by saying that the speaker could be hearing if they wanted but she had felt that they would prefer a deaf speaker. Susan suggested Mary Beth Miller, a deaf comedienne. Mark, another class sponsor, suggested Shaquille O’Neal, a hearing professional basketball player, because he had a deaf neighbor and so he (O’Neal) had learned ASL. In addition, O’Neal had recently invited a class of deaf students to watch one of his games, unbeknownst to them. When the game was over, the students were asked to stay in their seats and O’Neal came out to chat with them. The senior class members commented amongst themselves that they did not know this about O’Neal and they liked the idea of inviting him. Elaine suggested the reigning Miss America, Heather Whitestone, who was deaf. Rashad raised his hands to shoulder level (in order to be seen) and responded “CAN’T”.
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Susan commented that this would not reflect well on the senior class because Whitestone was unable to sign and it would look as if they supported her. During this discussion identity is prevalent. It begins with the class sponsor’s stated assumption that the students would prefer a deaf speaker. This stated assumption conveys the value of a deaf identity and deaf solidarity. The discussion concludes with the rejection of a possible deaf speaker due to the inability to sign. Just prior to this rejection, there was an acceptance (though not a final decision) of a possible hearing speaker (notably, the only hearing person who was suggested) due to the ability to sign. Using ability to sign in this manner, to judge appropriateness of a graduation speaker, reflects not only the value of sign language (highly valued) and speech (devalued) but also norms for employing language as an identity marker. The use of language as an identity marker is stated clearly by Susan: inviting Heather Whitestone would reflect badly on the class, "it would look as if we supported her".

Chatting (CHAT), informal talk that may shift topics frequently and rapidly with turns that may overlap, was quite possibly the most frequently observed genre\textsuperscript{14}. Chatting was observed to occur across all communication events. However, chatting occurred with greatest frequency in those events that were less structured and more within the student’s control, such as meals and freetime. For example, during freetime one evening, Marie and Deon were chatting about family dynamics while Brandi and I, sitting in proximity, talked about her severely chapped hands. As I turned to the conversation between Deon and Marie, I see that they were talking about how lucky it was if a baby and its parents were both deaf because communication was easy. On the
other hand, if the parents were hearing communication was hard and awkward. Marie offered that ISD had a good pre-school where the hearing parents would be taught. The conversation then shifted to another topic. While all the details of the conversation between Marie and Deon are not available, what is available clearly speaks to identity. It conveys the belief that deaf is good (if the baby is deaf that is lucky), that deaf and hearing are different (communication with one is easy, with the other hard and awkward), and the value of the deaf school (it can make up for the hearing parent’s shortcomings).

Another example of chatting occurred in the freshman girls’ pod area of the dorm immediately after school (when there was some “down time”). Tonya had come to visit. After fielding requests to help with homework and trying to goad Katrina into a game of one-upmanship, Tonya turned to Marie and told her that the freshman girls were not disciplined because while they were sharing dorm space (due to the number of visiting players for the CSSD tournament) one of the students pulled open the shower curtain to ask Tonya where another student was. Marie responded that she didn’t know where the student would have learned such behavior. ‘I flash the lights, students stick their heads out. I indicate which one I need to talk to’. Katrina agreed that flashing the lights is the way to go. Kelly, the other supervisor, confessed that the student probably learned it from her because the student in question tended to take very long showers. As a result, Kelly opens the curtain to tell the student her time is up and she must get out of the shower. Marie added that she sticks her hand into the shower and signs “HURRY” rather than opening the curtain. It is the last topic of this chat that is of
interest to this dissertation. Explicitly it speaks to visual adaptations of sound (norms), where a hearing person may simply call a student’s name while in the shower, a deaf person can not do this. Based on the conversation, one learns that pulling open the shower curtain is not within the range of acceptable behavior, but rather, the norm is to flash the lights or insert a hand into the student’s line of sight (that is, into the shower). This example is important not only because the chat itself makes available visual norms for attention getting, but also because it provides a glimpse into indigenous understanding of how culture learning occurs through interaction. In her confession, Kelly admits to demonstrating/modeling this behavior which was observed (repeatedly) by the student.

The final genre that is key in the transmission of nearly all aspects and components of deaf culture is inquiry (ASK-A-QUESTION). In inquiry a question is directed at another for the purpose of gaining information which requires a response from the interlocutor. Inquiry is differentiated from request by what is sought in the posing of the question. A request is a question directed at another for the purpose of satisfying a need such as for permission or assistance. Whereas, an inquiry seeks information regarding who, what, where, when, why, and how. The most common inquiry, by far, was “are you deaf or hearing”? This inquiry may be posed either as presented or as “are you deaf”, or even as “are you hearing” (though this last form is not very common on the deaf school campus). The inquiry may also be posed in the third person, as when Lori, having seen my husband at homecoming but not having been formally introduced, asked of his hearing status, “is he deaf”? This common inquiry
clearly states the belief that deaf and hearing are different. Its most typical form, again, places deaf before hearing thus conveying the relationship between the two identities that has been frequently described in this dissertation (deaf is superior to hearing).

Another example of culture transmission/learning that began with inquiry was presented earlier as an example of explanation since the required response was fulfilled by an explanation. In that example, I asked what made some hearing people trustworthy. In my asking, I acknowledged, explicitly, the belief that hearing people, in general, are not trustworthy. I also acknowledged the belief that deaf and hearing were different.

Inquiry was quite frequently employed in regards to language, particularly to check on the meaning of a sign and/or appropriate usage. In this usage of inquiry, the cultural information is not located in the question itself, as in the previous examples, but rather in the response, generally a demonstration or explanation. Nonetheless, the inquiry is important to the transmission/learning process because without it, the demonstration or example would likely not have occurred. For example, during a fifth grade ASL class students played a game which required them to produce as many signs as they could using a handshape indicated on a flashcard. The students produced a sign that the teacher was unfamiliar with (moving an “I” handshape, palm down, across the chin in a similar fashion to “LIE” while the tongue moves quickly in the cheek). He asked them to explain its meaning. Upon a satisfactory explanation (it means ‘to fool someone’), he accepted the sign as correct. This happened on several occasions during the course of the game. Another example of inquiry regarding the meaning of a sign
occurred during a girls' basketball game. The point-guard was dribbling the ball down
the court while raising her non-dribbling hand making a single sign that looked like
"YELLOW". Jill, one of the college students, inquired as to who "YELLOW" was. She
was told that this was not a person but rather the calling of a play. By employing this
type of direct inquiry, students are actively seeking and learning norms for language
usage.

The remaining genres of interaction contain cultural information which is made
available in much the same way as has been demonstrated for the eight key genres (see
again Figure 13). Of the remaining genres, it could be argued that each and every one is
responsible for information regarding language since the interactions are occurring
through language. At the very least, norms for language use are present in any given
interaction. Beyond that, it may be arguable that the value of ASL is present in its
regular and predominant usage. It is more important, perhaps, to note that correction,
direction, teasing, mocking, imitation, and verbal games appear to work in conjunction
with the eight key genres to convey the whole of language as it relates to deaf culture.
Likewise, reminiscence and cheering (as a demonstration of solidarity) appear to work
in conjunction with the eight key genres to convey the whole of identity. It should also
be noted that due to the close relationship between language and identity within
American deaf culture, teasing and mocking are also effective in conveying aspects of
identity because teasing (or mocking) about language use implicitly marks one as
"deviant", "not one of us". Finally, demonstration and visual games appear to be
important aids in the transmission of the visual component of the culture\textsuperscript{15}. 
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DOCUMENTING CULTURE LEARNING

Having established that cultural information is available through interactions, it would now seem necessary to demonstrate that culture learning in fact occurred. There are, however, a number of impediments to my ability to clearly and definitively establish that learning occurred. First and foremost, the basic behavioral design of the research, as discussed in Chapter One, precludes the direct investigation of cognitive changes (read as learning). Those changes that can be noted through behavioral methods can not be associated with any single interaction. Such changes are likely the cumulative result of multiple interactions. In addition, it was not possible to be ever present with any individual, thus, it was not possible to record every interaction that may have played a role in subsequent cognitive changes.

Despite the impediments mentioned above, some indicators of cognitive change were notable. Greater facility with the language is one such indicator. This was notable through simple observation. For example, when Betsy, an elementary student, first enrolled at the school in January, she used an English form of sign with simultaneous speech or mouth movement. By the end of the school year, four months later, I observed her to be using more ASL grammar without mouth movement even when conversing with other students who typically use sign with speech simultaneously. Change in language usage was also notable through informant report. For example, Harold, a vocational teacher, reported to me that when Marcus first arrived at ISD he frequently asked for interpretation and to be spoken to. Four months later Harold reported that Marcus “is much better now”, meaning that Marcus was requesting
interpretation and speech notably less frequently. Similarly, following the Valentine’s
day party, Amy, one of the college students, reported that she felt more comfortable at
this event than at any prior events, that there were students at the party she could talk
with and understand better. A final example of notable changes in signing ability via
informant report comes from another college student, Marian. Marian and I attended
elementary Black History Month student presentations in February. Following the first
day of presentations, Marian reported that she had difficulty understanding much of
what was being said (all the presentations were given in ASL, no interpreters were
present). Marian and I later attended the elementary end of the year academic awards
ceremony in May (again, the presentations were given in ASL with no interpretation).
Following the awards, Marian reported that she understood a great deal more of the
presentations than she had in February.

Changes in values and beliefs were more easily noted among the college
students than among the deaf students because, as noted in Chapter Three, formal
interviews were conducted with the college students at the beginning and the end of the
year. In addition, they each completed a deaf culture scrapbook near the end of the
year. Changes in values and beliefs can be seen in Susie, for example. In the initial
interview Susie spoke predominantly of the language component of deaf culture, though
her responses did indicate some knowledge of values (ASL is better than English),
beliefs (ASL/English relationship) and norms (sign with speech is not acceptable)
associated with the language. In addition, she indicated knowledge of the value of deaf
culture and the belief that deaf and hearing are different. During the final interview (5
months later) her knowledge was much broader reflecting more values and beliefs related to identity and the visual nature of the culture. In this second interview, Susie’s responses reflected the value of a deaf identity (when she heard the term “hearing-impaired” being used she wanted to correct this, to say, “deaf, just deaf”); deaf values regarding cochlear implants. mainstreaming and speech (negative values); the belief that hearing people don’t/can’t understand (she stated that it was inappropriate for a hearing person to teach deaf culture courses because “that’s not her (sic) culture, therefore, she shouldn’t teach it”); the value placed on the visual (stating that she found herself wanting to see the person on the other end of the phone rather than simply hear them); and norms for adapting to the visual nature of the culture (moving a centerpiece so that all at the table could be seen). Susie was chosen as an example here because she came to ISD with the least knowledge and experience with deaf culture. Her ASL skills upon arrival were weak (only a single class had been taken) and her only prior contact with a deaf person was with her ASL teacher. In addition, Susie did not often interact outside of her required practicum. She did not join in freetime activities and seldom participated in special activities such as parties and dances. Despite what could easily be considered limited interactions, it is possible to identify changes in her knowledge of deaf culture and in her culturally appropriate behavior.

On the other hand, Jill came to ISD having completed three ASL classes in addition to three years of personal interaction with deaf individuals that she continued while on ISD’s campus. During the initial interview (and in sign class journals from the first two months on campus), she demonstrates a fairly broad knowledge and a degree
of acceptance of deaf culture across all three key components. She spoke repeatedly
and at length about ASL and its importance (read value) to deaf culture. In fact, in her
sign class journals she demonstrates not only a knowledge of this value but also an
acceptance of the value through a lack of interest in non-ASL videotapes (“I thought
this tape was unchallenging. I’m hoping to never grab another. I don’t feel it was
educational because it was Signed English”). In the initial interview Jill also speaks of,
and appears to accept, two beliefs associated with identity: that deaf and hearing are
different, and that hearing people don’t understand. This later belief is again very
evident in her sign class journals where she often makes statements such as “I would
not recommend this (videotape) for educational purposes because it may give the
viewer (read hearing people) wrong ideas about the culture” and “if viewing with
hearing friends I would explain …”. Though not stated directly, Jill’s comments that
she would explain/clarify deaf culture, imply that she also accepts the positive value of
a deaf identity. Finally, Jill notes eye contact norms, the use of physical descriptions,
and straightforward talk as part of American deaf culture. Due to the degree of
knowledge that Jill brought with her to ISD, noting learning is more difficult as the
changes are more subtle when compared to those demonstrated by Susie. Where Susie
reflected an increasing breadth of knowledge, Jill reflects an increasing depth of
knowledge, especially in terms of identity. She titled her scrapbook, a twenty-three (23)
page detailed work, “Photographs of Deaf Culture through the Eyes of a Hearing
Person” clearly indicating, again, the belief that deaf and hearing are different. She
reiterates this belief to me during the interview when she expresses an interest in
exploring whether there was a difference in how the students related to deaf and hearing teachers. She continues this line of thought by speculating that language proficiency is key to the relationship. This statement begins to reflect her deepening knowledge of identity marking through language usage. She demonstrates an even deeper understanding of identity marking in the final interview and in the scrapbook when she notes that a deaf identity is not tied to audiometric hearing loss ("some who hear well are part of deaf culture", "not all deaf people are profoundly deaf"). Rather, she notes that a deaf identity is based on "acceptance of the culture, acceptance of norms, and rules and that kind of stuff". In addition to the belief that deaf and hearing are different, Jill includes in her scrapbook the beliefs that deaf role models are important ("children can see life exists as a deaf adult"), deaf is better than hearing (though she clarifies that this is not a belief found among the elementary students, in her opinion, but it is present by high school), and that hearing people are oppressors. These deepening beliefs regarding deaf identity occur in conjunction with a more directly stated acceptance of the value of a deaf identity. Jill's understanding of language also deepens a bit. Whereas in the initial interview she speaks of the value of ASL and the devaluation of signed forms of English, in the final interview she adds the devaluation of speech. Her understanding of the visual nature of the culture has changed the least. In the initial interview, she speaks of norms associated with the visual (eye contact, for example). In her scrapbook she goes slightly beyond this when she notes under a section entitled "Things I never realized about Deaf Culture before experiencing it for Myself" that "deaf people can't be interviewed on a tape recorder". When I asked her about this
statement. She chuckled and said that she had simply never thought of it until one day when she thought that I should be there with my cassette recorder to record an event, then it hit her that this was not feasible. In her final interview and in her scrapbook, Jill speaks to a new awareness of the place of sound in the culture (a secondary component of the culture). She writes in her scrapbook “the deaf school is not a quiet place!” She noted a similar sentiment during the interview. I had asked her to reflect on her experience over the year and to tell me if she recognized any misconceptions that she had when the year began. She responded that she had expected quiet. Jill also noted that she arrived on campus with the misconception that closed captions were clear and easily understandable. What she learned was that they were often incorrectly typed and not so easy to understand, especially if one’s reading level is not high.

Jill’s interactions with students and deaf staff beyond the required practicum hours were more extensive than Susie’s. Jill attended sporting events, parties and dances, meals, open captioned films, and free time at least occasionally. However, by her own admission, her interactions were largely limited to the classroom. Despite the limitations to both Jill and Susie’s interactions with deaf students, they learned something of the values and beliefs of deaf culture as has been shown. It seems reasonable, then, to assume that values and beliefs of deaf culture are likewise being learned by deaf students who spend substantially greater amounts of time in interaction with peers and deaf adults across a greater range of events and genres than either Jill or Susie.
In summary, patterns of interaction at ISD were found to be restricted by setting based on age and sex. This restriction was mediated, at least in part, by the ability to participate in a variety of communication events which cross-cut settings. In large part, genres were shared across communication events. The differentiation that was noted is attributed to the degree of formality of an event and locus of control and direction.

Degree of formality in an event is inversely related to the range of genres that are permissible within the event – greater formality, fewer genres. Range of genres seem to fall along a continuum of control with student controlled events employing the greatest range of genres, events with shared control employing a moderate range of genres, and adult controlled events employing the most restricted range of genres. The full range of genres employed within deaf culture is quite extensive. Within the range of genres, all of the culture content of American deaf culture can be found at both an explicit and an implicit level often reflecting the complex interrelationships between aspects of the culture. Eight genres appear to be most central to culture transmission/learning at ISD as they make available nearly all aspects of the culture (that is, the values, beliefs, and norms associated with each of the identified primary components of the culture). For each component of the culture, additional genres compliment the eight central ones in making content available.

CONCLUSION

Early in this chapter I posited that culture, in the case of this research, deaf culture, was transmitted/learned through interaction in which culture content was made available. It has been shown that the values, belief, and norms of American deaf culture
are in fact available to a learner in this way — through interaction — though not always explicitly. Numerous examples have been given in this chapter which demonstrate this availability across communicative events, settings, and especially genres. While interesting in and of themselves, these patterns are useful in answering the question of how American deaf culture is learned only in conjunction with evidence that learning did occur. Examples documenting cultural learning were provided in the chapter, though, admittedly, they are not direct evidence of cognitive change. Nonetheless, they are evidence of culture learning in that changes in knowledge and acceptance of values, beliefs and norms of deaf culture are evident. However, due to methodological limitations and the inability to directly link this learning to a specific interaction or cluster of interactions, some may continue to argue against my contention that one learns culture, in this case American deaf culture, through the process of interaction.

Additional support for this contention can be found in indigenous understandings of how deaf culture is transmitted/learned. Two examples of indigenous understanding of culture transmission/learning were presented in this chapter, one noting that socializing is the way by which hearing people can earn trust, and the other noting that attention getting behaviors in the shower were learned by observation of a dorm supervisor’s behavior. In each case interaction was of central importance. This same understanding was reiterated by Jill during her final interview. She stated that she planned to provide feedback to the supervisors of the college experience program that would emphasize the importance of being involved because “you can’t learn the culture unless you know what is going on”. Likewise, another college student, in her honor’s
thesis for graduation reflecting on her experiences at ISD, writes: "Our knowledge of Deaf (sic) culture was mainly acquired through interactions with Deaf (sic) people, talking to them and living with them on a daily basis" (Alvis 1997:4), and Many [college] students have their first experiences with Deaf (sic) culture through American Sign Language classes at [the college] and other classes in the major. The instructors impart a great deal of important information and give exposure to issues in Deaf Education and culture. While this information is helpful and necessary, it is difficult to integrate the knowledge without personal knowledge of Deaf people on a personal level: integration can only be accomplished through personal exposure (Alvis 1997:10, emphasis mine).

Restrictions to participation were only briefly touched upon in this chapter. Likewise, the role and/or effect of participants on interactions has yet to be addressed. In the following chapter, I explore patterns of participation, including the existence and nature of restrictions to participation, in order to further elucidate and support the role of interaction as the central process in culture transmission/learning and to explore the second primary research question (for deaf culture, is the acculturative experience different than the enculturative experience).

---

1 This phenomenon will be explored more fully in Chapter Six.

2 The reader is reminded of the translation issues noted in Chapter Three. The labels reported for all of the communication components discussed herein are presented in their best English translation.

3 It is perhaps important to note that this may lend credence to those who have argued that deaf culture is transmitted from peer to peer at the residential school rather than from adult to child. While the residential deaf school classroom does have a smaller teacher to student ratio than a public school, there are still more peers as potential interlocutors than adults. The same holds true for the dorm situation where a single supervisor may have responsibility for 5-6 students.

4 Note, however, that while attendance at sporting events allowed for interaction between sexes, participation in sports maintained segregation. There were no boys on the girls' volleyball team, no girls on the boys' basketball team, etc.
While the majority of courses are not segregated by sex, a few still reflect traditional gender roles. For example, only boys were observed in the electricity course. Likewise, only a single male student was enrolled in the foods course.

The year of this study, the gymnasium appeared to be a setting of central importance. Educational, social, sports events, freetime and formal meetings all occurred in the gym at one time or another. It is my belief that this appearance is skewed by the fact that the auditorium was closed for renovation early in the school year. It is my belief that at least some of the educational events (assemblies, special presentations, etc.) which occurred in the gymnasium would have otherwise occurred in the auditorium.

Also embedded within the various communication events are ends, key, and norms which will not be elaborated upon in this dissertation.

Note that there was adult supervision of these events, however, the adults did not determine which events would occur on any given day nor did they influence who would or would not be permitted to participate.

An exception to adult control of formal meetings was noted with class meetings. Students were observed to direct these meetings. Nonetheless, there was an adult "sponsor" present to oversee and assist.

The reader is reminded that previously these were identified as secondary components of the culture because they lacked associated values and beliefs. Their secondary nature is also reflected in Figure 12 through the association with a more restricted range of genre.

I chose not to classify observation as information seeking because it generally was not initiated for the purpose of intentionally gaining information, though I acknowledge that some individuals, such as anthropologists, may use observation in an information seeking manner.

This explanation led immediately into the reinforcement genre of ignoring. Maureen disregarded Tonya's explanation and continued to use sign and speech simultaneously. Tonya then diverted her gaze and ignored Maureen.

See Lartz and Lestina 1995.

CSSD member schools include Indiana, Ohio, Illinois, Michigan, and Wisconsin. A sixth school from outside the organization is invited annually to participate in the tournament.

The reader is reminded that actual frequency counts were not made, thus, this statement is intuitive.

It is entirely possible that other genres might also be more readily associated with the specific components of the culture. For example, introductions would seem to lend a great deal of identity information based on the norms for introductions reported in the literature and that I have experienced elsewhere in the deaf community. However, due to limited occurrences in this study there is not a clear relationship. I speculate that introductions (that is, formal introductions) were limited on campus because it is essentially a "closed" system, few unknown individuals are present. Other similar relationships also seem plausible but can not be stated with certainty here due to limited observed occurrences.
CHAPTER 6
ENCULTURATION/ACCULTURATION: A COMPARISON

The second primary research question of whether the acculturative experience is different from the enculturative experience within American deaf culture remains to be addressed in this dissertation. In this chapter, patterns of participation are examined in contemplation of this question. The reader is reminded that one assumption of this study is that it is possible to simultaneously study both acculturation and enculturation within American deaf culture due to the natural composition of the group. The majority of deaf children are born as “outsiders” to the culture, born to hearing parents, thus learning deaf culture through attendance at the residential deaf school (acculturation) rather than at home. On the other hand, there is a small percentage of deaf children who are born into the culture, begin to learn it immediately at home and continue to learn it through attendance at the residential deaf school (enculturation). This assumption has been specifically applied to this study in the comparison of new students (those who were enrolled at the school for the first time during the year of the study, as well as the college students) and established students (those who had previously been in enrolled at the school). Those new students who had deaf parents were re-grouped for analysis.
purposes with the established students. In this way, students have been grouped so that it is possible to proceed by assuming that new students were experiencing acculturation and established students were experiencing enculturation.

Initially, general patterns of participation, including observed social networks, are discussed ("with whom do students interact"). The patterns are examined through continued usage of the ethnography of communication as the analytic framework in order to discover any relationship(s) between participants and genres. This approach essentially addresses two tertiary research questions related to the role of interaction in culture transmission and learning: "are there restrictions to participation" and "is content form (explicit/implicit) affected by participants". In addition, changes in participation patterns, either over time or on other bases, is noted. Special attention is paid to the presence of differences in participation patterns for established students and new students (including the college students).

Additional elaboration of participation patterns is accomplished through a subsequent analysis employing Lave and Wenger’s (1991) concept of legitimate peripheral participation and Hall’s (1959) three types of learning (formal, informal, and technical). In particular, established and new students are compared to determine if legitimate peripheral participation is experienced by all, what is required to move closer to full participation in American deaf culture, and who the perceived “masters” are. Consequently, a model of enculturation is drawn from Hall’s work and further delineated. The model is then applied to the data in order to determined if established and new students are differentially involved in each of the learning types, how learning
type impacts culture content learned, and, ultimately, if any of the learning types appears to more readily lend themselves to acculturative experiences or to enculturative experiences.

In this way, both patterns for participation generally and a comparison of the experiences of established and new students will be identified. The chapter concludes, then, with a proposed model for culture transmission/learning within American deaf culture and a discussion of the implications of the identified patterns on the concepts of enculturation and acculturation.

GENERAL PATTERNS OF PARTICIPATION

Social networks

Social networks are particularly useful for the study of interactions because they map an individual's contacts/links with others. While not among the most commonly employed methods in anthropology, they are useful because they make up “a grid of personal links which, depending on the population, mirrors commonly studied domains of social structure such as kinship, friendship, religion and trade” (Gumperz 1982:41). Thus, social networks have been used in anthropology and in sociolinguistics for the study of a wide range of topics including, but not limited to, social structure, social status, social change, and language shift (See Ellen 1984; Gumperz 1982). An individual likely has numerous social networks, some of which may be “open” and others “closed”. “Exactly how many separate networks are recognized in any one study
and how the distinctions are defined depends on research goals" (Gumperz 1982:41). In this study, set-centered and ego-centered networks\(^1\) are of interest in determining what contacts exist, regardless of the purpose of the contact.

A number of methods are typically employed in the collection of social network data. These include interviewing, often beginning with a core set of individuals who are asked to identify other individuals with whom they have contact. All those who are named are subsequently interviewed, thus "snowballing" the sample. Interviews can be even further tailored depending upon the research question(s) being explored. For example, an individual may be asked to rank other individuals based on any number of criteria including frequency of contact, degree of friendship, relationship, etc. (Burt 1980). Data may also be collected using questionnaires (Mitchell 1969). "In many ways, however, the most reliable and adequate information is likely to be obtained through direct observation. The observer over a period of time is able to make his own assessment of the interaction of an individual with others around him and to record its characteristics" (Mitchell 1969:31), though the effectiveness of this technique is compounded by participant observation.

The social networks described herein were generated in this last manner, based solely on observation (both participant and non-participant), though, admittedly, more often than not, not on observation that was intended to record social networks. As a result, the networks were abstracted from fieldnotes upon return from the field and for purposes of determining patterns of interaction between individuals. While Mitchell (1969) believes that observation is the “most reliable and adequate” (31) means of data
collection. I find there are limitations to the extent of the data\(^2\) and to the ability to do formal analysis in this study. Formal analysis of network data requires substantially greater rigor in data collection than that afforded by observation without regard for the relevant characteristics of social networks (anchorage, reachability, density, range, content, directedness, durability, intensity, and frequency)\(^3\) as was employed here. Nonetheless, informal analysis was possible and does reveal patterns of contact (relationship) that are useful to an understanding of culture transmission/learning.

In re-constructing the social networks, I considered a contact/link to occur any time there was a direct, active interaction between individuals or when an individual was party to an interaction between others, that is when the individual participated in an interaction in a more passive manner such as through observation. I included passive interaction as a contact/link because I assume that transmission/learning can and does occur during passive interactions as well as active interactions. Networks were reconstructed for all of the new deaf students as well as the college students. Networks were also reconstructed for a sample of the established students. The sample was not randomly chosen. Those in the sample of established students were those who were most actively involved in the study and those who were identified as “leaders”.

ISD could, in fact, be considered a single, set-centered network or a “closed network” in that it is reasonable to assume that every individual on the campus of ISD has the potential to interact with every other individual on the campus at some time (set-centered) while at the same time interactions with others outside of campus are restricted (“closed”). Such a view is not, however, useful for the purposes of this
study. It is far more useful to recognize that students may be involved in a number of set-centered social networks as well as ego-centered networks on campus. In addition, the social networks may be either prescribed or voluntary, with ego-centered networks typically voluntary and set-centered networks commonly prescribed.

Two primary set-centered social networks at ISD are prescribed by setting. The first, the school setting, finds students grouped in cohorts prescribed by age or academic achievement. These networks are employed on a daily basis (during the five school days each week) from 8:00 a.m. until 3:15 p.m., a substantial part of the students' waking hours. The weight of this set is well illustrated by Tonya's comment to Brandi about her classmates, Elaine and Susan. Tonya, Elaine and Susan, all seniors, are in several classes together, thus they spend all day, everyday together (as a set). Tonya comments: 'can you imagine looking at each other all day, everyday!' The second critical set for students was prescribed by the dorm setting. Here, social networks were prescribed by age and/or sex. Students spend time in this set before school (total amounts of time vary here depending upon when students awaken) and again after school from 3:15 p.m. until bedtime (again, total amounts of time are variable). The social networks prescribed by the school and dorm settings are not always mutually exclusive. For example, Tonya, Elaine, and Susan share social networks both at school and in the dorm. This overlap adds additional weight to such prescribed social networks.

Students may also be involved in voluntary sets such as sports teams and student organizations. As noted in Chapter Three, the majority of students participated in at least one sports team during the year. A great many students participated in sports each
season. Two hours of each day was allotted for practice or games. Student organizations at the high school level met infrequently, thus the resultant social networks were not highly utilized. On the other hand, organizations at the elementary level appeared to meet more regularly thus creating stronger networks.

Although settings frequently prescribed social networks, events that allow for the formation of voluntary ego-centered networks mediated this to some extent, much as events mediated restrictions to participation imposed by settings (see Chapter Five). For example, meals and sporting events, which occur in the school setting, do not prescribe social networks. In these events, the networks are ego-centered and voluntary, that is, the students determine with whom they will interact and to what degree. Likewise, freetime events that occur in the dorm setting allow for ego-centered, voluntary associations. Less time is regularly spent in these networks than in the set-centered networks. However, because the campus is in reality a large "closed" set, ego-centered networks do, periodically, over-lap with set-centered networks.

It should, perhaps, not be surprising that ego-centered networks were quite variable and not so broadly characterizable as set-centered networks. Some students had rather large ego-centered networks which crosscut age and sex, others had rather large networks but remained principally age and/or sex segregated. Still others had relatively small networks, some of which cross cut age and sex, some of which did not. Again, due to the limitations imposed by the data collection method, no conclusions about these networks can be drawn with certainty. However, what appears to be true is that while there are interactions (represented by the existence of contacts/links) with a
number of others, there are primary contacts/links within each individual’s ego-centered, voluntary networks that can be characterized idiosyncratically. For example, Maureen’s ego-centered network revealed primary links with a number of other students who, like herself, were able to use spoken English in addition to sign. This group of students often used both sign and speech simultaneously to interact with hearing teachers and dorm staff. They also used this mode of communication amongst themselves on occasion. Marcus’s primary contacts/links, on the other hand, were made with students of similar ethnicity regardless of language/mode of communication. Even for those students whose networks did not reveal any particular set of primary contacts/links, idiosyncratic characterizations are possible. For example, shared interest in sports appeared to shape Brandi’s network. She more frequently chose to sit with those who were similarly involved with sports teams at meals. In addition, she more regularly participated in “pick-up” basketball games during freetime than in any other activity. Other characterizations for ego-centered networks maintain the set-centered characteristics of similarity in sex or age.

The observed social networks of the deaf students, whether set-centered or ego-centered, did not reflect a difference between new and established students. The social networks for all deaf students reflected contact (interaction) with both established and new students. In addition, the networks of the new students were no more or less extensive than those of the established students.
The networks of the college students also reflected contact (interaction) with both established and new students. Their set-centered networks corresponded to their placement in specific classrooms and their dorm placement (with the other college students). They were not involved in any voluntary set-centered networks. Their ego-centered networks largely coincided with the dorm set. their primary contacts being among themselves. Their lack of contacts outside the dorm and school sets is reflected in numerous comments students made to me about the college students' lack of participation in freetime and social events. It is also reflected in the fact that three months into their field experience (in November), Kelly believed there were only four (rather than nine) college students on campus. When I inquired into this lack of participation, the college students unanimously responded that they did not have time to participate and complete their own coursework. A few also noted that whenever they had attempted to participate in a freetime event, there were no students present.

This pattern of networks reveals two differences between the college students and the deaf students. The first difference can be noted in the college students' lack of voluntary, set-centered networks. Secondly, where the deaf students' social networks reflect contact (interaction) with both new and established students in prescribed, set-centered networks as well as in voluntary, ego-centered networks, the college students' networks indicate that interaction with deaf students (or adults), both established and new, occurred nearly exclusively within the prescribed, set-centered networks generated by the school setting.
While presented thus far as somewhat homogeneous, the ego-centered networks of the college students, like the deaf students, were variable. As has been mentioned, Kelly initially knew of only four college students on campus. These four (Jill, Claudia, Amy, and Mary) participated in events, other than educational events, on campus more frequently than the others thus the range of voluntary contacts/links within their networks is greater, though still notably smaller than those of the deaf students. Marian', who came to campus in January, was also notably more involved than the other college students. Her ego-centered network crosscut student age groupings, as did Mary’s and Jill’s.

The patterns revealed by the social networks alone do not allow for thoughtful or sophisticated response to the primary question of this research, is the acculturative experience different than the enculturative experience within American deaf culture, for they have revealed both similarity and dissimilarity. Similarity in networks is noted when the individuals experiencing acculturation (by virtue of this being their second culture) are deaf. Dissimilarity is noted when the individuals experiencing acculturation are hearing. It is impossible, however, to comment on whether this difference is substantive since the notable difference appears to be in the conditions under which contacts are made (read, context) rather than on the existence/non-existence of contacts. Further exploration of the context is thus needed.
Participation In Context

The relationship of social networks to settings and events has already been given cursory attention. It has been noted that each of the network types is found within particular settings and events. For example, the educational setting prescribed set-centered networks for the students based on age and/or academic achievement. Ego-centered networks were found in association with certain events occurring within a given setting. In staying with the example of the educational setting, meals allowed for the formation and employment of ego-centered networks. It appears again that locus of control plays a determining role in the relationship between type of social network and event. Where there is adult control, set-centered networks are found. Where there is student control, ego-centered networks are found. Where there is shared control, both set-centered and ego-centered networks are found. Formal meetings and educational events, which have exclusive or predominant adult control, are regularly associated with prescribed, set-centered networks. At the same time, formal meetings, especially meetings of organizations, and sporting events (for those who are team members) also include voluntary set-centered social networks. Freetime, meals, sporting events (for those who attend the events as spectators), and social events, with shared control that is predominantly student control, are associated with the existence of ego-centered social networks that are restricted to some extent because they develop within an existing set. In other words, while students freely choose with whom they will interact during meals, they are restricted to choices within a larger set\(^8\) that is determined by the setting. Thus, high school students may only choose to sit with other high school students. Ego-
centered networks are similarly restricted during freetime. The period of time for
freetime is predetermined by adults and restricted to a specific larger set (high school
freetime, middle school freetime, elementary freetime). Therefore, again, ego-centered
networks are restricted to those who are relatively of the same age. No events were
noted in which ego-centered networks were exclusively employed or unrestricted in
their development, just as no events were noted that were exclusively under student
control.

Events have previously been described as “mediators” of restrictions to
participation in that they allowed for participation across the limits imposed by settings,
namely age and sex. In terms of social networks, events have been shown to both
mediate and maintain restrictions to participation. Events mediate restrictions imposed
by settings by expanding the size of the set (from academic class to school, from pod to
entire dorm, etc.) within which one may participate. At the same time, restrictions
imposed by age are maintained in that the set is not often expanded beyond those of
relatively the same age. Only some sporting events (such as homecoming and the
CSSD tournament, when participating as spectators) and some social events (such as
family storytelling night and PTCO day) allow for the set to be expanded beyond the
age group. Thus it is clear that age is the primary restriction to participation regardless
of setting or event.

When events are examined in terms of participation patterns of established and
new students, it is noted, as it was noted for social networks, that there is no
differentiation. This should perhaps not be surprising in light of the relationship
between social networks and events. Two slight differences were noted for the college students when compared to the deaf students. The first is participation by the college students in orientation training events (a type of formal meeting) that were designed specifically for them. Deaf students were restricted from participation in these events. The second difference is a notable pattern for those who are not regular participants in the ISD speech community: participation that is marked by the presence of sign language interpreters. This pattern is based on sign language fluency, in this case the lack thereof. Interpreters are found in association with events (such as graduation, parent support group meetings, sports banquets, accreditation team orientation, and MADD presentation) that are open to parents and other hearing visitors. The presence of interpreters clearly marks marginality while at the same time allowing for some degree of participation. While interpreters were provided for the college students in their early training, they were not provided after their first week on campus. Interpreters were also never provided for a new deaf student who was not fluent in sign language. This pattern of interpreter use will be explored further later in this chapter in the discussion of peripheral participation.

I turn now to patterns of participation regarding genre, which have been posed as key to an understanding of the transmission and learning of American deaf culture and to differentiation in the enculturative and acculturative experiences. In Chapter Five, eight genre were identified as key to the transmission of American deaf culture: observation, reading, explanation, lecture/presentation, declaration/statement, discussion, chat and inquiry. These eight genre continue to be key when participation
patterns are considered. In addition, command/direction, demonstration, correction, teasing, mocking, imitation, verbal games, visual games, cheering, and reminiscence were identified in Chapter Five as important supplementary genres based on the culture content that they provided. In terms of participation, correction, demonstration, teasing, verbal games, and visual games are widely experienced, thus remaining supplementary in terms of participation. Direction, mocking, imitation, reminiscence, and cheering were not widely experienced, thus are not considered in the following discussion. In addition to the genres noted above, announcements, due to their frequency and wide participation (as these generally occurred during meals), come into play as an important culture transmitter. Two final genres, though occurring infrequently, are important primarily in terms of participation patterns and secondarily as transmitters of culture: adjusted signing and requests for interpretation.

No genres were identified that were restricted to participation by either established or new students exclusively. Both established and new students were able to participate in any genre of interaction. Thus, all students were potentially exposed to the values, beliefs, and norms of the culture as regards language, identity and its visual nature.

Participation in each of these genres, with the exception of reading, requires at least two individuals\(^9\). one to send the message and one to receive the message. Generally, the participants are aware of their role and participation in an interaction. An exception can be seen in observation where the sender may be unaware of his or her role in this regard. Comparing the participation patterns of established and new
students indicates that their experience of these genre is different based on the role that is assumed (see Figure 14). Established students were observed to participate as both message sender and receiver in all genres. Likewise, new students were able to participate as receiver in all genres. However, new students were more restricted in their participation as message sender. For example, while new students posed inquiries about deaf culture, they were not observed to respond to such inquiries. In fact, inquiries about deaf culture were not posed to the new students. Rather, inquiries posed to new students were about whether they (new students) understood what was being said. Likewise, new students were never observed to act as announcer, demonstrator, or to be the one who was doing the teasing.

Four genres with new students in the role of message sender, indicated on Figure 14 by a slash (/), were each observed to occur only once and under special circumstances. The explanation was given by Amy in response to Marian’s inquiry about the importance of my recording Rashad and Arron telling A-B-C stories\(^\text{10}\). The declaration was made by Jill, to me during a basketball game. She stated that it was fortunate that the girls’ basketball coach was hearing because he could argue with the officials just as the opposing team’s coach could. In both of these instances the participants are new students, college students. Amy had been living on campus four months prior to Marian’s arrival and is thus “less new”. Jill and I had been living on campus for the same length of time. Neither interaction involved an established student. The lecture/presentation was given by Marcus with guidance from Abby, an established junior. Marcus presented the results of a group discussion to the junior
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GENRE</th>
<th>ESTABLISHED STUDENTS</th>
<th>NEW STUDENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observer observed</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explainer Recipient</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecture/Presentation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer Recipient</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declaration/Statement</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker Recipient</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker Recipient</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chat</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker Recipient</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inquiry</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiator Respondent</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstration</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrator Recipient</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teasing</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaser Teased</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Announcement</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Announcer Recipient</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correction</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrector Corrected</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal Games</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Games</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound Games</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted Signing</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiator Recipient</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request for Interpretation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requester Recipient</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 14: Participation/Genre Relationships
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class. Abby assisted him by providing signs (vocabulary) as needed. Marcus was also involved in the single instance of correction. Marcus corrected Keisha’s use of the sign meaning “to call someone by name”. This interaction occurred after he had been on campus for four months. The difference in these interactions and that of the college students is that Marcus is taking on the role held for established students in interactions with established students, whereas, the college students took on the same role but only in interactions with other new students.

Adjusted signing and requests for interpretation, which were noted previously as important in terms of participation patterns, were also experienced differently by new and established students. What is important to note about adjusted signing is not that the new students did not initiate this genre, as we have already seen this role restricted for them. Rather, what is important is how the experience as a recipient of adjusted signing differed for the new and the established students. Adjusted signing includes both reduction in speed and adaptations in grammar. New students, while aware that such adjustments were common, were not always aware of their own participation in the genre. For example, Marian told me that she was not planning to return to her hometown on the weekends because when she attended events at the deaf club there people “switched” their language use to a more English-like signing. By comparison, she did not feel that people on campus or at the nearby deaf club made such adjustments with her. She told me this not long after I had observed at least two instances of deaf individuals adjusting their signs for her. These adjustments are made to assist in communication, in an attempt to be sure that what is said is understood. Established
students, on the other hand, experience adjusted signing as a form of teasing (because it is a marker of “outsider” status). Thus, this genre is not as regular an occurrence for established students.

Both new and established students requested interpretation. New students requested such interpretation on their own behalf in order to understand what was being signed. Consequently, their requests were for interpretation from sign to sign (ASL to a more English like version) or from sign to spoken English. Established students also requested interpretation on their own behalf, though this occurrence was quite rare. One instance of such a request was observed during a special poetry presentation. The presenter was a hearing poet who had been invited to the school in conjunction with “Wordstruck”, a literature appreciation conference. At one point, the poet was speaking to one of the hearing teachers who was nearby. The interpreter who was present did not sign what was being said between the poet and the teacher. The students then requested interpretation of what was going on. This request, unlike those made by the new students, was for interpretation from spoken English to ASL. More often, established students requested interpretation on behalf of the new students\textsuperscript{12}. Rashad, for example, while chatting with Claudia, a college student, and me inquired as to whether Claudia understood him. She stated that she did not. Rashad then asked me to interpret for her (from ASL to spoken English). The difference in this experience, however, is perhaps most clearly marked by an interaction between Rashad, Tonya, and myself. As I was explaining my research to Tonya, Rashad acted as “interpreter” (from sign to sign).
Tonya made it clear that this was not the norm for participation in interpretation by an established student (let alone one from a deaf family) by stating 'I don't need an interpreter. I'm from a deaf family, many generations'.

There is undoubtedly similarity in participation for established and new students across various genres, that is, no one is excluded from participation based on their status as established or new. However, there is a notable difference in the experience of a number of genres in terms of the roles that may be assumed. Similarly, the culture content that is made available through participation in the various genres reflects both similarity and difference in experience. As previously stated, since all students may participate in any genre, there is similarity in culture content to which students are exposed. Participation in any of the eight key genres potentially exposes students, established and new, to the values, beliefs, and norms associated with language, identity, and the visual nature of the culture. The difference in exposure to culture content for established and new students comes in the emphasis on certain content and in the presentation of that content either explicitly or implicitly.

The primary difference in content appears to be a stronger emphasis on language for new students than for established students. New students were consistently on the receiving end of interactions regarding language, especially language use norms. They observed sign language being used constantly. They were shown how to sign (demonstration). They were told about sign language (explanation, lecture, declaration). They inquired about signs. They were corrected when they signed incorrectly. They were teased about their language use. They were quizzed about
signs. They were subjected to adjusted signing and to the need for interpretation. In fact, nearly all of their interactions in reinforcement genres were language related. In contrast, established students were seldom recipients of language content. In fact, they were the primary message senders in interactions that conveyed language content. The few interactions in which established students were recipients of language content that were noted were not about norms but rather about values and beliefs. Once such interaction was a discussion between Rashad and Jody about the history of ASL, its relationship to French Sign Language and Rashad's desire to return to his home country to teach math (in ASL) at the deaf school. This discussion conveys the value of ASL and a belief about its appropriateness as a language of instruction rather than norms for use. The ASL/Deaf studies class is an important exception to this pattern. In these classes both established and new students were exposed to language content, including usage norms.

In the case of language content, as well as content regarding identity and the visual nature of the culture, the message may be sent either explicitly or implicitly. In fact, multiple messages may be sent in a single interaction utilizing both the explicit and implicit levels. For example, correction of an incorrectly articulated sign sends an explicit message about language use norms. Rashad and Jody's discussion described above included implicit content regarding the language. And, when Barbie and Maureen were teased about their use of sign with accompanying speech, an explicit
message about (inappropriate) language use was sent along with an implicit message about identity (as an outsider). The reader is also reminded of my meeting Rashad, an interaction that had both explicit and implicit content.

All students at ISD were exposed to both explicit and implicit culture content. New students experienced slightly more explicit content overall than established students (61% on average as compared to 51% of observed interactions). The majority of the explicit content received by the new students was language related (65% average, 36-100% range). While this percentage (65%) is not trivial, it is skewed. As new students demonstrate increasing facility with the language, the amount of explicit language content is decreased. Jill, a college student, and Maureen, a deaf student, arrived on campus with greater language facility than the other new students. As a result, they were exposed to substantially less explicit language content than the other new students, only 36% and 44%, respectively, thus skewing the general percentage reported above. Controlling for Jill and Maureen's interactions, the percentage of explicit language content for new students is 83%. This seems to follow logically considering the previously described emphasis on language content for new students and the central nature of language in American deaf culture.

This look at students' patterns of participation in interactions differentiates between established students and new deaf students only in terms of roles assumed in certain genres, emphasis on language content, and the manner in which culture content is presented (explicitly or implicitly). Greater differences were identified for the college students (all of whom were hearing) than for the new deaf students. It is
tempting to conclude that due to the existence of differences in experience there is justification to continue to consider enculturation and acculturation to be distinct concepts. However, such a conclusion would be premature since differences, as well as similarities, were found among those students (new deaf and college) who, it was assumed, would share an acculturative experience as second culture learners.

A close look at the patterns of difference found further confounds the ability to draw a conclusion. New students are restricted from assuming roles as message senders in specific genres that require a demonstrated or assumed degree of knowledge. New students are exposed more heavily and more directly to language content, again, until adequate knowledge is demonstrated. It could be argued that this pattern is simply developmental, that a close look at young children's interactions with their parents would reveal the same pattern. In an attempt to resolve these difficulties it is necessary to look at the data through a different lens, a different theoretical framework.

PERIPHERAL PARTICIPATION

The concept of legitimate peripheral participation, that is, learning through social practice to become full participants in a community, was introduced in Chapter Two. While this concept had only been applied to small, rather homogeneous groups and never to a culture as a community of practice, it was believed to fit well with established notions of the "avenues to membership in the deaf community" (see Figure One, Chapter Two). My understanding of the concept of legitimate peripheral participation is that of controlled access to information and opportunities to participate that is experienced by all, that "everyone can to some degree be considered a
"newcomer’ to the future of a changing community” (Lave and Wenger 1991:117). With this understanding in mind, it also fit well with the belief that even those individuals born into American deaf culture, that is, those from deaf families, have to achieve status within the culture. More specifically, legitimate peripheral participation “requires access to a wide range of ongoing activity, old-timers, and other members of the community; and to information, resources, and opportunities for participation” (Ibid:101). As has been shown throughout this dissertation, these conditions exist at the residential deaf school. There is a wide range of events with varying degrees of formality. There are old-timers in the form of established students, teaching and dormitory staff, and volunteers. Alumni, as other members of the community, make frequent appearances. And, there are abundant opportunities for students to participate. As a result, I feel confident in stating that students, both established and new, experience legitimate peripheral participation in the learning of American deaf culture. The question that must be asked, then, in terms of this study is “is the experience of the periphery different for established and new students”.

Lave and Wenger believe that there is no such place as “the periphery” from which there is linear movement as a learner travels to the “core” of the community, to full participation. Rather, they conceive of peripherality as “multiple, varied, more- or less-engaged and – inclusive ways of being located in the fields of participation defined by a community” (Lave and Wenger 1991:36). Nonetheless, movement towards full participation requires some ordered demonstration of skills and or knowledge. In Lave’s study of Vai and Gola apprentice tailors (reported in Lave and Wenger 1991),
apprentices begin participation in the production of garments by mastering the finishing stages (sewing buttons and hemming by hand), moving on to constructing the garment (sewing by machine), and then on to cutting the material. Similarly, in a study of apprentice naval quartermasters reported by Lave and Wenger (1991), novices learn the six positions involved in standard steaming watch by demonstrating mastery of a position before moving on to the next position. Thus, while "the periphery" can not be described in explicit terms, the experience of legitimate peripheral participation is marked in ways characteristic to the community.

In American deaf culture facility with the language is a primary marker of peripheral participation. The greatest "distance" from full participation is the inability to communicate in sign language on one's own. Peripheral participation at this level is marked by the presence of sign language interpreters. As previously described, sign language interpreters were present on campus for events that involved participation by hearing parents (such as orientation, homecoming, and graduation) or other hearing visitors (such as the accreditation team, the Mothers Against Drunk Driving (MADD) representative, and the poet). Sign language interpreters were also present for trainings that were offered to the college students during their first week on campus. It is important to note that, in general, interpreters were not used as markers of peripheral participation for new deaf students who were unable to communicate on their own. Rather, their position was marked by verbal reminders of peripheral status and by adjusted signing. Marking peripheral participation by verbal reminders is evident in comments such as; "I wish you would sign", "she really needs to sign", and speech "is
not permitted here'. Marking by verbal reminder is also used for those who can communicate on their own in a limited fashion but do not have great facility with the language. This is seen in comments such as: ‘You are hesitant to use ASL now and you make mistakes. Next year, when you are fluent, you will be popular with the girls who are now watching from afar’, and ‘You are still learning sign. You will learn 100%, then the conversation won’t be over your head’. As another marker of peripheral participation, signing was typically adjusted by a reduction in speed or a shift to a more English-like signing. Examples of adjustments to signing are reflected in passages from my fieldnotes: “Tonya switches her discourse patterns and signing style with me. She signs in English word order and uses her voice minimally. With Rashad, she does not use her voice. Her signs seem quicker and they are not in English word order” (10/2/95). “Rashad then says he had to adjust his signing style until Marcus had gotten to know him” (12/1/95). “I observe him to sign slowly and patiently with her” (1/10/96). My fieldnotes also reflect that, as previously stated, while these adjustments occur as markers of peripheral participation, the receiver is not always consciously aware of the adjustment. This is reflected in a conversation I had with Marian that was used as an earlier example of participation in adjusted signing where she overlooks the adjustments that I have seen occur on two occasions immediately prior to our conversation.

Aside from interpreters, verbal reminders and adjusted signing, peripheral participation was marked by non-verbal reminders, the use of a teaching curriculum guided practice, and expressed “attitude”. Non-verbal reminders are perhaps best
conceived of as behaviors that say in essence “you are here, but not really one of us yet”. A clear example of this occurred during the volleyball sectional tournament. Wayne had brought signs (ISD #1) for the crowd to raise in support of the team. As he passed them out, I requested a sign to show my support. Wayne told me to wait and continued to pass out the signs. He ran out before he had given me one. Another common behavior that served as a non-verbal reminder of peripherality was exclusion from preferred seating at meals. Employment of a teaching curriculum marks an assumed lack of knowledge. A teaching curriculum was employed during the year in regards to ASL, the use of interpreters, “deaf culture”, how to use a TTY, and the relationship between ASL and English in teaching reading. In contrast, guided practice assumes an emerging knowledge that needs fine-tuning. Guided practice of language use and the cultural use of sound were exemplified at the autumn homecoming when elementary girls joined the high school cheerleaders on the field, copying and practicing the school’s cheers. At the same time, the elementary girls practiced beating the school drum. Whether cheering or beating the drum, the elementary girls were “guided” through correction and demonstration. The final means of marking peripherality noted in this study, expressed “ATTITUDE”, is somewhat different than the other means. Each of the other markers of peripherality involve an individual being marked by another. In marking by expressed “ATTITUDE” an individual marks him/herself. “ATTITUDE” is commonly referred to within the deaf culture. It is, however, not easily definable. In this study, “ATTITUDE” appears to be linked to the values and beliefs of the culture. For
example, expressing the belief that deaf people are simple minded or not regularly participating in social events reflects an "ATTITUDE" contrary to the value of solidarity and of loyalty to the community, thus marking one's peripherality.

Movement "off" the periphery, towards more inclusive participation, is where application of the concept of legitimate peripheral participation to cultural learning seems most clearly to deviate from the apprenticeship learning upon which it was based. In their descriptions of apprenticeship learning, Lave and Wenger (1991) were able to delineate, to some extent, that mastery of specific skills and/or knowledge must be achieved to move toward greater inclusiveness (mastery of finishing is required before proceeding to sewing by machine, mastery of the first position is required before proceeding to the second position of the standard steaming watch). In this study of culture transmission and learning, movement toward full inclusion is less clearly marked for it occurs by degree rather than mastery, by modulation in those characteristics that mark the outermost edges of the periphery. For example, more inclusive participation is marked by less frequent use of interpreters, by less frequent verbal and non-verbal reminders of peripherality, and by less frequent expression of contrary "ATTITUDES". At the same time, and with the previous discussion of genre in mind, more inclusive participation is also marked by changing roles in participation, for example, increased participation in verbal and non-verbal reminding (as opposed to being the recipient of the reminder). Changes in roles are also seen in invitations to participate as "trainers" in specialized trainings rather than as "trainees".
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At ISD, movement towards full inclusion was evident. An excellent example of such movement has been described in Marcus' assumption of the message sender role. In addition, the opportunity for such movement was frequently noted. Opportunities for movement, especially where language skill is concerned, could be said to occur in any interaction where facility with the language is regularly demonstrated. More specifically, opportunities for movement were found in sign language play, especially "tests" and games. For example, one evening Brandi "tested" the college students' knowledge of signs by repeatedly asking if they knew the signs for various things. Another form of language play involved flashcards showing various handshapes that were used to elicit knowledge of sign language based on one's ability to demonstrate a sign that was articulated with that specific handshape. Exchange interactions also frequently afforded opportunity to demonstrate increasing cultural knowledge and/or appreciation. Inquiries such as 'do you prefer a husband who can speak or one who can sign', and 'where do you look when I sign (at my face or at my hand)' and subsequent discussion afford opportunity to demonstrate an appropriate "ATTITUDE" and a degree of language sophistication respectively.

Thus far, it has been noted that established and new deaf students have similar experiences in terms of social networks and participation in events. Some differentiation of experience was found when looking at the level of genre. Here new deaf students were found to participate in the same genres as established students but in different roles (more often the receiver than the sender). In addition, a difference was noted in increased emphasis on language content for new deaf students that was often
more explicit in nature than cultural content received by established students. And.
finally, new deaf students were more often on the receiving end of adjusted signing.
The college students, on the other hand, experienced greater dissimilarity than the new
deaf students. In addition to the differences found for new deaf students at the level of
genre, college students also experienced two differences in terms of events, training and
the provision of sign language interpreters.

Looking, now, at the experience of new and established students through the
lens of peripheral participation, the pattern that has been established thus far is upheld.
Both similarity and difference of experience are noted, with differences between
established and new deaf students being less marked than differences between deaf
students (both established and new) and the college students\textsuperscript{19}. Both established and
new students experienced peripheral participation that was marked by verbal and non-
verbal reminders, expressed "ATTITUDE", and guided practice. In addition, both
established and new students participated in teaching curricula. For established and
new deaf students, the teaching curriculum took the form of the required ASL/Deaf
Studies course. At the elementary level, this class was taken annually. At the high
school level, only a single course was required. The college students, on the other hand,
 Experienced teaching curricula numerous times during the year, including on-going
ASL classes, a deaf culture class, and orientation panels during the first week of
school\textsuperscript{20}. 219
Only new students, however, participated in peripheral participation that was marked by the presence of interpreters, and adjusted signing. Adjusted signing, which, again, includes slowed articulation and a code-switch to a more English-like grammar, was similarly used with both new deaf students and college students. Marking peripherality by the presence of interpreters, on the other hand, was somewhat distinct for the new deaf students and the college students. For the college students, marking of peripherality by the provision of interpreters was done through the efforts of others. As previously noted, interpreters were hired by ISD to provide services during training sessions for the college students in their first week on campus. At a more informal level, "interpreters of convenience", that is, individuals who happened to be present and could provide an interpretation, were sometimes requested during a given interaction by a deaf student or adult on behalf of the college student, such as when Peggy requested that interpretation be provided to Marian during a brief exchange or when Rashad request interpretation for Claudia. "Interpreters of convenience" were also used to mark peripherality for new deaf students, however, in contrast to the college students, the students initiated the marking themselves. For example, Marcus requested interpretation from Harold, his vocational teacher. Similarly, Tracy requested interpretation from her dorm supervisors.

Patterns of movement towards more inclusive participation are not clear for either established or new students. Nonetheless, evidence of such movement (Marcus is invited to present the findings of a group discussion to his class with Abby’s guidance, Claudia’s expression of an appropriate attitude was noted by Rashad through her
expressed desire to understand his signing) and of opportunity for such movement (I am provided opportunity to demonstrate appropriate attitude in responding to Rashad's inquiry as at whether a speaking husband or a signing husband was better, each of the college students is afforded the opportunity to demonstrate language fluency through Brandi's "tests" and games) has been provided (here and above). The lack of an identifiable pattern is attributable to both method of data collection and the nature of learning. As previously stated, movement towards more inclusive participation in a culture occurs in degrees that are more difficult to quantify than mastery of measurable skills in an apprenticeship. This difficulty is compounded by the fact that there is no consistently identifiable state of "full" participation in a culture as there is in an apprenticeship. Attention to the subtle movements that were undoubtedly occurring and the variably recognized definitions of "full" participation requires more intensive observation and specific case studies than that undertaken here. In addition, the rate of learning is idiosyncratic. Some individuals learn quickly, thus, theoretically, allowing for more rapid movement towards full inclusion. Marcus, for example, who was new to the school in November, appeared to participate more fully than did Arron, who had been in attendance at the school for three years.

An important concept that should not be neglected in the desire to document the existence and form of peripheral participation is that of the "master". The "master" is a repository of vital information, resources and access to opportunity. "Masters" earned this status through achievement of "full" participation or the perception of such achievement. The apprentice, or as more broadly applicable, the learner, relies on the
“master” for assistance in moving towards more inclusive participation. Assistance may take the form of provision of information and resources or the granting of initial, continued or increased access to a variety of opportunities. At ISD, it could be said that the elected student leaders were seen as “masters” of a sort, as individuals to be followed. During the year of this study, all school-wide elected leadership positions, such as student council positions, were held by established students who came from deaf families. In reality, the position of “master” at ISD was defined more by the perception of the individual learner than by group consensus. In other words, the “masters” were not always those elected to leadership positions. What is of particular interest here is the difference in perceived “masters” between new deaf students and the college students. The new deaf students all chose established students or deaf adults as “masters”. Beyond the criterion of “established” status, selection of a “master” appeared to be based on perceived similarity of experience. Thus, Marcus looked to Tonya and Rashad as “masters”, both of whom shared his ethnic identity. Maureen, on the other hand, looked to Barbie and Wendy as “masters”, both of whom shared her propensity for communicating through sign accompanied with speech. The college students, perhaps following a similar criterion for “master” selection, turned to me as the “master”, even given the opportunity to look to an established deaf student or adult. This was best exemplified in an interaction between myself, Claudia, Mary and Brian. Brian used a sign that Mary did not understand. Rather than asking Brian, with whom she was conversing, Mary turned to me to ask the meaning of the sign. In their choosing of a hearing “master”, the college students further marked their own
peripherality by displaying an inappropriate “ATTITUDE” (a misaligned center). The difference in perception is striking. To the college students, I was a “full” participant in the culture. To the deaf students, I was a competent signer who proved to be trustworthy and possessing an appropriate attitude, however, I was not, nor could I ever be, perceived as able to participate “fully” in the culture.

What the concept of legitimate peripheral participation provides then is corroboration of the pattern identified earlier by the ethnography of communication. There are distinctions of experience between established and new students generally. And again, further distinctions between new deaf students and the college students are seen. Although, the extent to which these distinctions are developmental remains unclear, the most salient distinction noted for the college students does appear to be outside of any possible developmental pattern. The marking of peripherality within deaf culture by the presence of interpreters is exclusively employed on behalf of those who have a hearing identity – visitors and parents. The second salient distinction, peripheral participation through teaching curricula, also hints at being non-developmental. While it is true that new deaf students (as well as deaf adults) are exposed to teaching curricula (ASL/Deaf studies classes for the students, school orientations, and invitations to attend parent support groups for the adults), there are essential differences in the curricula offered to the college students (and hearing adults). The college students participate in more frequently offered (and required) teaching curricula. In addition, the curricula that are offered instruct in content areas that differ
from the curricula received by new deaf students in extent of information (college students receive more in-depth training in ASL) and type of information (panel discussions on "the deaf experience", what is an interpreter and how to use one, etc.).

Through the identification of a pattern of interaction and the corroboration of that pattern, a model for the transmission and learning of American deaf culture is emerging. In addition, support for the continued consideration of enculturation and acculturation as separate concepts is garnered. However, further support and clarity is sought through Hall’s proposed types of learning prior to articulation of a model.

HALL’S TYPES OF LEARNING

Hall’s (1959) three types of learning were developed in conjunction with a “re-definition” of culture that includes formal, informal, and technical aspect of each cultural component. Hall distinguishes formal aspects as that which everyone knows and accepts without question, informal aspects as that which has become so integrated as to be unconscious, and technical aspects as that which has been scrupulously examined and thereby readily accessible. Each of these aspects is in turn associated with a particular type of learning, conveniently named for the aspect being learned. Formal aspects are learned through correction and direction without any accompanying explanation. Informal aspects are learned through observation, imitation, and some limited guidance. Again, informal learning involves no explanation, in fact, explanation is not possible because of the unconscious nature of the aspects. Finally, technical aspects are learned through direct explanation, generally from a teacher to a student. Hall acknowledges that the formal, informal, and technical aspects are
intertwined in each cultural component. For example, Hall considers interaction to be a cultural component that is made up of tone of voice (formal aspect), gesture (informal aspect), and language (technical aspect) which may occur simultaneously.

There is a developmental hierarchy of sorts within Hall’s framework, where “formal activity tends to become informal, informal tends toward technical, and very often the technical will take on the trappings of a new formal system” (1959:87). It is this developmental relationship that is of key interest here. Hall implies through this developmental relationship that, while all three types of learning may occur simultaneously, culture learning is founded on formal learning. This implication seems to be reasonable as his concepts were drawn from studies of American culture where it is unusual to instruct infants and toddlers in a technical manner. However, the data from ISD indicate that this may not be the case in the acculturation experience.

Culture learning, as I interpret Hall’s conception of it, is represented visually in Figure 15. A key element to bear in mind, and which is not reflected in the diagram, is that each of these types of learning may occur in a single interaction, though one type is generally dominant. This implies that all learners will experience each type of learning to some degree. There is also an assumption that formal and informal learning will be more prevalent since, by definition, technical aspects are known only to a few. It is also worthy of note that this is a model of learning, however, the definitions of the types of learning are based on transmission actions. Thus, formal learning is that which occurs through correction, etc. A final assumption of the model is that cultural information is transmitted from adult to child.
As I apply this model, two basic modifications are introduced. The first modification is minor. I replace the assumption that information flows from adult to child with the assumption that information flows between two or more individuals. In the majority of cases, information will flow from an individual who is more knowledgeable to one who is less knowledgeable. The second modification is more substantial as it regards the conception of technical learning. Hall presents technical learning in a less clear-cut manner than he presents either formal or informal learning for he presents technical learning only in its pure form implying the existence of another form (or forms) but leaving further distinction to the readers discretion.

Technical learning, in its pure form, is close to being a one-way street. It is usually transmitted in explicit terms from the teacher to the student, either orally or in writing. Often it is preceded by a logical analysis and proceeds in coherent outline form (Hall 1959:69, emphasis mine).

Hall follows this definition with examples of military training. In its pure form, then, technical learning coincides with Lave and Wenger's (1991) "teaching curriculum" for it is classroom learning. This definition is difficult to rectify with the basic assumption that all three types of learning occur in any given situation. As a result, I conceive of
two forms of technical learning, both of which I will continue to refer to generically as technical learning. The first form, the “pure” form, conforms to Hall’s conception of classroom learning. The second form, the regular or everyday form, softens the definition of “teacher” and “student” to allow for peer-to-peer interactions where one peer, having greater knowledge of the content to be transmitted, is the “teacher” and the other peer, having lesser knowledge, is the “student”. This second form of technical learning may not necessarily be preceded by a formal analysis. It may also not necessarily proceed in a coherent outline form. Rather, it may occur, as do formal and informal learning, as the result of “student” initiation. Thus, this second form of technical learning is situational. It conforms to Lave and Wenger’s (1991) “learning curriculum”.

The ISD data indicate that, as theorized, all students experience each type of learning to some extent. The actual extent to which any type is experienced is not possible to discuss, again, due to limitations created by the data collection methods. Further, the pattern that was originally identified through the ethnography of communication is again reinforced by the learning types: even though all students experience each type, only the established students act in the role of “teacher” and it is the established students that new deaf students look to as models for informal learning. However, as previously stated, analysis of the learning types is of greatest importance in that it offers a glimpse at what may differentiate the developmental and enculturative from the acculturative – technical learning.
It is true that all students experience technical learning. What is striking is the difference in the technical learning experience for college students (briefly noted in the earlier discussion of teaching curricula as peripheral participation). Contrary to Hall's framework, the college students begin their learning of American deaf culture through technical learning rather than formal learning. Prior to coming to campus for the year, each of the college students had been “introduced” to the culture through having taken at least one ASL course. Their experience on campus was begun with a week long (five day) orientation training schedule that included a history of ISD (through a campus and ISD museum tour, as well as a lecture on the communication philosophy at the school), a deaf panel (discussing deaf identity, communication frustrations, family experiences, and hearing misperceptions), a lecture on “what is an interpreter and how to use one”, and a lecture on the relationship between ASL and English (particularly English as a second language). This training is perhaps not surprising in light of the cultural belief that hearing people don’t/can’t understand (especially on their own), therefore, content is made explicit. The orientation training is also the epitome of “pure” technical learning. The college students experienced additional “pure” technical learning through required on-going coursework in ASL (taken in a “developmental” sequence – ASL I followed by ASL II, etc.) and deaf culture and history.

It is worth noting that the college students were also likely exposed to a greater amount of ongoing everyday technical learning during the year of this study. This is due to the fact that many of their interactions with deaf students and adults outside of the ISD classroom included me as a participant (and the fact that they tended to look to
me as the "master"). In my role as a researcher, I displayed a proclivity for turning what may have otherwise been formal and informal learning into technical learning. A very clear example of this proclivity is found in a previously cited interaction where Brian, upon seeing me conversing with Jill using sign with speech, tells me 'sign with speech is forbidden'. At this point the interaction is an example of formal learning, I made a mistake (using sign with speech) and Brian corrects my mistake. I, however, ask him "why" which, in turn, causes him to proceed into a technical explanation - 'because hearing won't learn sign (in this way)', if I wanted to 'teach good, turn-off-voice'.

In comparison, the new deaf students are not provided with any similar "orientation" experience upon arrival at the school. The only "pure" form of technical learning (of deaf culture content) that they experience is in the ASL/Deaf studies course, a two-credit requirement for all high school students and an annual requirement at the elementary level. For new high school students, this course is not required in their first grading period on campus, but rather, when it fits in their schedule. For new elementary students, enrollment in the ASL/Deaf studies course begins immediately, however, their study begins wherever their class (i.e., Mrs. Jones' third grade) is in the curriculum. The course is described in a "Indiana School for the Deaf Core 40 Curriculum" handout that was given to parents in an orientation packet in this way: "This course is designed to instill American Sign Language in the students. Activities
will incorporate all ASL grammar, structure, functions, and linguistic processes”. It is much the equivalent of American (hearing) students studying English during their academic careers[30].

Bearing this difference in mind, I propose Figure 16 as a visual representation of Hall’s model that is adapted to reflect technical learning, as opposed to formal learning, as the basis of the acculturation experience. Further support for this proposition is found in the experience of hearing parents and the accreditation team. They, like the college students, are provided with orientations to deaf culture and support groups that are “purely” technical in nature[31]. The parent orientation held at the beginning of the school year included a lesson in how to use the TTY and the relay system to place calls to deaf individuals and an “experienced” parent panel. Parents were also presented with an orientation packet including a brochure from Relay Indiana that provided written instruction on the use of the TTY and the relay system, two articles (one from Deaf Life magazine and the other an ISD publication) on the history of the school, a handout

Figure 16: Model of culture learning (acculturation)
entitled "Bilingual/Bicultural Education Goal Statement" that outlined a number of beliefs about ASL as well as the relationship between ASL and English, and a handout entitled "Common Questions with Answers" that, again, addressed values and beliefs about ASL and its relationship to English. In addition, a flyer was made available that announced ASL classes (ASL I, ASL II, ASL III) and a course entitled Deaf Community that "may be of interest to you" (parents). Aside from this orientation, support group meetings were held monthly. Of particular note, the first meeting of the school year addressed "Myths and Facts about Deaf People". Each of the other group meetings was similarly structured around a particular theme (the year of this study, the themes were predominantly focused on reading and, thereby, the relationship between ASL and English) and generally involved a deaf presenter ("teacher"). The accreditation team was provided an orientation to begin their visit their first day on campus. It included "purely" technical lessons in conjunction with the handouts found in Appendix D - "A Brief Orientation to Deaf Culture" (presented by a small group of established students) and "How to Use an Interpreter".

As a result of this different basis for culture transmission/learning, the college students had a more technical understanding of the culture. This is most clearly seen in the findings from the language/identity stimulus tapes. When asked to identify the language being used by a videotaped storyteller, the college students overwhelmingly used linguistic considerations in their determination, a technical level of understanding. For example, the college students cited word order (grammar), the use of classifiers (a pronominalization system of ASL), the use of directional verbs (to show subject-object
agreement in a single sign) and the use of space among other characteristics to identify ASL. The deaf students, on the other hand, reflected a more informal understanding of ASL. When an explanation was given, the deaf students employed characteristics such as flow, speed, and ease of understanding among others in their determination of which language was being used. The vast majority of the time, however, in keeping with the unconscious nature of informal understanding, no explanation could be given as to why the signing was perceived as ASL or English.

CONCLUSION

Thus, a pattern of interaction has become evident through the analysis that allows for a tentative model of culture transmission and learning within American deaf culture to be articulated. In this model, culture is transmitted and learned through participation with a variety of interlocutors in interactions across a range of settings and events that include a range of genres. Participation may be active or passive and occur in the role of either message sender or message receiver, although the role of message sender is more often assumed by an individual with “greater” knowledge than the receiver. Further, participation may be either “full” or peripheral with peripheral participation marked in ways characteristic of the community. In the case of American deaf culture, peripheral participation is marked by teaching curricula, the presence of interpreters, verbal and non-verbal reminders, adjusted signing, guided practice, and expressed “attitude”.
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For the purpose of comparing enculturation and acculturation, the basic model outlined above is conjoined with the expanded version of Hall's culture learning model. In this way, a dominant type of learning, formal, informal, or technical ("pure" or everyday), can be identified in any interaction. It is through an examination of learning types that a sound argument for the continued distinction between enculturation and acculturation can be made. It is true, that differences in assumed roles (message sender/message receiver), more explicit content and more marked peripheral participation were noted for new students in general. What continues to be unclear is the extent to which these differences are developmental. Therefore, a sound argument regarding the similarity or difference in enculturation and acculturation can not be made on the basis of these apparent differences. However, a difference exists between the experience of the new deaf students and the (hearing) college students that begins to emerge in looking closely at peripheral participation and becomes salient when looking at learning types. The data indicate that, aside from the fact that peripherality is marked somewhat differently for the college students than the new deaf students, the experience of culture transmission and learning for the college students is based in technical learning as opposed to formal learning for the new deaf students. While it might be argued that this difference is also developmental, after all the college students are older than the deaf students, no similar distinction is made on the basis of the age of a new deaf student. That is, no noticeable distinctions were found in the experience of new
elementary students and new high school students (exhibiting a greater age difference than new high school students and college students). Rather, what appears to be behind the distinction is hearing status.

I argue, then, that there is justification to continue to consider enculturation and acculturation to be separate concepts. However, it is perhaps time to reconsider how we (anthropologists) distinguish them. A primary distinction by definition has been that enculturation is learning the “culture of birth” and acculturation is learning a “second culture” (or third or fourth for that matter). The findings here call this distinction into question. What the new deaf students experienced can not readily be distinguished from developmental (enculturation) experiences even though deaf culture is their second culture. On the other hand, the college students, also learning deaf culture as a second culture, experience something that is seemingly non-developmental but rather acculturative. Again, the distinction appears to be hearing status, which, in American deaf culture is translated into perceived identity. The new deaf students, having a hearing loss and attending the deaf school, regardless of their signing ability or parental hearing status, are seen as “in-group” members and are treated thusly. They experience enculturation. The college students, having no hearing loss, are seen as “outsiders” and are treated as such. They experience acculturation.

Secondarily, this study began based on my own sense that the literature on culture transmission and learning had overlooked, or at best, downplayed, similarities between enculturation and acculturation. The findings in this study indicate that there are a great number of similarities. Indeed, all students were exposed to the same
settings, events and genres of interaction. Likewise, all students found themselves participating in markedly peripheral ways to some extent and experiencing the three types of learning.

I propose, therefore that a more accurate distinction of the concepts may be that enculturation occurs when there is a perceived shared cultural identity and acculturation occurs when there is a lack of perceived shared cultural identity. Further, I proposed that the process of enculturation and acculturation is essentially the same, participation in interaction, however, each concept is founded on a different type of learning. Much as the proposed basic model of culture transmission and learning in American deaf culture is tentative, so too is this proposed re-conceptualization of enculturation and acculturation. However, both the model and the re-conceptualization are worthy of further anthropological consideration.

Ellen (1984) distinguishes between ego-centered and set-centered networks. “Networks may be set-centered, that is they may refer to links among a set of actors that the observer assumes may potentially have contact with one another. Alternatively, networks may be ego-centered that they may be related to the links among a set of actors selected because they are linked directly or indirectly to some central actor” (268). In the case of this dissertation, ego-centered social networks were drawn with each individual student as the “central actor” for his/her own network.

Limitations that result from the use of observation as a method of data collection have been previously alluded to and will be further detailed in Chapter Seven.

See Mitchell 1969 for a detailed discussion of the relevant characteristics of social networks.

The reader is reminded that this is the case during the school week (Sunday evening through Friday afternoon), however, the students do have social networks beyond the school that exist during weekends (non-school time) and that were not explored for the purposes of this study.

Through their participation in sports, Tonya, Elaine and Susan also participate in several voluntary sets together.

A notable exception is meals for the elementary students. At this level, students are not afforded free choice in seating. They must sit either with their classmates and teacher (during lunch) or with their dorm mates and supervisor (during breakfast and dinner).
Marian came to ISD from a different University than the others. She was not there, as the other college students were, for field placement in Deaf Education. Rather, she was on campus as a sign language student. Her required coursework, and thus her schedule, was different than that of the others and seemed to afford her more “free” time.

I am speaking of a larger set in the sense that it includes the entire high school as opposed to sets prescribed by class (freshman, etc.) or course.

This is true for all of the genres identified not only those being discussed here. The exceptions include reading and self-talk which only require a single individual.

A-B-C stories are a storytelling genre in which facility with the language is displayed. The first sign of the story is made with the handshape that corresponds to the letter “A”. The second sign is made with the “B” handshape, and so on through the alphabet.

Marcus’s assumption of these roles in interaction will be reiterated in the subsequent discussion on peripheral participation.

Note that this was only possible when someone who was perceived as an “interpreter” (perhaps even another deaf individual) was present.

Reinforcement interactions for established students also included identity and visual content.

Rashad’s home country was French speaking. French sign language with accompanying speech was used at the deaf school there at the time of his enrollment.

Lave and Wenger (1991) indicate that in their conception there is no “illegitimate” peripheral participation. Bearing this in mind, and recognizing that because of the context all peripheral participation at the deaf school is legitimate in terms of learning deaf culture, I will refer simply to peripheral participation.

Ironically, interpreters also mark peripheral participation for those who are able to communicate in sign language when they are participating in the hearing community.

An exception to this was noted for a female middle school student. She enrolled at the school for the first time at the beginning of the year. After two and a half months, she was still unable to communicate in sign language on her own. At that time, there was discussion about hiring an oral interpreter (someone who would sit close to her in class, repeating inaudibly everything that was being said, so that she could read their lips) for her. The inappropriate nature of this was marked by Kelly’s amazed look and decision to approach the dean of girls to express her concern.

Lave and Wenger (1991) refer to a “teaching curriculum” as that which is “constructed for the instruction of newcomers” (97) as opposed to the “learning curriculum” found in situated opportunities and not systematically constructed for specific instruction.

I note again, that it is not possible to compare either frequency or duration of peripheral participation due to limitations created by the data collection methods that were employed.

It is also worth noting that teaching curricula were offered to other hearing individuals who were involved with campus. Monthly parent support group meetings were held, as were parent orientations. Likewise, the accreditation team was provided a brief, teaching curriculum regarding deaf culture and the use of interpreters.
Again I note that the presence of interpreters was regularly used to mark peripheral participation of hearing visitors, including parents. Previous discussion noted that interpreters were only officially present for events in which hearing participation was anticipated.

It is unclear if this is a regular pattern, as I was not afforded access to records from previous years. However, leadership positions within classes, such as class council positions, were held by established students who had hearing families. This would lead me to speculate that it is possible for established students with hearing families to hold school-wide positions of leadership.

It is worthy of note that the “masters” coincide rather neatly with the primary contacts within these students’ social networks.

This was the only year on record that the college students who came to ISD for field experience were joined by another hearing college student from a different university. It would be interesting to know how the absence of another hearing peer, perceived to be more knowledgeable in the culture, effects the selection of “masters” as well as the overall experience of cultural learning.

This statement may seem to contradict a basic tenet that peripheral participation leads to “full” participation. However, Lave and Wenger also acknowledge that “depending on the organization of access, legitimate peripherality can either promote or prevent legitimate participation” (1991:103, emphasis mine). It is here that I believe Barth’s concept of the boundary intersects with legitimate peripheral participation. In American deaf culture, the ability to hear is a group defining boundary. According to Barth (1969), the boundary creates an “insider/outsider” dichotomy that in turn “implies a recognition of limitations on shared understandings, differences in criteria for judgement of value and performance, and a restriction of interaction to sectors of assumed common understanding and mutual interest” (15). The existence of such a boundary had been articulated in the numerous beliefs about differences between deaf and hearing people and the inability of hearing people to understand. This boundary is maintained even for those hearing people who are born into the deaf culture by virtue of having deaf parents. Peripheral participation, therefore, is allowed to the extent that it does not interfere with the maintenance of this boundary.

The reader is reminded of the single exception that was noted for a middle school student. While this may seem contrary to the pattern, the student was clearly more closely aligned with a hearing identity than with a deaf identity as she communicated almost exclusively through speech. It should also be noted that, to the best of my knowledge, the interpreter was never actually hired.

Rather than speaking of cultural components, Hall employs the term “primary message system”.

The research on which Hall’s book is based is an investigation of non-verbal communication and “unconscious culture”, especially time and space. Thus, he does not pose his discussion as a model of culture transmission/learning. Rather, I am interpreting its suitability for such a study.

This is a natural consequence of ethnographic research that employs more than simple observation in data collection. It should not be a surprising occurrence, however, it is highly likely that it skewed the data to some extent. A similar phenomenon occurred with the deaf students, though the effect was likely less dramatic as my interactions with the deaf students were more widely dispersed.

Contrary to this, the ASL courses that are taught to the college students also include instruction in proper pronunciation (articulation of signs) and basic vocabulary building (lexicon development). These courses also tend to underemphasize functions of the language, if they are mentioned at all.
Note that deaf parents are also invited to attend these orientations and support group meetings, however, they do not attend. In one meeting, being led by a deaf outreach employee, the reasons for the lack of deaf participation were explored. Not wanting to be the voice of all deaf parents, not wanting to be the “educator”, lack of need for a support group (they have a network of support readily available through the deaf community and they share their children’s culture), and feelings of oppression were given as possible reasons.
CHAPTER 7
CONCLUSION

This dissertation set out to address two primary questions, "how is American deaf culture transmitted/learned" and "for deaf culture, is the acculturative experience different than the enculturative experience". It was believed that the answers to these questions would inform two greater anthropological theory questions, "how is culture (in general) transmitted and learned" and "is it valid to consider enculturation and acculturation to be two separate and distinct concepts". Thus far evidence has been presented that American deaf culture is transmitted and learned through interaction with members of the culture across a range of settings and events including a range of genres. Evidence has also been presented that the experience of established students and new students (in general) is different to some extent. Finally, evidence has been presented that the experience of new students is variable, that is, the experience of deaf students and (hearing) college students is different in notable ways. What remains unclear is the extent to which the experience of the new students, particularly the new deaf students (and the college students, in so far as their experience mirrors the new deaf students), is developmental and therefore enculturative in nature. Nonetheless, based on the unique experiences of the college students, it has been concluded that there
is justification to continue to consider enculturation and acculturation as separate processes. It is time now to explore the implications of these findings for the larger theoretical questions.

**THEORETICAL IMPLICATIONS**

Interaction has been shown to be the manner by which American deaf culture is transmitted and learned. A model based on examination of patterns of participation, particularly as regards genres of interaction, has been proposed. I suggest that interaction is also the answer to the greater theoretical question of culture transmission/learning in general, that is, regardless of specific culture. While never stated in this manner in the literature, interaction as the primary process of culture transmission/learning is not that far afield of traditional discussions. Traditional definitions essentially identify enculturation or acculturation as the "process" by which culture is transmitted/learned. When that "process" is taken beyond its theoretical posture and described empirically as it occurs within various cultures, discussion turns to events and genres, though not classified in such a manner. For example, Kimball (1976) speaks of educational events in the form of pedagogy, specifically history lessons and of rites of passage. Discussions of genres are more common in the literature and include modeling (Jules 1960), direct and indirect teaching (Jules 1960), handling, suckling, cleaning, and comforting (Kimball 1976), myths (Kimball 1976), folklore (Rutherford 1992), storytelling (Padden and Humphries 1988), belittling (Jules 1960), inquiry (Shimahara 1970), reward (Jules 1960), observation (Williams 1983), experimentation (Whiting 1980) and manding (Whiting 1980) for example. In fact,
some of the genres found in the literature may coincide with those that I have outlined for American deaf culture. For example, storytelling, inquiry, observation and experimentation are genres noted both in the literature and in this study. I also suspect that the genre “modeling” found in the literature and my genre of demonstration may be related, perhaps even directly, as belittling and mocking may be. However, caution must be taken in drawing such comparisons for the genres found in the literature were often not clearly defined, therefore the ability to compare is compromised. Thus, the interaction-based model proposed here calls for an increased emphasis on what Tindall (1976) referred to as theory, models based on empirical description, rather than on what he calls theory work, which amounts to little more than theoretical posturing. At the same time, it calls for the development and use of more explicit and uniform definitions of genres so that findings may be productively compared across studies.

The theoretical implications in regards to the concepts of enculturation and acculturation are perhaps more significant as the findings of this study call for a re-conceptualization of the concepts that, while maintaining them as separate concepts, is contrary to much of the literature. The concepts of enculturation and acculturation were conceived for two very different purposes and researched entirely independently of each other. Enculturation was conceived for the discussion and understanding of culture learning, specifically for the learning of the culture of birth. Acculturation, on the other hand, was conceived for the discussion and understanding of culture contact and the resultant impact on the cultures. As a result of this basic difference in purpose, enculturation and acculturation have been studied independently, even to the extent that,
in general, different methodologies were utilized. The most substantive traditional
distinctions continue to be origin of information (where acculturation is an inter-cultural
experience and enculturation is an intra-cultural experience) and age at which learning
is begun (where enculturation occurs in early childhood (and comes to an end) and
acculturation occurs later in life). Some allowances have subsequently been made in
the literature for life-long enculturation. Thus the most salient contemporary distinction
is the origin of information — from the culture of birth (intra-culturally) or as a result of
contact (inter-culturally).

The re-conceptualization of the concepts proposed here was conceived in an
entirely different manner. Of great importance, it would seem, is the fact this study
undertook to examine both concepts simultaneously utilizing a single method. In so
doing, similarities in the experience of enculturation and acculturation became apparent.
At the same time, perceived identity began to appear more important to the experience
than culture of birth. In this study, perceived identity appeared to be the determining
factor for where the process of culture transmission/learning began — with formal or
technical learning. Thus, I propose that enculturation and acculturation be
conceptualized as variations of a singular process (interaction) of culture
transmission/learning where enculturation is marked by perceived shared cultural
identity with formal learning as the base and acculturation is marked by a perceived
difference in cultural identity with technical learning as the base. This proposal, having
no support in the literature at present, calls for additional research to either affirm or negate the re-conceptualization. Suggestions for future research along these lines are detailed later in this chapter.

LIMITATIONS

As with any research project, there are limitations to this study. A number of limitations were the result of the chosen research design and method. Some of these have been noted throughout the text of this dissertation. They will be reiterated here in brief. Other limitations were the result of my own inexperience in the conduct of research. All ultimately impact the generalizability of the results.

The project was designed to study the transmission/learning of American deaf culture in the place where it was determined (by the literature and popular belief) to occur, on the campus of a residential deaf school. The focus was student interaction. again, as the literature and popular belief, held that deaf culture was transmitted from peer to peer. As a result, off-campus influences, especially adult influences, on the students were not explored. For example, it was not determined to what extent the family supported/reinforced or undermined the transmission and learning of deaf culture that was occurring on campus. Rather it was assumed that students from deaf families received support/reinforcement and students from hearing families did not, at least not to the same extent. Likewise, the manner in which cultural learning was supported/reinforced or undermined by interaction off-campus was not explored. Off-campus interactions and their role in the transmission and learning of deaf culture can only be speculated upon based on students', teachers' and/or dorm supervisors'
comments and yet their existence and possible impact should not be denied. In fact, had off-campus, particularly family, interactions been explored it may have been possible to discern that which was developmental (enculturative) from that which was, in fact, a difference in experience attributable to acculturation. In addition, both by limiting the conduct of the research to the deaf school campus and by focusing on the students, I was constrained by the students’ own limited world experience. It was noted in the body of this dissertation that students were not actively involved in the larger political organization of deaf culture, thus this is absent from my exploration and analysis. Likewise, introductions are absent from exploration and analysis as they were not a common occurrence since the campus was in large part a closed system. Finally, by confining the scope of the research to campus, limitations were imposed by time. Students were only on campus for five days each week (Sunday evening until Friday afternoon). This often caused a disruption in the research process as momentum was lost each weekend.

Additional limitations were created by the ethnographic method. Throughout the text, reference was made to limitations created by the use of observation (participant or non-participant). These limitations include the inability to be ever present and the inability to observe all interactions within a given event resulting in sampling errors and inadequate data for drawing comparisons based on frequency or duration of occurrence. Limitations were also noted in the writing and reporting of fieldnotes due to the lack of a written form of ASL (see Chapter Three for a detailed discussion).
By far the greatest limitations to the study were due to my inexperience as a researcher and resulted in missed/under-utilized opportunities and other challenges that affected the richness and completeness of data. For example, access to students and events in educational and dorm settings were restricted in a number of ways. While the classroom was not a central setting for the conduct of this research by design, it was an under utilized opportunity to observe interaction. Requested access to classrooms was more frequently denied than granted, particularly at the high school level. Ultimately, access to classrooms was gained through negotiation with the supervising teacher. However, access was limited to scheduled observations once a month. Similarly, access to some dorm pods was restricted. In hindsight, it is obvious to me that these restrictions may have been more readily ameliorated by facility in negotiation and/or conformity to cultural norms. Employing reciprocity, a cultural norm, may have granted me greater access to student and events within the educational setting and dorm setting. In fact, where I had the greatest access, reciprocity was employed. Likewise, taking advantage of volunteer opportunities, especially as regards the educational setting, may have also allowed for greater access.

Limits to participation were also created by my lack of experience. As noted previously, getting students to participate was difficult due to their (rigid) schedules. The only time that I could conduct formal interviews or ask them to participate in other structured research activities (such as the language/identity videotape) was during their freetime, a valuable (and limited) time to socialize. Students were not motivated to give up freetime in order to participate formally in the research due to a lack of tangible
rewards. Not only did this create limitations to student participation in the formal aspects of the research, it also limited my ability to form relationships that were adequate to allow my participation in their more private events (such as rule breaking events including drug and alcohol use, and dating events). In either case, limits to participation (students' or my own) resulted in missed opportunities and restricted access to data which I believe could have been ameliorated by experience in identifying and providing adequate incentives.

At the elementary level, limitations to participation were similar to those at the high school level. Their schedules were equally as fixed as the high school students. Likewise, there was a lack of tangible reward to participation. Thus, opportunities for data collection were missed. Compounding the extent of missed opportunities, research work with the elementary students did not begin until January.

In addition, missed/underutilized opportunities resulted from lack of skill in interviewing, generally and in a second language specifically. General lack of skill in interviewing was noted in the use of follow-up questions, especially during informal interviews. Appropriate follow-up questions were often overlooked. A clear example of this occurred during an informal interview with a deaf teacher who expressed concern that the research not present a medical perspective but rather a cultural one. His concern was predicated on his belief that I was not talking to "the right people". An experienced interviewer may have followed these comments with questions about who the teacher would recommend I talk to; who I was talking to that was not "right"; how, in his opinion, I should be approaching the research differently; why a cultural
perspective was better/correct by comparison to a medical perspective: and what a
cultural perspective would include. This inexperienced interviewer asked no follow-up
questions, thus missing the opportunity to collect valuable data.

Compounding the general lack of skill and experience in interviewing was
conducting the interviews in ASL. Despite my fluency in the language, the interview
was a genre I had no previous experience with. Structures that are commonly used in
conversation and/or explanation such as including examples did not work well for me in
the interview situation. The examples I provided often appeared to influence the
answers that were given. The same problem presented itself in providing directions for
formal activities. An example of this was described in the discussion of the semantic
domain card sort (see Chapter Three). When I explained the activity without the use of
examples, students were uncertain what I was looking for. When the directions were
more appropriately structured in ASL and examples of the kinds of groupings that
might be possible were given (as the students began to explain the activity to each
other), the student’s actual groupings inevitably (and almost uniformly) reflected the
examples given. In addition, I was uncertain how to even pose (structure) some
questions that I wanted to ask. When I attempted to ask these questions on my own, the
responses indicated that I had not succeeded. Again, opportunities to collect data were
missed or at best under utilized as a result of my second language abilities.

Finally, inexperience with recording created challenges that caused some
limitations to this study. As discussed in Chapter Three, both video and audio recording
were utilized. The quality of the recordings, both video and audio, was most affected
by my inexperience. Thus, I have videotapes that would have been better if taken from a different, more effective angle; videotapes that are interrupted in mid-interaction as the battery power ran out; and videotapes with unsteady pictures. Likewise, I have audiotapes with speakers who can not be clearly heard, both as a result of recording volume and as a result of environmental noise (a mechanical hum). These were not entirely insurmountable challenges, however, they did account for some loss of potential data (where tape or batteries ran out and where transcription was not possible).

Aside from the limitations to the data created by the chosen research design and method, as well as by inexperience, the study as a whole has rather limited generalizability. It was conducted within a single residential deaf school, a school that had unique characteristics. In comparison to other residential schools of the time, ISD had a large student enrollment. In addition, ASL was the official language of instruction within a bilingual-bicultural philosophy where English was being taught as a second language. It was these characteristics that drew me to ISD and which limit generalizability of the findings even across other residential deaf schools. Generalizability is also limited by the sample size. While the school had a large population of established students and twenty-eight (28) students enrolled at the school for the first time, the number of students who met the criteria established to be considered "new" deaf students (from hearing families, that is no deaf parent, and enrollment at a deaf school for the first time) at the high school and elementary level substantially reduced the sample size of new deaf students to 14, all of whom did not actively participate in the study. Finally, because the study focused on students at the
school, generalizability is further compromised. As has been noted, the present study can only account for learning of a restricted piece of the culture. Political structure, religion, adult social organization, kinship (marriage and family), and so forth have not been adequately explored. In addition, applicability of the findings to interactions that occur at home, at the deaf club, or at other deaf functions is tentative at best. Likewise, it is possible only to speculate that the patterns of interaction observed here would be replicated in adult-to-adult interactions or when the newcomer is an adult.

IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY

Despite the limitations found in the data and the limits to generalizability, this study has important theoretical and descriptive implications (some of which have been discussed) for both the discipline of anthropology and the field of deaf studies, an emerging discipline. Applied importance can also be teased out of the findings.

The discipline of anthropology is changing in response to the changing world in which we (anthropologists) work and to challenges (critiques) from within the discipline as well as from outside. As the discipline changes, its theories and concepts must be scrutinized so that they may be modified as necessary to keep up with the changes. This dissertation has been an attempt to scrutinize traditional theories of culture transmission/learning, including the concepts of enculturation and acculturation, in light of recent critiques and changes in the discipline. Elsewhere (Ross 1996), I have proposed that an adequate, contemporary model of culture transmission/learning would be characterized by the ability to accommodate changing definitions of culture, allowance of two-way exchange of information, allowance of simultaneous experience
of enculturation and acculturation, and acknowledgment of similarities in the concepts of enculturation and acculturation. The open nature of the model of culture transmission/learning and the re-conceptualization of enculturation and acculturation proposed here takes into account nearly all of these characteristics. It is open enough to accommodate a number of definitions of culture, including those that contend culture is dynamic, contested and negotiated. It is not constrained by age prescriptions, thereby leaving it open enough to consider culture transmission/learning to be an on-going, lifelong process. It allows that any given interaction may convey multiple aspects of a culture in multiple ways (explicit, implicit, formal, informal, and technical), therefore it does not preclude simultaneous experience of enculturation and acculturation. Finally, it makes clear that the basic process of culture transmission/learning, interaction, is the same whether an individual is experiencing enculturation or acculturation. Nonetheless, the proposed model and the re-conceptualization of the concepts are just the beginning of what is hoped to be a fruitful dialogue within the discipline that will return these once central concepts to the fore.

A hallmark of anthropology is the body of literature describing various cultures generated through its scholarship. It is only in recent years that deaf cultures have become a focus of anthropological study. Aside from the theoretical importance, then, this study contributes a description of American deaf culture as it manifests itself at a midwest residential deaf school to the body of literature on cultures in general and specifically to the growing body of literature on deaf cultures.
In much the same way, the study is of importance to the emerging field of deaf studies. It adds a description of American deaf culture to the body of literature that is being called upon in deaf studies. At the same time, it demonstrates the value of anthropological study to this emerging field. In addition, while the theory proposed herein is not directly pertinent to the field, the specifics of culture transmission/learning in American deaf culture, which are of interest to deaf studies, are closely explored and described for the first time.

Finally, even though this study was designed to address two theoretical questions, potential application can be teased out of the findings. For example, sign language interpreter training is becoming commonplace. Traditionally, interpreters have been trained in associate degree programs, however, more and more bachelor’s degree programs are coming into existence. A single master’s degree program in sign language interpretation is housed at Gallaudet University. In each of these programs students are encouraged to become involved in the deaf community (beyond simply taking sign language and deaf culture classes). This study confirms the importance of this aspect of interpreter training. It also indicates that perhaps a more stringent requirement, rather than encouragement, is necessary in order for graduates to more fully understand the culture and language with which they will ultimately be working (beyond the technical level gained in the classroom, at the formal and informal levels gained through interaction and peripheral participation as well). At the very least, this study provides instructors with a rationale beyond “to practice using the language” for encouraging their students to participate in the community and an understanding of the
limitations of culture transmission that is purely technical. In addition, through the concept of peripheral participation, it provides instructors with a framework by which to prepare students for what they will experience in the real world. The findings from this study could similarly be applied in any program where the learning of a second culture is the goal.

FUTURE RESEARCH NEEDS

This dissertation began with a commitment to write the story of culture transmission and learning at a midwest residential deaf school that I believed to be true. Throughout the writing I have kept this commitment in mind. The model of culture transmission/learning and the re-conceptualization of enculturation and acculturation that have been proposed here represent the process as I believe it to have occurred. In order to further substantiate and refine that belief, additional research is needed.

Several directions for future research are suggested by this study. First, replication of the study with a larger sample of new deaf students and at other residential deaf schools is necessary to confirm the model for American deaf culture and to enhance generalizability. Further, the findings generated an additional question that needs to be addressed: to what extent is the pattern identified for new deaf students developmental in nature. This requires that studies of culture transmission/earning be conducted within deaf families. The model and re-conceptualization also need to be tested cross-culturally, again, for confirmation, further development, and refinement. Cross-cultural research should include non-American deaf cultures, American "hearing" culture, and other "hearing" cultures. Finally, it is acknowledged that this study
occurred in a setting where acculturation was not the result of force or domination. In order to be truly useful, the model and re-conceptualization proposed here must be tested in situations of force and domination.

It is my belief that through ongoing research as suggested here, and beyond that suggested here but with continued focus on interaction, a solid, reliable model of culture transmission/learning can become a reality; a model based on empirical evidence rather than "theory work". I envision a model based on a cross-culturally generated, detailed, and carefully articulated listing of genres of interaction that would allow for comparison across studies. I envision that the listing would function in much the same manner as the international phonetic alphabet - allowing for a standardized description of culture transmission/learning in a specific culture by drawing from the full range of possible genres, where no culture is expected to employ every possible genre. In this way, Huxley's vision of the creation of a discipline unifying concept may ultimately be realized.

---

1 The reader is reminded that the inability to compare findings is one of the critiques of the body of work on culture transmission/learning.

2 I should note again that some methods have been adapted so that they can be applied to the study of both concepts. For example, the Instrumental Activities Inventory (Spindler and Spindler 1965), originally developed for the study of acculturation was later adapted to be used to study enculturation as well.

3 For example, teachers and dorm supervisors commonly commented on the "language loss" that occurred over the weekend for those who did not sign at home. Or, as Mimi pointed out, her parents didn't acknowledge that there was such a thing as deaf culture. Such statements implicate off-campus interactions that seemingly undermine the transmission and learning of deaf culture. On the other hand, Rashad speaks of involvement on a deaf team in a basketball league. His statement implicates off-campus interactions that support the transmission/learning of deaf culture.

4 I was aware that these events occurred based on miscellaneous conversations with both students and staff. However, I was never privy to such events nor did I ever stumble upon such events.
Unfortunately, once begun, the elementary students proved to be far more willing to participate in the research than the high school students. Likewise, the elementary dorm supervisors were more willing to allow me to conduct formal research activities despite the established schedule for students.

The small sample size is also implicated in the validity of the study.
APPENDIX A

RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND THEIR RELATIONSHIPS
How is American deaf culture transmitted/learned

Is there a deaf culture, and if so, what does it look like

what is the role of interaction in culture transmission and learning

For deaf culture, is the acculturative experience different than the enculturative experience

What distinctions does the concept of legitimate peripheral participation provide

What distinctions do Hall’s three types of learning provide

Is acculturation for a deaf student the same as acculturation for a hearing student

Figure 17: Primary and Secondary Questions
What is the role of interaction in culture transmission and learning

In what types of communicative events do learners find themselves
What cultural content is available from the various events and genres
Are there restrictions to participation based on setting, events, and/or genre, if so what are they
With whom do students interact
Does participation change over time or on other bases
Is content form (explicit/implicit) affected by participants
Are certain genres more prevalent than others
Are certain genres associated with particular communication events

What distinctions does the concept of legitimate peripheral participation provide

Is legitimate peripheral participation experienced by all
In what way(s) is peripheral participation marked
What is required to move closer to full participation
Who are the perceived masters

What distinctions do Hall’s three types of learning provide

Does any learning type more readily lend itself to acculturative experiences or enculturative experiences
How are the various types of learning related to the participants
How does learning type impact learned content

Figure 18: Tertiary Questions
APPENDIX B

INTERVIEW PROTOCOLS
INITIAL STUDENT INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

• Remind student what the study is about
• Remind student of confidentiality
• Explain purpose of the video cameras

BACKGROUND/PERSOINAL INFORMATION

• Were you born deaf
  • If no, when did you become deaf
• Are your parents deaf or hearing
• Do your parents sign
  • If yes, what kind of sign language do they use
  • If no, how do you communicate with them
• Do your parents have deaf friends
• Is anyone else in your family deaf
• When did you learn sign language
• How did you learn sign language
• What kind of sign language do you use
• When did you start school here – what year, what grade
  • If later than kindergarten, where did you go to school before here
  • How are the schools different
• What grade are you in now
• What activities are you involved in at school
• Is this the best school for you
  • If yes, why
  • If no, why not
• What do you like best about this school
• What do you like least about this school
• Do you wear hearing aids
  • Why or why not – how do they help you or not help you
  • When and when not
  • Have you ever worn them (when you were younger, perhaps)
    • When did you stop wearing them
  • If you don’t wear them, do you own them
    • If yes, where do you keep them
• Are people who wear hearing aids different from those who do not wear them
  • Do most deaf people feel the way you do in this regard
  • Do most deaf people have the same perception
CULTURAL INFORMATION

AMERICAN SIGN LANGUAGE
• Does everyone at the school use ASL
  • Who does not
  • What sign language do they use
• Should everyone use ASL
  • Why or why not
  • If no, who should and who need not
• Should ASL be used at all time
  • If no, when not
• How do you feel about hearing people learning ASL
  • What about hearing people learning signed English

FOR THOSE WHO ATTENDED OTHER SCHOOLS
• Did your teachers sign
  • Did anyone else at the school sign
  • If yes, what kind of sign language did they use
  • If no, how did you communicate
• Should your teachers at the other school be able to use ASL
  • Why or why not
  • If yes, should they use ASL at all times
    • When or when not

ENGLISH QUESTIONS
• Does English fit in deaf culture
  • How
  • In what form
    • Written
    • Spoken
• How are students who use spoken English here at school perceived
  • Do all deaf people feel the same way you do in this regard

HEARING PEOPLE QUESTIONS
• How do hear people perceive hearing people
  • Are all hearing people the same
• Is it acceptable for hearing people to wear pro-deaf or pro-ASL clothing
  • How do you feel when you see this
• Are deaf and hearing people at all the same
• What do hearing people think about deaf people that is incorrect
• If you were teaching a class about deaf culture to hearing people, what would you teach them about
COLLEGE STUDENT INITIAL INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

- Reminder – what the study is about and why their contribution is important
- Permission to take notes and record
- Reminder – will ask questions that may seem silly, bear with me; if you don’t want to answer any question(s), you need not

GENERAL BACKGROUND

- What is your hearing status
- Is anyone in your family deaf
- Does anyone in your family sign
- How long have you been signing
- How did you learn to sign
  - Were your teachers deaf or hearing
- Why did you want to learn sign
- Why did you want to get involved with deaf people
- What kind of signs do you use
  - Do you know other kinds of sign
    - What makes you use one kind instead of another
- When is the first time you ever met a deaf person
  - Can you describe this experience
- Do you have deaf friends
  - What are they like
- Why did you choose to come to ISD
- What kind of contact with the deaf community do you have outside of ISD
  - What activities
- Do you have a sign name
  - Who gave it to you
  - Has it ever changed

ISD EXPERIENCE AND DEAF CULTURE

- Having been here for a little more than 2 months, what are your impressions
- Remembering back to your first week here, what struck you as culturally different from your own experiences
- Since that first week, what other things have you noticed
- What has surprised you, either because it was contrary to what you had been told or because it was not what you expected
  - Who told you what to expect
- What makes you uncomfortable
In your opinion, and based on your experiences so far, are deaf and hearing cultures at all the same
- In what ways
- In your opinion, and based on your experiences so far, how are deaf people and hearing people the same and/or different
- Describe a typical day for you at ISD
  - Who do you interact with
  - What kind of interactions are these
- If I were coming here for the first time and had never met a deaf person before, knew nothing of deaf culture, what would you tell me to prepare me to come

COLLEGE STUDENT EXIT INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

- Purpose of this interview
- Renew permission to record
- Some questions will be similar to the initial questions, even possibly drawing on your previous answers

- During our first interview, you told me some of the characteristics of deaf culture that you noticed when you first arrived (provide some of their examples). Looking back over the year, have your opinions or understanding of deaf culture changed at all
  - How
- What misconceptions do you now realize that you had about deaf folks before you came to ISD (misconceptions that you brought with you)
- What expectations did you bring that were confirmed
- Now that you’ve had more experience with deaf culture, are deaf and hearing cultures the same in any way
  - In what way(s)
- As part of your training, have you taken a deaf culture class
  - What was it like
    - Can you describe the class
      - What topics were covered
    - After your experience here, how would you teach a deaf culture class
      - Would you do anything different than your teacher did
- If you could tell hearing people ONE thing about deaf people that they must understand, what would you tell them
- At the beginning of the year, you told me if you brought someone to campus you would prepare them by telling them ( ). If you were bringing someone who knew nothing about deafness or sign language to campus now, what would you tell them to prepare them for what they would see and experience
• There is a lot of noise here on campus, perhaps more than you expected. Some of it is meaningful and some of it is just noise. How do you differentiate the two – or do you
• Have you ever felt guilty for being hearing
  • In what situation(s)
• Have you ever apologized for being hearing
  • In what situation(s)
• Have you ever been asked if you were deaf and wished you could say “yes”
• Have you ever caught yourself “acting” or behaving deaf (unconsciously), doing deaf things
  • Like what
  • Have others who don’t know deaf culture noticed and commented
• What was your most embarrassing experience here
• What was your most memorable experience here
• Is there anything else you’d like to tell me about deaf culture and your experience here
• Is there anything you would like to ask me about the project or whatever
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DEFINITIONS OF CULTURE

General Definition: A set of learned behaviors of a group of people.

Definition from B. Kanapell (1988): A set of learned behaviors of a group of people who have their own language, values, rules of behavior, and traditions.

Note that there are hundreds of different definitions of the word "culture".

ASPECTS OF DEAF AND HEARING CULTURES

MATERIALISTIC Aspects of a Culture

The materialistic aspects of a culture are those things that are produced by the group of people. Examples include clothing, food, architecture, and art. These materialistic aspects of a culture are very easy to see and to identify. They are most readily acceptable by people from outside the culture. Often when persons become acculturated into the mainstream of a larger, majority culture, they continue to celebrate the material aspects of their native culture. We see evidence of this in the numerous "festivals" that occur within our nation's cities or in the ethnic restaurants and shops in the cities.

Deaf and Hearing People share many material aspects of culture such as clothing, homes, food. These are shared, aspects of American culture.

Deaf also have some materialistic aspects of their culture that are unique to the Deaf such as TTY/TDD's, captioning, and signaling devices. They also have generated a rich tradition of storytelling, painting, sculpture, dance, and poetry that is unique to the Deaf experience.
BEHAVIORAL Aspects of a Culture

The behavioral aspects of a culture are the rules that govern how we act. These rules become so internalized that we are often not aware of them. When meeting people from other cultures, however, we begin to watch their behaviors and to see that their behaviors may be different from ours. Initially we think of these different ways of acting as strange or weird. It is relatively easy, however, for us to assimilate these behaviors if we choose to do so.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deaf</th>
<th>Hearing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Formal Introductions</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deaf tend to give their first and last names, then tell what school they attended. The introduction continues as the people involved discuss common people they know.</td>
<td>Hearing tend to give their first and last names, their title, degree, and occupation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Telephone**

Deaf tend to first say hello, then to give their name. Telephone conversations tend to be factual with very little "small talk". Socializing is done on a person to person basis. It should be noted when TTY's were first made available people, they did engage in long, social conversations.

Hearing people tend to say hello. They may or may not give their name, depending on whether or not the listener knows the caller's voice. The call is generally initiated with some casual "chat" before business. American culture has made many jokes and anecdotes about the use of the telephone for socializing, particularly in the case of women and adolescents.

**Attention Getting**

Deaf people have a variety of ways of getting the attention of another person. They use a hand or arm wave, shoulder tapping, table tapping, and foot stomping. Each behavior is rule governed.

Hearing will get someone's attention by calling "hey!" or other phrases. These may be accompanied by a wave. What you call out and the tone/intensity of your voice are rule governed.
Deaf people use touching to get other's attention and to display support for another. Deaf people also tend to use hugging to show support, to greet each other, or when leaving each other's company.

Touching in the Hearing community is reserved for family members and very close friends. Strangers or casual acquaintances are touched appropriately through handshake.

Eye Contact

Eye contact during a conversation is not needed unless the eye gaze is shifted to index a pronoun or to change the topic. If eye contact is broken for other reasons it is considered rude and an unnecessary interruption in the conversation.

Eye contact during a conversation is intermittent. Extended eye gaze can signal anger or suggest sexual aggression.

Interrupting A Conversation

If there is not enough room to walk around two people signing to one another, it is appropriate to walk between them and it is not necessary to sign "excuse me." If a conversation must be interrupted in order to address another person, attention is held with the first conversation by holding the index finger in that direction.

Hearing people must say excuse me before passing through two people who are in a conversation. You may not pass through until your "excuse me" has been recognized.

The Environment

Deaf people arrange their physical environments to be sure that lighting is good. They make sure that the visual field is open and free of any distractions or "visual noise". Seating arrangements are often set up in homes to provide opportunities for group interaction in ways that all members of the group can see each other.

Hearing people tend to use lighting to "set the mood". Music often provides a backdrop for the environment. Furniture is often arranged for small, intimate conversations. Large group seating is often done in rows.
Deaf show gratitude through facial expression, signs, and gestures. The sign most commonly known as "thank you" is seldom used among Deaf people themselves, but is used with Hearing people.

The words "thank you" are used extensively both to show gratitude and as a social ritual.

**COGNITIVE Aspects Of A Culture**

Cognitive aspects of a culture represent ways of thinking about the world, generalizations that are based on the group's perceptions, values, and beliefs. Often the language used by the group is the vehicle for seeing these cognitive aspects. What people talk about and how they talk about it gives us insight into the mind. Cognitive differences between cultures are difficult to identify. They do, however, evoke the greatest emotional response. If a member of another group challenges our own ways of thinking, we generally respond very personally and negatively. The cognitive aspects of the culture are very deep inside of us and we often do not know they exist until we meet someone from another culture. As a result, we may assume that everyone thinks or should think alike.

**Language**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deaf</th>
<th>Hearing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Descriptions and comments in ASL tend to be direct and to the point.</td>
<td>Descriptions and comments in English are often vague and general. People are expected to be tactful and diplomatic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events are described in detail. Those events having to do with death, accidents, physical appearance, sex, and bodily functions are also explained in graphic detail.</td>
<td>Detailed descriptions are appropriate in many situations. However, events such as death, illness, sex, and bodily functions are taboo subjects. They are generally described using euphemism and analogy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often, specific situations are given as examples to explain a broader view or opinion. When this is done, people involved with the situation are named. This naming is not done to ostracize but to make a more general point.</td>
<td>When giving examples of situations in order to prove a point, the names of people are not used. Use of names is considered a breach of confidentiality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal discourse structure for situations such as presentations or formal contexts.</td>
<td>Formal discourse structure for situations such as presentations or formal contexts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussions begin by stating the specific point or opinion that is to be presented. Then, a variety of supporting examples are given. During informal disclosure ASL makes use of detailed examples. Often these examples are given as a response to a question. The answer is expected to be inferred from the examples. During informal discussions, responses to questions are expected to be blunt and to the point. If the answer seems vague, the respondent is viewed as evasive and not trustworthy.

Criticism

Criticism is offered openly and specifically. It is given with the expectation that it will be perceived as helpful advice. The advice is given because the person is valued and considered worthy of the criticism. Criticism is often given in vague generalities and inferences must be made by the listener as to the reason for the critique and the point of the critique. Criticism is not often perceived as a form of validation, but rather as a way of establishing subordinate roles.

Values

Deaf and Hearing people share many values. Ideas such as "democracy" and "freedom" are examples of these shared values. However, a closer analysis of how minority and majority groups interpret such words is needed. Perhaps the words are the same but the meanings for people in these two groups are different.

Deaf

The Deaf Community cherishes the residential schools. These schools place where Deaf culture has been transmitted. The residential schools represent the cornerstone of the

Hearing

Hearing people value education, however schools are viewed as institutions separate from the Community. Schools are also viewed as factories for the production of students with a set of skills and knowledge that are defined by the curriculum. Culture is transmitted at home and the school has very little role
Deaf people value Deaf children. They represent the future. Deaf people feel a keen sense of responsibility to all Deaf children, not just to their own children. All Deaf children are viewed as members of the Community.

Deaf organizations play an important role in providing opportunities for personal growth, group interaction, an information network, and transmission of the language and culture. Many organizations and sporting events do, indeed become places of empowerment and organizing.

Identity

While Deaf people do maintain and value their own sense of individuality, theirs is a strong sense of group identity. This identity is revealed in circumstances where one Deaf person is accused of crime and other Deaf people feel as if the entire community is at fault. Group identity is also seen in the decision making process. The process most often involves a group caucus and finally a consensus.

Hearing

In the transmission of a culture. It should be noted that progressive educational movements are now challenging this view of the schools.

Deaf children, as all children, are the property of the parents. Parents are obligated to raise their children on their own with very little or no interference or assistance from others. Those parents who require assistance are viewed as dependent, unworthy, or inadequate.

Hearing organizations can provide similar opportunities for Hearing people. For many white, Hearing males, these organizations serve the role of networking, competition, and philanthropy. For females and people of color, these organizations often provide a place for empowerment and organizing.

Hearing people value individuality. They are considered mature and independent if they are able to make their own decisions.
Reciprocity

Deaf people have a set of rules concerning reciprocity that are strongly influenced by group identity. Deaf people recognize the individual talents and skills of their community members. Each member contributes his or her skills to the reciprocity "pool" where other community members on those skills. Members only have access to the "pool" when they or their family members have already given to the "pool". If a member needs a favor and asks another member for assistance and assistance is denied, a reason is stated. If no reason is given or if the reason is not considered valid, that member's place in the "pool" is suspect.

Hearing people have a set of rules that govern reciprocity. If a person does you a favor, you are obligated to return a favor to that same person within a short period of time. If assistance cannot be given, it is not necessary to state the reason. It is, in fact, rude for others to ask why you cannot do them the draw favor.

Status

Deaf people place a high value and status on those who are skilled users of ASL, who are skilled in a particular craft or trade, or who are leaders in the community. Status and success is often given to those who are able to get through the many road blocks that often prevent Deaf people from achieving. Those Deaf who achieve in other ways such as becoming lawyers or doctors, are often held suspect until they have proven their commitment to the community and have shown that they have not forgotten their "roots".

Hearing people place a high value on educational degrees, salary earned, and the accumulation of items that can be bought with that salary. Success is highly rewarded to those who have "made it to the top" and have done it on their own. English metaphors give a clear perspective of success and what it takes to succeed: "climbing the ladder", "top man on the totem pole", "king of the hill".
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A BRIEF ORIENTATION TO DEAF CULTURE

- Politically correct terminology: Deaf and Hard of Hearing
- In this bilingual environment, individuals may elect to use either ASL or English.
- Visual alerting systems, i.e., phones, class "bells", emergency notification, etc.
- Culturally-based introduction norms
- Lighting is important for communicating visually
- Culturally appropriate ways to initiate conversation, i.e., flashing of lights, tapping shoulder, waving, table vibrations, etc.
HOW TO USE AN INTERPRETER

I. Visual languages vs. spoken languages

- Visual languages use the eyes to take in the message, spoken languages use the ears; therefore,
- Visual languages have developed their structure naturally based on the functionality of the eyes.
- It's only been in the past 30+ years that American Sign Language has been acknowledged as the natural language of the Deaf Community.
- Through research, linguists have come to recognize that ASL is a true language with its own unique grammar and syntax.
- You may observe various communicative styles at ISD. Styles vary based on the individual's background, the participants and other factors.

II. The "Nitty Gritty"
Specifics on communicating through an interpreter

A. Our Role

- Positioning
- Avoiding visual "noise"
- Code of Ethics
- Providing language equivalency
- Lag time
- Full access to the environment
- Creating equal access
- Solo or team interpreting
- Clarification/Modification

B. Your Role

- Ask for an interpreter anytime

ETIQUETTE:
- Opening a conversation
- Use first person
- Eye contact
- Turn taking: one-on-one/groups
- Other's conversations
- Relax! Be yourself!
- "IGNORE" INTERPRETERS...we don't mind!!
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