5 *A bilingual approach to the education of young deaf children: ASL and English*

Michael Strong

Editor's introduction

One educational approach that has never been attempted officially with deaf children is bilingual education. Uncertainties about whether ASL constitutes a language and about the number of children who learn that language at home, the lack of trained teachers who know ASL, and the fact that it has no written form, in conjunction with negative feelings in general about bilingual education, probably account for the reluctance to try it with the deaf. This chapter describes a pioneering effort to design and execute an experimental bilingual curriculum for young deaf children. The justification for adopting a bilingual educational approach for this special population is three-pronged: Evidence from existing research has shown the alternatives to be unsuccessful, Cummins's linguistic interdependence model provides theoretical support, and findings from an earlier observational study of residential school children has shown that children from both hearing and deaf families use more ASL-like structures than English forms in their spontaneous language.

There follows a brief description of the experimental curriculum, which uses a storytelling format first to introduce ASL into the classroom and later to teach English through the medium of ASL. Emphasis is on both language learning and the enhancement of metalinguistic awareness. This program, although limited, is the first of its kind to be researched and evaluated in the United States.

Probably the most difficult problem deaf children must face is the acquisition of language. The long-standing failure of educators in this area is evident from the poor oral English skills and low reading levels of these children. Recently, the acceptance of signing in classrooms for the deaf in America has legitimized a second means of communication for Deaf children, one that hitherto was restricted to covert interactions between students and conversations out of sight of school personnel. Furthermore, the formal study of ASL by contemporary linguists has

confirmed its status as a genuine linguistic system distinct from English. However, the sign system used in classrooms that have adopted a Total Communication approach is not ASL, but one of the signed varieties of English developed as an artificial code for the representation of spoken (or more accurately written) English in a visual-gestural mode.

Although most deaf people consider the widespread acceptance of signing a great step forward in deaf education, many educators of the deaf are still opposed to the use of ASL. The reasons for this are complex and often politically motivated, but the fact remains that no attempt has yet been made to test the efficacy of using ASL formally in the classroom (in the manner of many bilingual programs throughout the world) as a medium of communication through which other school subjects, notably English, might be taught. There is, however, ample theoretical and research evidence to support this kind of approach, although apparently it has not been convincing enough to those who make programmatic decisions to outweigh the competing political perspectives, threats to existing teachers, demands on time, and potential disruptions to established curricula. This chapter describes an initial attempt to overcome some of these problems and the rationale used for eliciting the necessary cooperation from members of the educational establishment.

Justification for the approach

Previous research

One way to distinguish the different kinds of programs for deaf children is to look at the kinds of communication systems they employ. Oral programs use spoken English only and place great emphasis on speech training, lipreading, and maximal use of hearing aids and residual hearing. A second approach combines manual communication with spoken English so that the teachers use both sign and speech simultaneously. Simultaneous communication has been in use for many years, but recently has become the backbone of the relatively new Total Communication approach to educating the deaf. Total Communication officially proclaims the right of a deaf child "to learn to use all forms of communication available to develop language competence" (Denton, 1970). As Quigley and Kretschmer (1982) subsequently noted, this definition may refer to practically any communication method and may, in many cases, simply be a way of giving a positive label to a program that otherwise has no coherent philosophy attached to it. A third kind of program uses manual communication only, either a manual form of English or ASL. This last variety is uncommon and is confined largely to preschool programs for children of deaf parents. (However, there are

programs in Sweden that use Swedish Sign Language and Swedish bilingually, and in England there is at least one experimental program using British Sign Language and English.) ASL is permissible in Total Communication programs in this country, but tends to be the last resort of a teacher who is unable to make a child understand in any other way. The low incidence of deaf teachers, coupled with official policy, accounts for this situation.

In general, very little research has been done on the relative effects of different systems. Positive results have been demonstrated for oral programs only when subjects were selected from one of the few model oral programs in the United States (Quigley and Kretschmer, 1982, p. 22). However, the oral method was used almost exclusively for many years before people began to admit that it was by and large a failure. When researchers initiated studies into various forms of manual communication, results generally favored the sign systems over the oral approach. Russian studies (e.g., Morazova, 1954) reported the benefits of using fingerspelling over a strictly oral method, and Quigley (1969) confirmed those findings in this country. Moores (1978) reported that preschool programs using total communication or fingerspelling outperformed oral programs.

Some researchers have investigated the effects of parental language use on the language development of deaf children. The hearing status of the parents has been well established as a predictor of future linguistic and academic success (Meadow 1968; Quigley and Frisina 1961; Stevenson, 1964; Stuckless and Birch, 1966), the advantage being enjoyed by fewer than 10% of the deaf children who have deaf parents. Researchers have been unable to pinpoint the reason for this advantage. That it might be entirely due to early exposure to ASL is somewhat difficult to accept in view of the findings on parental attitudes (Corson 1973) suggesting that deaf parents are better prepared to cope with deaf children and therefore provide better emotional and educational support. Corson's study included both oral and manual deaf parents, and both groups showed significantly more positive acceptance of deafness than hearing parents. Furthermore, some signing deaf parents use as much manual English as they do ASL with their children, so it might be more an issue of comprehensible native signing than of ASL per se.

Brasel and Quigley (1977) attempted to address this issue by assessing the effects of four different home language environments on academic performance through a comparison of scores on the Stanford Achievement Test and the Test of Synthetic Abilities. The four groups consisted of children aged 10–19 who had received oral English with intensive training, oral English with no special training, manual English (PSE), and ASL. The authors found that the manual English group scored highest in all measures of achievement, reading, and grammatical ability.

The oral group with no special training scored lowest on all measures, and the ASL group scored higher than the intensive oral group. Thus, Brasel and Quigley concluded that manual communication has an advantage over oral communication, and that manual English is preferable to ASL.

This carefully designed study leaves unanswered one important question concerning the language varieties of the manual English group. It is not clear to what extent the parents excluded ASL from their communication. One would expect that, as the children were from deaf families, their PSE would have tended toward the ASL end of the continuum. It follows, too, that deaf parents who describe themselves as using English are likely to be better educated than parents using only ASL at home. Conversely, if the ASL parents were well educated, it is probable that they used English to some extent as well. Unfortunately, the groups were established on the basis of self-report, with no verification by the researchers, so that the reality of the distinctions between groups is in doubt.

Bilingual education theory

The fact remains that more than 90% of deaf children have hearing parents, most of whom are not fluent enough in any form of sign language to provide native user input. These children then arrive at school with, at best, minimal communication skills. In this way deaf children are unlike hearing speakers of other languages, who come to school fluent in a first language. Whereas the question for hearing children centers on whether to incorporate this primary language in their formal schooling, for most deaf children the issue is which form of which language should be considered their primary means of communication. As we have seen, the choice is between various forms of signed or spoken English. However, now that linguists have recognized ASL as a language (e.g., Klima and Bellugi, 1979), researchers are beginning to view the education of the deaf as an issue centering on bilingualism (e.g., Barnum, 1984; Champie, 1984; Erting, 1978; Kannapell, 1974; Marmor and Petitto, 1979; Quigley and Paul, 1984). This is a positive shift in that deafness as a handicap is being deemphasized, and attention is turning instead to language acquisition. Such a change also brings the acquisition of language by deaf individuals into the realm of legitimate concern for those who conduct research into bilinguilism, bilingual education, and second language acquisition, and for those who teach English to speakers of other languages.

This change in thinking is not yet reflected in school programs for a number of reasons. First, there may still be some skepticism among educators of the deaf as to the status of ASL as a language. Second,

most teachers in elementary schools for the deaf are themselves hearing, and consequently few are native users of ASL. Third, children cannot learn to read ASL as it does not have a written form. Lastly, there are no published ASL curricula.

In spite of these problems, much of the theoretical justification for bilingual education is applicable to the special case of deaf children. The Cummins (1981) model of Common Underlying Proficiency, for example, is particularly appropriate. Cummins uses this model to illustrate that experience with either of two languages can promote development of the proficiency applicable to both languages. Elsewhere, Cummins (1979, 1980) argues that in order to keep up in subject matter and maintain normal cognitive development, students need to develop high levels of first language competence. Moreover, they need to develop not only basic interpersonal and communicative skills in the first language, but also the ability to use language effectively "as an instrument of thought and to represent cognitive operations by means of language" (Cummins, 1978, p. 397). Cummins further suggests that a lack of development in the CALP (Cognitive/Academic Language Proficiency) aspect of first language competence may explain why some minority children have problems in school. Thus, low first language skills can exert a limiting effect on the development of the second language. Given this interdependence hypothesis, Cummins argues that education in the first language develops CALP in any other. Thus, for example, in the case of children from Latin America, those who have learned to use Spanish for academic purposes will have developed an ability that aids them in using any other language in an academic setting. On the other hand, those who have not fully developed CALP skills in their first language have more trouble in acquiring second language CALP skills and perform academically below the level of other children their age.

The issue of common underlying proficiency clearly has bearing on the education of deaf children. Deaf children, even more than non- or limited-English-speaking hearing children, have consistently performed far below the level of their hearing English-speaking peers throughout their school careers (DiFrancesca, 1972; Furth, 1966; Wrightstone, Aronow, and Moskowitz, 1963). The handicap of deafness alone cannot account for this failure, because there are group and individual differences in the academic achievement of deaf students exposed to the same educational conditions. One variable that possibly does account for many of these differences is the home language experience of the child. A large number of research studies (summarized by Moores, 1978), show that deaf children of deaf parents outperform deaf children of hearing parents in many aspects of academic work. One may hypothesize from such findings that the advantage enjoyed by deaf children of deaf parents derives largely from the consistent input they receive in the first language.

Children of hearing parents rarely have this opportunity and must learn to communicate as much as they can either from oral English, pantomime, or from nonnative signs that their mothers and sometimes their fathers are attempting to learn themselves.

Evidence cited by Cummins in support of his theory of common underlying proficiency resembles these findings, which demonstrate the value of fluency in the parental language for deaf children of deaf parents. Cummins's evidence stresses the advantage of good first language skills for learing the L2, English. Although bilingual education, as an educational institution, has not gained widespread approval in the United States, findings of available, well-controlled research are strongly supportive of the basic principle upon which it rests, namely, the interdependence of skills across languages. For example, Troike (1978) reviewed 12 evaluations and several research studies in which bilingual instruction was found to be more effective than English-only instruction in promoting English academic skills. Cummins (1981) reviews six other program evaluations from both the United States and abroad, all of which clearly show the benefits for second language performance of programs emphasizing the use of the first language.

Other research evidence derives from the study of primary language development in the home. In essence, these studies show that the use of a minority language in the home is not a handicap to children's academic progress. Cummins and Mulcahy (1978) studied a Ukrainian bilingual program in which first and third grade students who used Ukrainian consistently were better able to detect ambiguities in English sentence structure. Chesarek (1981; quoted in Cummins 1981) studied elementary students on a Crow reservation in Montana and found that a subgroup of students, who had one or more Crow-speaking parents but who were raised as English speakers, scored significantly lower both on a nonverbal ability test and on several aspects of English achievement than the native Crow-speaking group, who had been learning English for three years in a bilingual program.

Bhatnager (1980; quoted in Cummins 1981, but without reference) traced the academic progress of Italian immigrant children in French and English schools in Montreal. He found that the children who used Italian and either French or English interchangeably were better at speaking and writing their second language than children who used English or French all the time. These findings are explained by the fact that the quality of the second language used in the home by parents may have been lower than was necessary to provide beneficial input for the children's academic development. Wells's (1979) study has shown that the quality of interaction children experience with adults is more important for academic success than whether that language is English or something else.

This wealth of evidence strongly suggests that deaf children of hearing parents are suffering, not from their lack of English input, but from a lack of *any* language input that is of high enough quality to aid cognitive/academic language proficiency. This problem has not gone unrecognized by educators, but the solution in the past has been to attempt to find some way to improve the teaching of English as a first language, and efforts ranging from oral approaches, through new-oralism to manual English and Total Communication, have all failed to raise significantly the reading levels of deaf children in comparison with their hearing peers. The disappointing results from these approaches may stem from the fact that none represents a complete language system in itself to the deaf child. Very little spoken English can be processed by most deaf children, either through aided hearing or lipreading, and manual systems of English of the type used in Total Communication programs are not taught accurately or consistently (see Kluwin, 1981, on junior high teachers; Marmor and Petitto, 1979, on high school teachers; Strong and Charlson, in press, on elementary school teachers; Swisher, 1984, on hearing parents).

Thus, a bilingual approach would certainly seem to be applicable to deaf children of deaf parents who use ASL in the home, although this is only a small proportion of deaf children. However, deaf children of hearing parents who associate with deaf adults and children of deaf parents – for example, in a residential school – have as much chance of acquiring ASL as a means of social communication and group identity, as they do English. Under these circumstances, they, too, are suitable candidates for this approach. The following section describes the findings of a study that examined the language patterns of children at a residential school and provides empirical evidence to support this line of reasoning.

Data on the language patterns of young deaf children at a residential school

A study (Strong, 1985) of the spontaneous sign language of young deaf children was recently carried out at a residential elementary school for the deaf. Data from this study provide the third kind of justification for a program that teaches and uses ASL.

The subjects were 19 children aged 4–7 from the four most junior classes at the residential school. Eleven children were of deaf parents, 8 had hearing parents. All the subjects were deaf from birth and had no other impairments. All were described as profoundly deaf, with hearing loss greater than 80 DB in the better ear, 4 were in the preschool class that met each morning, 11 were in two kindergarten classes, and 4 were in the first grade class. Three of the four teachers (all female) were hearing and one (the preschool teacher) was deaf. The official school policy

espouses total communication, with teachers speaking and signing simultaneously; the signs are loosely based on the system known as SEE 2. The teachers themselves do not feel bound either to the SEE 2 system or to simultaneous communication and readily admit to using any kind of language they feel will help the children to understand. The children represented all levels of signing ability from rudimentary skill to exceptional fluency.

The children were videotaped at regular intervals over the course of one school year. Spontaneous samples of sign language were collected in the classroom and in the cafeteria as the children went about their daily tasks. In addition, special sessions of "weekend news" were recorded. These consisted of reports on the events of the weekend that each child presented to the class every Monday. In all, between 50 and 60 hours of tapes were recorded.

The study sought to examine the observed language of the children to determine the extent to which it could be characterized as either ASL or English. The tapes were transcribed on coding sheets that made it possible to record each observed utterance, along with instances of particular grammatical structures, identified in advance as acceptable in one language but not in the other by a team of experts in linguistics and ASL.

This analysis revealed an overwhelming majority of ASL over English elements, regardless of situation or skill level and in spite of constant English input from the teachers throughout the year. Signs for English verb inflections, determiners, and forms of the verb *to be* were rarely used whereas ASL markers for directionality and temporal aspect were very common. Classifiers were widely used, as were indexic reference and facial questions and negatives. Overall, children seemed to be more motivated to acquire and use the social language of their peers than the English forms modeled by the teachers. This finding might have been predictable from the evidence of studies of simultaneous communication cited earlier (Kluwin, 1981; Marmor and Petitto, 1979; Strong and Charlson, in press; Swisher, 1984), which showed teacher and parent language as incomplete, inconsistent, and nonstandard, and thus as potentially impeding the learners' acquisition process.

Since ASL is accessible to deaf individuals, is used by many deaf adults and deaf children, and might be considered the most appropriate full language system available to the Deaf, it is surprising that no formal school programs have yet been based on ASL. Since it also appears that, at least in the environment of a residential school such as that observed in the above-mentioned study, deaf children from all backgrounds appear to use language that is more like ASL than English, there is even more reason to consider it as a likely medium for classroom instruction. Deaf children differ from hearing non-English speakers mainly in the

poor quality of input they receive in their primary language (unless they have deaf parents who use ASL). The aim, then, of the program described below was to provide good quality primary language input and establish the viability of using ASL as a means of teaching English.

The experimental bilingual/ESL program

The present program was seen as a first step toward creating a bilingual educational environment in which ASL is used as the primary language and English the second language. Owing to its limited resources and the fact that only a small part of the school day was available to work with, the program's goals were conservative. They were defined as follows:

1. To develop and expand ASL skills and then to use that language as a medium for teaching English.
2. To develop an awareness of ASL and English as equal but separate languages together with an ability to recognize some of the differences between the two languages.

These goal statements were also transformed into research hypotheses that were to be tested by using a matched pair design to compare the experimental group with a second group of children who had not been exposed to the experimental syllabus. This research is being evaluated at the time of writing. (For a report, please contact the author directly.)

The experimental class contained eight profoundly, prelingually deaf children from a variety of backgrounds. Two had deaf parents and were fluent in ASL, three had parents who were skilled signers, two had almost no communication skills when they arrived at the school, and the last one was somewhere in between. The class differed from traditional bilingual models in that there were no native speakers of another language in the group, but may be considered bilingual in that two languages (ASL and English) were used. The teacher was a deaf, native user of ASL (and bilingual in English), who visited the class to teach the special syllabus. She had more than ten years of teaching experience and had been coached in the art of storytelling by a professional storyteller.

The syllabus (see the appendix) was appropriate for children aged 4–7 and was constructed around a series of children's stories that were culturally adapted, where necessary, for an audience of deaf children. Thus, characters do not listen and talk on the phone, they communicate on a TTY; characters do not overhear a conversation, they watch it from a distance, and so on. The syllabus is divided into two parts. The first part deals with ASL only, the second part introduces English. Part 1 is divided into 10 units. Each unit centers on a different story and focuses on a separate aspect of the language. A unit is expected to take

5–10 one-hour sessions and begins with the introduction to and telling of the story in ASL (either live or on videotape); this is followed by a variety of activities, including role playing, story retelling, drawing pictures, question-and-answer sessions, quiz games, and so on. Part 2 also consists of 10 units with similarly structured activities. However, Part 2 focuses on structures and functions that are realized very differently in ASL and English. In this part, stories are presented on videotape, first in ASL and then in a strict manual version of English (i.e., not PSE). Children are encouraged to look for differences in the two versions, with the teacher guiding them toward those that pertain to the theme of that particular unit. The lessons are still conducted in ASL, but now the goal is to introduce English and to show some of the ways in which it differs from ASL with a view to stimulating a metalinguistic awareness in the learners.

Although considerable attention is given to form as well as function, the overall emphasis is on the use of language in real situations, in this case the language of telling or acting a story, and on asking or giving information. The grammatical aspects are kept simple and elementary. Teacher evaluation can be effected in a number of ways. Children may retell the story one-on-one with the teacher, the teacher may pose questions in either ASL or English and have the child respond in the appropriate language, the teacher may ask information questions about the story, and so on. For research purposes, the children were given a signed repetition task (Strong, Gold, and Woodward, 1986) to measure vocabulary and structural knowledge, and a recognition task to measure metalinguistic awareness. Both of these kinds of tests, which had stimulus items recorded on videotape, could also be used for teaching purposes.

The experimental program ran in this form for a year and a half, starting in January; the first part was repeated after the summer break. The children, who had already experienced some storytelling events in the classroom, were enthusiastic participants. The parents, who all gave special permission for their children to be involved, were also enthusiastic. Even some parents of nonparticipating children who heard about the program asked whether their offspring might be involved. For the most part the children's regular classroom teachers were cooperative, or at least tolerant of the program. It did, after all, represent a certain amount of disruption to the normal schedule and involved using ASL, a language in which most hearing teachers are not completely comfortable. One teacher was very much in favor, one ambivalent, and one basically against the idea. The school administration were at first skeptical, but later wholly supportive. In view of the fact that some people react emotionally when ASL is recommended for use in school, this generally positive reception was encouraging.

Summary

Deaf children educated under the commonly available programs that use either an oral approach or total communication, with or without some measure of mainstreaming into regular classrooms, continue to perform well below their hearing peers, especially in English. In many ways, deaf children can be likened to hearing speakers of other languages for whom bilingual education is one available option. Although increasing numbers of researchers, parents, and others associated with the Deaf have suggested that bilingual approaches should be developed for deaf children, few, if any, such programs are in operation in the United States. This chapter describes an attempt to design and implement an experimental program of this type, which is justified by findings from previous research on alternative methods, bilingual education theory, and a study of language use in a residential school for the Deaf. Although the program described here is necessarily limited in scope, it may encourage others to explore more extensively the potential benefits of applying the principles and practices of bilingual/ESL education in programs for deaf children.

Acknowledgments

The research for this chapter was funded by NIHR grant #Goo8300146 to the University of California, Center on Deafness, and by a grant to the author from the UCSF Academic Senate. The author would like to thank Dr. Henry Klopping, Jacob Arcanin, Marianne Deluca, and Pat Dorrance for making it possible to conduct the study at their school, and Linda Cox-Kuntze, Nancy Eldridge, Norma Richards, and Rosemary Marshall, the teachers who welcomed us into their classrooms with such good humor. Suzy Bank-Schamberg provided much help on storytelling techniques. Most of all, the experimental program owes its success to Joyann Burdett, teacher extraordinaire and tireless supporter of this approach. Thanks, too, to the children who both accepted and ignored us in just the right proportions, who willingly took part in extra tests, and who at times stayed on after school so that the program might continue. The chapter has also benefited from the careful comments of Virginia Swisher and other colleagues, who should not feel responsible for any errors.

Appendix: *ASL/English Storytelling Syllabus*

(Created by Michael Strong, James Woodward, and Suzy Bank-Schamberg, University of California, San Francisco, Center on Deafness)

Part 1: ASL

This syllabus has been designed for deaf children, aged 4–7, who are in an environment such as a residential school where ASL tends to be the principal language of social interaction. Part 1 is divided into 10 units, each of which focuses on one or more functional/grammatical features of ASL. Part 2 also has 10 units, each of which serves as a very elementary introduction to an aspect of English structure that differs greatly from ASL in its surface features. Each unit is based on a different story, which incorporates the linguistic material to be introduced. The purpose is, first, to introduce ASL into the classroom curriculum and thereby to provide reinforcement for those children of deaf parents who are already fluent in the language, at least in conversational settings, and to give other children who have less developed linguistic skills instruction in the language; second, to introduce English as a language distinct from ASL, by teaching a few basic examples of how the two languages might express the same idea differently.

UNIT ONE: STORY: "GOLDILOCKS AND THE THREE BEARS"

1. Referring to people and things (pronouns).
   This focuses on indexic reference with referents present and absent, scene setting, and includes possessives (your, his, etc.), reflexives (yourself, myself), and number incorporation (the three of you, etc.).
2. Describing (word order).
   This illustrates the sign order of noun followed by descriptor, which is common in ASL but not acceptable in English.

UNIT TWO: STORY: "ONE FINE DAY"

Expressing location and direction (locational and directional verbs).

This unit will introduce verbs that maintain the same orientation, such as *give*, *show*, *tell*, *go sit*, and those that involve a change in orientation, such as *ask*, *say no*, *fly*.

UNIT THREE: STORY: "THE LITTLE RED HEN"

1. Asking questions.
   This part of the unit focuses on how to ask yes/no questions in ASL with appropriate sign order and facial expression.
2. Saying "no."
   Various forms of the negative are introduced here.

UNIT FOUR: STORY: "THE HARE AND THE TORTOISE"

1. Locating and moving living and inanimate things (classifiers).
   This will focus on location and movement in classifiers, while ignoring handshape.
2. Describing action (adverb incorporation).
   This focuses on how to modulate verbs of action to indicate movements (e.g., fast, slow, stop/start) and nature (e.g, careless).

UNIT FIVE: STORY: "AMOS AND BORIS"

Representing people and things (handshape classifiers and some size and shape specifiers).

This unit focuses on the different handshapes used in ASL to represent persons, cars, and objects of varying sizes, shapes, and patterns.

UNIT SIX: STORY: "THE BOY WHO CRIED WOLF"

Talking about events that have already happened, are happening now, or will happen sooner or later (time line).

This unit introduces the ASL time line, or the way tense is marked in that language. The story introduces different points on the time line such as yesterday, ago, distant past, a few days, weeks ago, recently, tomorrow, will, a few days from now, soon, and so on.

UNIT SEVEN: STORY: "THE THREE LITTLE PIGS"

1. Describing how you do things (temporal aspect).
   This focuses on the facial expressions and sign movements that represent the marking of verbs for temporal aspect to express ideas such as "again and again," "continuously."
2. Describing the order in which actions are carried out (distributional aspect).
   This covers the movements attached to verb signs when marked for distributional aspect, for example, "you, then you, then you"; or "all of you together."
3. Expressing completion or incompletion (aspect marked syntactically).
   This introduces the important ASL concepts "finish," and "not yet."

UNIT EIGHT: STORY: "THE THREE BILLY GOATS GRUFF"

Identifying and emphsizing topics (topicalization).

This focuses on word order adjustments and facial expressions that are used to emphasize or draw attention to particular aspects of an utterance.

UNIT NINE: STORY: "SYLVESTER AND THE MAGIC PEBBLE"

1. Expressing doubt or uncertainty (conditionals).
   Simple conditionals are introduced using the correct sign order and facial expression.
2. Giving more information about persons or things (relative clauses).
   Again, sign order and facial expression are the means to relativize in ASL.
3. Asking questions (Wh-questions).
   This focuses on how to form Wh-questions in ASL using the correct vocabulary, facial expression, and sign order (e.g., repetition of question word at the end of the sentence).

UNIT TEN: STORY: "THE LION AND THE RAT"

1. Specifying action (object incorporation).
   This introduces some ASL verbs that can be modified to incorporate the object, such as *chop tree*, *close window*.

2. Noun–verb distinction. Finally, some noun/verb pairs are introduced that share the same sign but are distinguished only by an additional movement, for example, *sit/chair*, *drive/car*, *fly/plane*.

A unit normally takes at least one week and possibly two weeks of classroom time, at one hour per day. Stories have been chosen to facilitate the appropriate focus/foci for the particular unit, but frequently include elements from other units.

Part 2: English

Part 2 introduces several elementary English constructions and shows how the same function is performed differently in ASL and English. Each story is told first in English then in ASL, with the teacher continuing to use ASL as the medium of instruction.

UNIT ONE: STORY: "THE LITTLE GIRL AND THE BIG BEAR"

Referring to people and things (pronouns).

This unit introduces the English nominative pronouns, as represented by the English sign system Signing Exact English (SEE 2).

UNIT TWO: STORY: "THE BEAUTIFUL RAT"

Describing (basic word order of the English noun phrase: article, adjective, noun).

The purpose of this Unit is to introduce the definite article and focus on the English word order adjective + noun in comparison with the ASL word order noun + adjective. (Although the English word order is acceptable in ASL also, the differing forms are presented in order to reinforce the concept of two distinct languages).

UNIT THREE: STORY: "WHERE CAN AN ELEPHANT HIDE?"

Saying "no" (negatives).

This unit introduces the English forms *no* and *not*, and the contractions *can't*, *don't*, and *won't*.

UNIT FOUR: STORY: "CINDERELLA"

Asking questions.

This unit introduces the *wh*-question words with the verb *to be*, and yes/no questions of the form "do you . . . ," "did you . . . ," and "can I . . . ."

UNIT FIVE: STORY: "THE HORSE, THE FOX, AND THE LION"

This unit introduces a number of English adverbs, most of which carry the suffix *-ly*, which in SEE 2 is represented as a separate sign tagged on to the adjective sign (e.g., SLOW-LY; HAPPY-LY, etc.).

UNIT SIX: STORY: "HANSEL AND GRETEL"

Describing things that have happened or will happen (past and future tenses.

The simplest forms of the past and future tense are introduced in this Unit. Thus, the sign PAST following an English verb is used to indicate past time, and the sign FUTURE before the verb is used for future time, in accordance with the SEE 2 system.

UNIT SEVEN: STORY: "THE MAGIC PORRIDGE POT"

Talking about things that are happening now (present progressive; habitual).

This unit introduces the two verb inflections *-ing*, and *-s* for the third person singular, and also the verb *to be* (copula) in the present tense.

UNIT EIGHT: STORY: "JACK AND THE BEANSTALK"

Prepositions.

Some of the most frequently used English prepositions are introduced here, particularly in environments where ASL would normally incorporate them into the verb.

UNIT NINE: STORY: "LITTLE WOOD DUCK"

Giving more information about persons or things (relative clauses).

This introduces the use of "who" and "that" in English relative clauses.

UNIT TEN: STORY: "LEO THE LOP"

Expressing doubt or uncertainty (conditionals).

This is difficult and should be included only if the children have mastered the present and future tense forms.

References

Barnum, M. (1984). In support of bilingual/bicultural education for deaf children. *American Annals of the Deaf 129,* 404–408.

Brasel, K., and S. Quigley. (1977). The influence of certain language and communication environments in early childhood on the development of language in deaf individuals. *Journal of Speech and Hearing Research 20,* 95–107.

Champie, J. (1984). Is total communication enough? The hidden curriculum. *American Annals of the Deaf 129,* 317–318.

Chasarek, S. (1981). Cognitive consequences of home or school education in a limited second language: A case study in the Crow Indian bilingual community. A paper presented at Language Proficiency Assessment Symposium, March, Airlie House, Virginia.

Corson, H. (1973). Comparing deaf children of oral deaf parents and deaf parents using manual communication with deaf children of hearing parents on academic, social, and communication functioning. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Cincinnati, Ohio.

Cummins, J. (1978). Educational implications of mother tongue maintenance in minority language groups. *Canadian Modern Language Review 34,* 395–416.

(1979). Cognitive/academic language proficiency, linguistic interdependence, the optimal age question and some other matters. Working Papers on Bilingualism, no. 19. Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

(1980). The cross-lingual dimensions of language proficiency: Implications for bilingual education and the optimal age issue. *TESOL Quarterly 14* (2), 175–187.

(1981). The role of primary language development in promoting educational success for language minority students. In *Schooling and Language Minority Students: A Theoretical Framework.* Los Angeles, Calif.: California State University, Evaluation, Dissemination and Assessment Center.

Cummins, J., and R. Mulcahy. (1978). Orientation to language in Ukrainian-English bilingual children. *Child Development 49,* 1239–1242.

Denton, D. (1970). Remarks in support of a system of total communication for deaf children. In *Communication Symposium.* Frederick: Maryland School for the Deaf.

DiFrancesca, S. (1972). Academic achievement test results of a national testing program for hearing-impaired students: United States, Spring, 1971. Office of Demographic Studies Series D, no. 9. Washington D.C.: Gallaudet College.

Erting, C. (1978). Language policy and deaf ethnicity. *Sign Language Studies 19,* 139–152.

Furth, H. (1966). *Thinking without Language: Psychological Implications of Deafness.* New York: Free Press.

Kannapell, B. (1974). Bilingualism: A new direction in the education of the deaf. *The Deaf American 26* (June), 9–15.

Klima, E., and U. Bellugi. (1979). *The Signs of Language.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Kluwin, T. (1981). The grammaticality of manual representations of English in classroom settings. *American Annals of the Deaf 126,* 193–286.

Marmor, G. and L. Petitto. (1979). Simultaneous communication in the classroom: How well is English represented? *Sign Language Studies 23,* 99–136.

Meadow, K. (1968). Early manual communication in relation to the deaf child's intellectual, social, and communicative functioning. *American Annals of the Deaf 113,* 29–41.

Moores, D. (1978). *Educating the Deaf: Psychology, Principles and Practice.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Morazova, N. (1954). *Development of the Theory of Preschool Education of the Deaf and Dumb.* Moscow: Institute of Defectology.

Quigley, S. (1969). The influence of fingerspelling on the development of language, communication, and educational achievement in deaf children. Urbana, Ill.: Institute for Research on Exceptional Children.

Quigley, S., and R. Frisina. (1961). *Institutionalization and Psychoeducational Development of Deaf Children.* CEC Research Monograph. Washington D.C.: Council on Exceptional Children.

Quigley, S. and R. Kretschmer. (1982). *The Education of Deaf Children.* Baltimore, Md.: University Park Press.

Quigley, S., and P. Paul. (1984). ASL and ESL? *Topics in Early Childhood Special Education 3*(4), 17–26.
Stevenson, E. (1964). A study of the educational achievement of deaf children of deaf parents. *California News 80,* 143.
Strong, M. (1985). A study of sign language among young deaf children. A paper presented at the nineteenth annual TESOL Convention, New York, N.Y.
Strong, M., and E. Charlson. (In press). Simultaneous communication: How teachers approach an impossible task. *American Annals of the Deaf.*
Strong, M., R. Gold, and J. Woodward. (1986). A signed repetition task for deaf children. (Videotape). San Francisco: University of California, Center of Deafness.
Stuckless, R., and J. Birch. (1966). The influence of early manual communication on the linguistic development of deaf children. *American Annals of the Deaf 106,* 436–480.
Swisher, M. V. (1984). Signed input of hearing mothers to deaf children. *Language Learning 34, 2,* 69–85.
Troike, R. (1978). Research evidence for the effectiveness of bilingual education. *Nabe Journal 3,* 13–24.
Wells, G. (1979). Describing children's linguistic development at home and at school. *British Educational Research Journal 5,* 75–89.
Wrightstone, J., M. Aronow, and S. Moskowitz. (1963). Developing reading test norms for deaf children. *American Annals of the Deaf 108,* 311–316.