4. Карпенко І. М. Духовний ідеал ноосфери і катарсична сутність виховання/ І. М. Карпенко // Педагогіка і психологія. – 1998.– № 2. – С. 48 – 53.

У статті розглянуто проблему використання катарсичного механізму у вихованні духовної культури особистості.

Ключові слова: *катарсичне виховання, духовна культура, духовний катарсис, духовний антикатарсис, духовний розвиток.*

In the article the problem of the use of catharsis mechanism is examined in education of spiritual culture of personality.

Keywords: *catharsis education, spiritual culture, spiritual catharsis, spiritual anticathars is, spiritual development.*

Карпенко І.М. – кандидат педагогічних наук, доцент кафедри педагогіки, декан філологічного факультету Луганського національного університету імені Тараса Шевченка (м. Луганськ, Україна)

Рецензент – член-кореспондент НАПН України, доктор педагогічних наук, професор Г.П. Шевченко

UDK 376.1-O56.033

APPROPRIATELY ADDRESSING THE COMMUNICATION AND LANGUAGE NEEDS OF AMERICAN STUDENTS WHO ARE DEAF: AN EXAMINATION OF CORE CONCEPTS OF IDEA

Lisle Kauffman III

The problems of the communication and language needs of American students who are deaf have been considered in the moral aspect. The author ananalyzes the ways of treating these problems in the sociocultural and educational area in the USA.

Key words: *language needs, communication needs, spiritual and moral aspect.*

The United States is a multicultural and multilingual society. Languages from many countries and cultures can be heard spoken in our streets, stores, cafes, and schools. This is also true within the Deaf community. There is not one dominant sign language or communication

system in the United States. Common options of communication in the deaf community include American Sign Language (ASL), Signing Exact English (SEE II), Signed English (SE), Contact Sign (also called Pidgin Signed English – PSE), Cued Speech, and spoken English (Moores, 2001). The Deaf community is a multi-cultural and multilingual social group. With so many different communication options, how do educators decide what is the most appropriate manual language or system to use with students who are deaf or hard of hearing children?

Educators must consider the unique language needs of each individual child. This has been made clear by the historic 1970 Supreme Court case Diana v. State Board of Education, California, in which the court ruled that teachers must take into consideration the language needs of children with disabilities. Specifically, the High Court ruled in Diana that diagnostic testing must be conducted in a child's first and native language, and this is critically important when developing educational programming for children. The above court ruling and other federal laws such as the *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act* (IDEA) have had significant implications for the education of students who are deaf or hard of hearing.

After a thorough perusal of the literature, the current author has observed that very little, if any, scholarship has been published discussing schools' choices of manual language communication with deaf and hard of hearing students from the legal perspective of the *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act* (IDEA). This paper examines the language needs of deaf children and the responsibilities of educators through an examination of best practices and key core concepts of the federal law *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act* (IDEA). This is a critical task, because IDEA mandates that *all* children with disabilities receive a *free appropriate public education* (FAPE) (Turnbull, Stowe & Huerta, 2007). An appropriate education is a core concept of IDEA, one that must be observed by educational programs serving children with disabilities. Additional core concepts of IDEA include individualized educational programming, parent involvement in education, autonomy, and culturally responsive education (Turnbull, Stowe & Huerta, 2007). When choosing a manual language or communication system for a child who is deaf, these core concepts of IDEA must be observed. Any practices which are inconsistent with core principles of IDEA cannot be implemented. This is a critical issue, because the type of communication used in classrooms serving deaf and hard of hearing children

has a profound influence on their linguistic and academic development, which ultimately has lasting effects on their adult lives.

Unfortunately, very little is written about how schools choose one communication option or another or the considerations educators should explore in order to make an appropriate choice. On the other hand, there is considerable acrimonious debate regarding which sign language or system is appropriate (Paul, 2009). There is so much debate, in fact, that lawsuits have been filed in the United States by parents over communication used by teachers of children who are deaf or hard of hearing. In Lachman v. Illinois Board of education (1988), the Supreme Court heard a case in which the parents demanded that the school district place their child in a Cued Speech program, a mode of communication which makes non-visual oral sounds more visual for individuals who are deaf (Cornett, 1967). In Visco v. School District of Pittsburgh (1988) the Supreme Court heard the case of a parent of two deaf children who had rejected a school districts decision to educate her children in a total communication program that was to use Signing Exact English (SEE II). The parent wanted the children to attend an oral program. In a related case argued at the United States Court of Appeals, Tenth Circuit, Logue v. Shawnee Mission Public Schools (1997), the parents also demanded that their deaf child be educated orally. In Petersen v. Hastings Public Schools (1994), the United States Court of Appeals, Eighth Circuit heard arguments from parents that their three deaf children should be educated using strict SEE II, instead of a simplified form of English signing, and in Michael and Arlys J. v. Ankeny, (1999), an Iowa administrative law judge heard the case of parents who wanted their daughter educated using SEE II instead of Pidgin Sign English (PSE).

In each of these cases, the courts have ruled in the favor of schools, arguing that choice of communication is an issue of methodology left to the discretion of educators, not parents. Repeatedly, American courts have held that a school has the right to educate a deaf or hard of hearing child using the communication mode of its choice, even if it conflicts with the parents' interests. The courts have consistently argued that parents do not have a right to compel a school district to use a specific methodology with their child. Despite legal precedence, the question remains: do schools have the right to choose the language or communication system used in teaching deaf and hard of hearing children, even if such a decision conflicts with parents' wishes?

Before proceeding, it helpful to first review the major manual options for communicating with and educating students who are deaf. One of the most common manual communication system used by most programs for the deaf in the United States is Pidgin Sign English (PSE) (Drasgow & Paul, 1995; Luetke-Stahlman & Tyrrell, 1995). "[P]idgin languages are reduced in structure, contain a partial mixture of structure of two to several languages, and contain structure common to none of the languages in the communication situation" (Woodward, 1973, p. 39). This definition of pidgin is consistent with the structure of PSE, which possesses features of both ASL and English, but is "reduced in grammatical features in comparison to its parent languages" (Reilly and McIntire, 1980, p. 152). Caccamise and Newell (1984) note that "PSE involves varying combinations of and modifications of ASL and English features" (p. 117). PSE is a system of manual communication that is exceedingly difficult to define. Historically, "Pidgin Sign English (PSE) has been referred to as signed English, sign English (Siglish), American Sign English (Ameslish), manual English, simultaneous communication, and Total Communication" (Paul and Quigley, 1990, p. 161).

While many individuals use the term Pidgin Signed English (PSE), this is an older term that is that is being replaced by the more descriptive term "Contact Signing" (Lucas and Valli, 1991; Luetke-Stahlman, 1998). PSE or Contact Signing is a system of communication that has developed to allow people who use distinctly different sign languages or systems to communicate effectively. For example, Deaf individuals who use ASL and hearing individuals who depend on English can use Contact Signing to communicate with each other (Moores, 2001; Reilly & McIntire, 1980). Contact Signing is, therefore, a meeting place halfway between two languages, allowing individuals of diverse backgrounds and cultures to communicate with each other.

PSE does not represent the grammar structure of either ASL or SEE II, making it ineffective in modeling either ASL or English (Luetke-Stahlman, 1998), and some researchers have suggested that while PSE is useful in communicating socially with deaf children, it is not an appropriate model for teaching them ASL or English (Luetke-Stahlman, 1998). Since PSE is not a complete representation of either ASL or English, it may have limited instructional validity, as researchers have found that PSE provides incomplete linguistic input (Kluwin, 1981; Luetke-Stahlman, 1988a, 1988b). Drasgow and Paul (1995) further argue that not only does PSE provide incomplete input, it also affords inadequate and inappropriate linguistic input. It is also critical to note that

PSE is not a language at all, but a *system* of manual communication (Paul & Quigley, 1990).

Another sign system used in educational programs for children who are deaf is Signing Exact English (SEE II). SEE II was developed in the early 1970s by Gerilee Gustason, a deaf teacher of the deaf (Luetke-Stahlman, 1998). This sign system was specifically developed to replicate spoken English, thus each sign is paired with a corresponding English morpheme (Luetke-Stahlman, 1998). In other words, SEE II is a visual representation of spoken English. For example, the sentence "He walks slowly" would be signed, HE WALK + S SLOW+LY. SEE II was invented to address the dismally poor language abilities of deaf children. The specific goal of this system's developers was to assist deaf children in learning how to read and write English by providing them with complete linguistic input (Gustason & Zawolkow, 1993). Researchers have found that SEE II can accurately represent English grammar if users strictly adhere to the rules of production (Hyde & Power, 1991). Approximately three-quarters of the signs used in SEE II have been borrowed from or based upon ASL (American Sign Language) signs (Gustason & Zawolkow, 1993).

While SEE II is a visual representation of English, it is critical to note that it is not a *language*, but in actuality a *system* of manual communication. True languages develop naturally, while a communication system such as SEE II is contrived or invented (Paul & Quigley, 1990).

Pure SEE II is used in a much smaller number of programs for the deaf and hard of hearing than PSE. Unlike PSE, devoted users of SEE II adhere to strict rules of production when signing. As a result, it can be signed with a high level of consistency across programs throughout the United States. This feature of consistency across a wide variety of users makes it much easier to evaluate the instructional effectiveness of SEE II than PSE. Studies assessing the effectiveness of SEE II will be discussed at length in subsequent pages.

The final mode of manual communication discussed in this paper is American Sign Language (ASL). ASL traces its origins to The Royal Institution for the Deaf, the world's first public school for the deaf founded in Paris, France in 1755 by Abbe Charles Michel de l'Epee (Moores, 2001). In 1817, Laurent Clerc, a deaf teacher at the Royal Institute came to America to teach in the first public school for the deaf in the United States (Van Cleve & Crouch, 1989). Clerc brought with him French Sign Language (FSL), which became the basis for American Sign Language (Rutherford, 1988). Although a language distinct from FSL, ASL still

shares some similar vocabulary and grammar with its linguistic parent (Padden & Humphries, 1988; Rutherford, 1988).

In contrast to PSE and SEE II, ASL is a true language that has developed naturally to meet the unique communication needs of the Deaf community. ASL has its own unique rules of grammar and discourse with a highly developed and complex morphology entirely different from English and Manually Coded English (MCE) systems (Padden & Humphries, 1988). To illustrate the distinct grammar structures of English and ASL, a comparison is helpful. The English sentence, "That's very dark hair." would be signed in ASL as: "HAIR VERY-DARK IT" (Padden & Humphries, 2004, p. 281).

The status of ASL as a true language has been scientifically verified through years of research by linguists (Stokoe, 1960, 1970; Stokoe, Casterline, Croneberg, 1965; Bellugi, 1972). Like spoken languages, researchers have discovered that ASL follows strict rules of pragmatics (use), semantics (meaning), syntax (grammatical structure) and phonology (called cherology in ASL) (Paul & Quigley, 1990). A significant distinction between ASL and spoken languages concerns phonology. All spoken languages have a phonology or phonetic system. In contrast, being a visual form of communication, ASL has a cherology, which refers to hand movement. All signs can be broken down into smaller cheremic elements consisting of handshape, location, and movement (Paul & Quigley, 1990). Unlike most spoken languages, there is no written form of ASL, and most deaf Americans use written English to communicate (Moores, 2001).

A central and critical component of any culture is generally its spoken language. In this regard, the Deaf community is no different than any other cultural group. ASL is the language of the American Deaf community, a distinct cultural group (Moores, 2001; Padden & Humphries, 2005; Rutherford, 1988). In fact, many Deaf individuals consider ASL to be the true and natural first language of Deaf people (Johnson, Liddell, & Erting, 1989). Through ASL, the norms, values, beliefs and customs of Deaf culture are passed down from generation to generation. ASL is a central and key component of Deaf culture and the Deaf community. In fact, so strong is the connection between ASL and Deaf culture that any criticism of the use of ASL with children is perceived by some as an attack on the Deaf community itself (Moores, 2001).

With three entirely different manual options available, how should educators decide which language or system to use with students in school? Obviously, a decision must be made, but it must be made with careful deliberation. It is critical

to first stress that administrative convenience should never the influence the development of a child's educational program, only thoughtful consideration of his or her individual needs. To meet this goal educators must adhere to core concepts of IDEA, and the first core concept requiring the attention of educators is the importance of providing each student with an *appropriate* education. Federal law mandates that all children with disabilities receive a free appropriate public education (FAPE) (Turnbull, Stowe & Huerta, 2007). Choosing a sign language or other communication system for a deaf child must address this core concept of IDEA. Anything less than an appropriate education is inconsistent with the principles of IDEA and must be rejected. For example, choosing an ineffective language or communication system would result in an inappropriate education and would have negative consequences on a child's development. Therefore, choosing an effective language or communication system is critical to implementing an appropriate educational program for a child who is deaf or hard of hearing. An educational team must conduct a thoughtful and thorough discussion about the advantages and disadvantages of using SEE II, ASL, PSE or any other communication system with a child. Such an evaluation is not only appropriate and ethical and but also in compliance with federal law as expressed by IDEA.

Which method of manual communication is appropriate? This is a question that requires very careful consideration. The manual language or system that has greatest positive influence in developing a child's communication, linguistic, academic, and social development is the most appropriate and will depend on the unique needs of each individual child. Educators must ask themselves important two questions: How does the choice of a language or communication system (SEE II, ASL, or PSE) facilitates the student's acquisition of literacy, and which has the greatest positive impact on the development of academic knowledge? Choice of communication will absolutely impact a student's knowledge of reading, writing, and academic subjects, and it is critical to choose a language or system which will facilitate his or her development, not hinder it. If the language utilized facilitates literacy development, then academic progress will be facilitated, as well. On the other hand, if the language or system chosen does not facilitate literacy, academic skills will be negatively impacted, as there is a direct correlation between language ability and academic success (Luetke-Stahlman, 1999).

Unfortunately, research on the effectiveness of various sign languages and systems in the U.S. is not abundant, although some researchers have

made attempts to evaluate the effectiveness of SEE II, PSE, and ASL on literacy development and academic achievement. Several researchers have investigated the effects of SEE II in teaching English to deaf and hard of hearing children. One of the earliest investigations was a longitudinal study by Babb (1979) who examined the academic achievement, syntactic knowledge and written English of 36 deaf students exposed to SEE II. Babb found that the students who used SEE II at both home and school demonstrated much higher levels of achievement than students who used SEE II at school only. Additionally, some of the students were reading at grade level. Moeller and Johnson (1988) investigated the effects of SEE II on the English language abilities on deaf children. The subjects of this study were deaf students from a public school system in Sedalia, Missouri. The subjects, ages 7 to 18, were followed for a ten year period. The authors found that the students' English grammar and reading abilities systematically improved as they matured and that 75% of the students were reading at or above grade level. The results suggested that students using SEE II could learn to read on grade level.

In another study, Luetke-Stahlman (1988a) evaluated the reading abilities of 176 deaf students (ages 5-12) exposed to various manual languages and systems. The students were divided into two groups: 1) Group A, which consisted of students who received complete and consistent linguistic input in a language or system, i.e. American Sign Language (ASL), Seeing Essential English (SEE I), Signing Exact English (SEE II), and oral only English. 2) Group B, which consisted of students exposed to a manual input that incompletely and inconsistently represented English i.e. Signed English (SE) and Pidgin Sign English (PSE). Luetke-Stahlman found that the students exposed to complete linguistic input scored significantly higher on the reading measures than students exposed to incomplete input. Additionally, the students who used SEE II performed significantly better than the students exposed to the other inputs.

Schick and Moeller (1992) evaluated students in Omaha, Nebraska and revisited the Sedalia, Missouri school district. The students in both of these programs communicated in SEE II. The authors found that these deaf and hard of hearing students had acquired age appropriate syntactic and lexical skills. Furthermore, they found that English was the first language for these students.

Additional research is sorely needed, as there have not been any been any serious scholarship on SEE II, since the 1980s (Paul, 2009), but studies that have been conducted have demonstrated that children who communicate through SEE II can learn to read English at grade level. This is especially true of children who are exposed to SEE II both at home and at school. Regarding, PSE or Contact Language an exhaustive review of the literature of the literature failed to identify empirical studies validating the use of this communication option, which may be a direct result of the inconsistent nature of this communication option. PSE is not a manual communication system that is signed consistently by users. The syntax of PSE is not uniform as is ASL or SEE II. There is a wide variation in the grammar of PSE from user to user (Drasgow & Paul, 1995; Paul, 2009; Paul & Quigley, 1990; Reilly and McIntire, 1980; Woodward, 1973). Teachers in different schools signing in PSE will likely use widely varying grammatical structures and vocabulary. This paucity of research has been confirmed by Drasgow and Paul (1995) who noted, "Because of the wide variations in the use of this 'system' [PSE], it is difficult to describe its use by practitioners and just as difficult to evaluate its effectiveness" (p. 81).

On the other hand, a review of the literature has identified studies questioning the effectiveness of PSE in developing the English literacy skills of deaf children. Marmor and Petitto (1979) investigated the English modeling of teachers signing PSE in a simultaneous communication (speaking and signing a message) context. The authors found that only 10% of the teachers' signed utterances which accurately modeled English grammar, indicating that PSE does not represent correct English grammar, thus making it unlikely that a deaf child would learn English syntax simply from seeing PSE.

The incomplete nature of PSE was explored in great depth by Newton (1985). The researcher compared the grammatical input of three groups of teachers: teachers of hearing students, teachers of profoundly deaf oral students, and PSE using teachers of profoundly deaf signing students. After comparing the linguistic input of each group, she found that hearing teachers provided greater linguistic English input than the signing teachers. The signing teachers made more grammatical errors and signed fewer idiomatic expressions. In fact, unlike the teachers of hearing children, the PSE teachers omitted spoken figurative language 60% of the time. Newton (1985) stressed that the communication model used by teachers of the deaf must, therefore,

include all aspects of the linguistic system; phonological, syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic. If these are not present in the environmental model, it would be difficult to imagine how children might come to incorporate them into their own developing systems (p. 336).

The effects of incomplete input are clearly evident in a study by Jones (1979) who examined the written English of PSE using deaf college students. She found that the students had considerable difficulty writing comprehensible English, and they would "translate into English only the manual sign signs they would use if rendering the same passage in PSE" (Jones, 1979, p. 275). In other words, their writing simply replicated or imitated their signing.

In a study by Luetke-Stahlman (1988a), students who were exposed to PSE scored significantly lower on measures of reading and language than students who used SEE II. Luetke-Stahlman concluded that exposure to a linguistically complete form of a language, such as SEE II, results in significantly higher reading achievement than exposure to PSE, which is linguistically impoverished. The author noted that the poor performance of PSE signing deaf students was due to the incomplete linguistic input they received. Luetke-Stahlman & Tyrrell (1995) studied adults' abilities to transcribe the form and meaning of both PSE and SEE II. The subjects in this study consisted of 38 proficient users of PSE who worked in the field of deaf education. They viewed two versions of a highly similar story signed once in PSE and once in SEE II. They were asked to transcribe the stories as they watched them. The subjects were able to transcribe both the syntax and meaning of the stories with significantly greater accuracy after viewing the SEE II version than the PSE version. The implications for deaf education are clear. If adults cannot completely grasp the syntax and semantics of a story in PSE, children who are language delayed will have even less success. As Luetke-Stahlman (1993) observed, "If adults who possess a strong language base in English cannot retrieve the grammar and semantics via PSE, then it seems logical to predict that deaf children will also have difficulty" (p. 91).

Because PSE is linguistically incomplete, a child exposed to this communication system has fewer opportunities to learn and internalize the rules and components of the English language. Mitchell (1982) noted, deaf children "exposed to an impoverished form of MCE…will only acquire that simplified form" (p. 333). Since PSE models incomplete English, the child will acquire incomplete English skills. As Wood and Wood (1992) pointed

out, deaf children "come to sign what they typically see their teachers signing" (p14). Put simply, what goes in the child, comes out.

Given the research reviewed, there is a lack of empirical data substantiating the positive effects of PSE on English literacy development. Furthermore, studies have demonstrated that PSE is linguistically deficient. It does not provide complete input of English phonetics, syntax, semantics, and pragmatics. Studies have shown that deaf children are not able to learn the phonological, syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic components of English from PSE, because it does not provide complete linguistic input (Drasgow & Paul, 1995; Kluwin, 1981; Luetke-Stahlman, 1988a, 1988b 1993; Luetke-Stahlman & Tyrrell, 1995). Numerous scholars have persuasively argued that unless children receive complete linguistic input, they will never produce linguistically complete language themselves.

As with other communications options, research on the effectiveness of ASL in teaching written English is also limited (Paul, 2009). A few researchers have attempted to investigate the effectiveness of ASL in teaching English, so some limited information is available. ASL is a natural language that provides complete linguistic input. See Table 1 for a comparison of PSE, ASL and SEE II. Due to its linguistic qualities, ASL may be useful as a means of teaching English as a second language to students who are deaf. There are a significant number of educators and researchers who strongly advocate that ASL can be used to facilitate the acquisition of English (Drasgow, 1993; Johnson et al., 1989; Kuntz, 1998; Mahshie, 1995; Strong & Prinz, 1997). State Erting and Pfau, (1997) "children's knowledge of and mastery of ASL serves as the conduit for learning to read and write English" (p.2).

The relationship between early acquisition of ASL and academic achievement has long been substantiated by researchers and educators. As early as 1970, Vernon and Koh found that deaf children of deaf adults who used ASL demonstrated higher rates academic achievement than deaf children of hearing parents who did not use ASL. The implications are that early development of ASL language skills provide a solid foundation for linguistic and academic achievement. Strong and Prinz (1997) studied the relationship between mastery of ASL and English literacy. The authors found a significant correlation between knowledge of ASL and tests of English vocabulary, syntax and writing. A significant weakness of the study is that a reading measure was not administered, so it unknown if skill in using ASL positively

influences English reading ability. However, the researchers did discover a correlation between ASL and English language proficiency. In response to this relatively new paradigm of language learning, a number of ESL programs are currently being developed to teach deaf students ASL as a first language and English as a second language, but as Paul (2009) points out, there are insufficient empirical studies to know with certainty that mastery of ASL is sufficient for students to acquire fluency in written English. One significant obstacle is the transfer of knowledge about a manual language without a written form to an oral language with a written form based on a phonetic code (Paul, 2009). In contrast to PSE, ASL is a natural language that models complete linguistic input (Luetke-Stahlman, 1998) and holds tremendous importance as the first language of the Deaf community and the purveyor of Deaf culture. For instance, mastery of ASL allows an individual to be a participating and accepted member of the Deaf community. This is a valuable social need which cannot be overlooked. It is just as important for Deaf individuals to be accepted into a community of peers as it is for hearing people. Mastery of ASL opens many doors for individuals within the Deaf community.

Following a careful discussion about research on and characteristics of the various language and communication systems, one can begin to thoughtfully consider which method may be most appropriate for individual students. All students have the right to a free appropriate public education (FAPE). IDEA clearly mandates that all children with disabilities receive educational services that appropriately meet their needs. Implementing the most appropriate sign language or system addresses this first critical core concept of IDEA. For some students, the appropriate language might be ASL. For other students, SEE II may be more appropriate. Given what is known about the incomplete linguistic nature of PSE, this manual system may be an inappropriate instructional choice for some students, but may be acceptable for socially communicating with children who already possess mature English language skills (Luetke-Stahlman, 1998). On the other hand, empirical research on the transfer of ASL linguistic skills to English literacy is extremely limited, as well (Paul, 2009), and despite the instructional promise of SEE II, there appears to be no empirical examinations of this sign system during the last two decades. Hence it becomes difficult for educators to determine which sign language or system is most appropriate in the classroom, making it even more critical to carefully evaluate the individual

needs of *each* child. Besides FAPE, there are other core concepts of IDEA educators must consider, which might make the decision of choosing a sign language or system less daunting.

The second core concept of IDEA that must be considered when choosing a manual language or system is individualized educational programming. The core concept of individualized services is demonstrated through the implementation of the Individual Education Plan (IEP). Each child with a disability protected under IDEA is legally entitled to an IEP. The IEP is intended to result in the development and implementation of an educational program that is tailored to address the student's unique individual strengths and needs. There are no exceptions to this mandate; even an incarcerated juvenile is entitled to an IEP if he had one before the incarceration (Turnbull, Stowe & Huerta, 2007). Schools have a legal obligation to provide an individualized education program for each eligible child based on his or her *individual* needs. Consequently, when choosing a language or communication system for a child who is deaf or hard of hearing, the principle of individualized instruction cannot be ignored, and decisions regarding language and communication are made by the student's IEP team, not the school or individual teachers. It is the IEP team that decides whether the student will benefit from ASL, SEE II, or any other communication system, and that decision is written into the child's IEP, which is a legal binding document.

It would be highly inappropriate for a district to implement a communication policy for all students, as that would violate the core concept of individualized services, articulated and mandated by IDEA. In this instance, the school district would be following a paradigm of placing district policy over the individual needs of students. The mandate of individualized educational programming must never be disregarded by a school. When a school district decrees a "one size fits all" policy for all deaf students, it fails to take into consideration each student's unique needs. By its very nature, a communication policy instituted for all students obstructs individualized programming. Furthermore, establishment of a communication policy trumps the principle of parent participation, another key concept of IDEA. Developing an IEP is a shared decision making process between the student's family and the service providers (Turnbull, Stowe & Huerta, 2007). IDEA makes it abundantly clear that parents are to be fully participatory in the decision making progress (Turnbull, Stowe & Huerta, 2007). Schools must

respect parents' right to choose the language through which their child will communicate. Schick (1990) noted that a child's native language is that which she acquires from her parents. Indeed, common-law doctrine makes clear that parents have a responsibility to support their children and consequently common-law grants parents rights to control their children in a variety of ways (Turnbull & Turnbull, 2000). Parents have a right to make decisions in the best interests of their children. If a school declares that it would use a language or communication system not used or approved by parents, it would be ignoring the important core concept of parent participation. The decision of what language or communication mode to use with students who are deaf is made by the child's IEP team of which parents are members. Parents must always be included on IEP teams and be equal participants in educational decisions that affect their children (Turnbull, Stowe & Huerta, 2007). Another core concept of IDEA requiring consideration is that of autonomy, or the right of a child with a disability and his family to exercise control over their lives (Turnbull, Stowe & Huerta, 2007). "Autonomy refers to the state of being self-governed and to act in chosen ways" (Turnbull, Stowe & Huerta, 2007, p. 358) This core concept refers to the right of the person to make decisions for him or herself. If a school is going to be sensitive to the concept of autonomy or self-determination, they will seriously consider a parent or child's request regarding choice of language. Language is one of the most personal possessions a family has, and schools should be sensitive to parents' desire to have their deaf or hard of hearing children educated in their native language.

Besides autonomy, another core concept expressed in IDEA is cultural responsiveness. Sensitive consideration of a child's cultural needs and background must also be addressed, in order to provide students with an appropriate education. "IDEA requires educators to respond to families' cultural, linguistic, and ethnic characteristics" (Turnbull, Stowe & Huerta, 2007, p. 362). A student's educational program must be structured around her linguistic needs. An assessment must be conducted to identify her first language, which will subsequently guide the development of appropriate educational goals and objectives (Luetke-Stahlman, 1998). Notes Luetke-Stalhman (1998), [T]he dominant language of each student should be empirically identified. Once assessed, it should be this language or system that is used for instruction to teach new, unknown information to the student" (p. 21). Therefore, a careful assessment must be conducted to determine if the child's first language is ASL or English and then develop the IEP around her

dominant language. Language is one of the dominant characteristics of a cultural group, and families have a right to use and maintain their native language.

Additionally, there should be sincere discussion regarding a child's language needs as an adult. It is not unusual for mainstreamed deaf children to join the Deaf community and adopt ASL as their primary language when they reach adulthood (Padden and Humphries, 2005). The decision to use ASL, English, or PSE must be carefully evaluated in order anticipate her cultural needs. Decisions regarding a deaf child's language or communication system cannot be taken lightly, nor should they be based on administrative preference.

As was discussed earlier in this paper, ASL is the language of Deaf culture and the Deaf community. Failure to consider a child's communication needs as an adult is effectively deciding for her that Deaf culture is not a valued part of her experience a member of the Deaf community. Individuals have the right to decide for themselves in which culture and community they wish to live. It is inappropriate and unethical to deny a deaf or hard of hearing student access to his or her native language whether its ASL which provides her access to the Deaf community or English, which provides him or her access to American society as a whole. Finally, IDEA has a special clause regarding communication and language issues. IDEA clearly states:

Consider the communication needs of the child, and in the case of a child who is deaf or hard of hearing, consider the child's language and communication needs, opportunities for direct communication with peers and professional personnel in the child's language and communication mode, academic level, and full range of needs, including opportunities for direct instruction in the child's language and communication mode. (Section 614(d) 3Biv)

The IEP team must carefully evaluate the communication and language needs of each deaf or hard of hearing child when planning his or her educational program. What is the family's and hence the child's first language? The instructional language used in the classroom is dictated by the child's native language. This not only appropriate and ethical, but is a requirement of IDEA. Unfortunately, many school districts have either forgotten or have failed to realize that the decision to use ASL, contact signing (PSE), SEE II, SEE I (Seeing Essential English), Cued Speech or other modes of communication are issues of language and communication and

specifically addressed in IDEA. The sign language or system used by the school and parents alike relates to the communication and linguistic needs of the child, not methodology. An example of methodologies to teach language would be either the analytic or natural methods of language instruction, not deciding between two different languages or modes of manual communication.

It is a violation of both cultural responsiveness and the communication principles of IDEA for courts to insist that the decision to use a specific language or mode of manual communication is a methodology issue left to the discretion of a school district rather than the child's IEP team. Furthermore, it also violates the core concept of individualized programming by leaving a deaf child's language and communication needs at the mercy of school administration. Certainly there is legal precedence of methodology issues being left to the discretion of the school district, but not at the expense of an appropriate education (Turnbull & Turnbull, 2000). Therefore, to provide for an appropriate education, the form of manual communication chosen should not reflect the school's or teacher's preference, but rather the child's dominant language. Considering what has been discussed in the preceding pages regarding SEE II, ASL, and PSE, the educational team will need to examine how the child communicates at home. If the family's first language is English, and the parents are using Manually Coded English, then SEE II would be an appropriate option. On the other hand, if the parents are deaf and their first language is ASL, then logically, the child's native language is ASL. In that situation, American Sign Language would be an appropriate instructional language. In both of the preceding scenarios, IDEA explicitly charges IEP teams to "*consider the communication needs of the child, and in the case of a child who is deaf or hard of hearing, consider the child's language and communication needs*" (Section 614(d)3Biv). Deciding between ASL, SEE II or PSE, is not a matter of methodology. Multiple courts have erred in ruling that a decision to use a particular sign language or any other mode of communication is a methodology issue by misinterpreting very clear language in IDEA.

In summary, when choosing a language or communication system for a deaf or hard of hearing child, educators must carefully consider the core concepts of IDEA. The critical principles requiring thoughtful deliberation include free appropriate public education (FAPE), individualized educational programming, parent involvement in education, autonomy, and culturally responsive education.

These core concepts are not included in IDEA simply as window dressing, nor should they be viewed as a nuisance. They were written into IDEA to protect students' rights and to provide parents and educators with the critical tools to help *all* students reach their fullest potential.

References

1. Bellugi, U. (1972). Studies in sign language. T.J. O'Rourke (ed.), *Psycholinguistics and Total Communication. American Annals of the Deaf*, 68-83.
2. Drasgow, E., & Paul, P. (1995). A critical analysis of the use of MCE systems with deaf students: A review of the literature. *Association of Canadian Educators of the Hearing Impaired Journal, 21*(2/3), 80-93.
3. Johnson, R., Liddell, S., & Erting, C. (1989). *Unlocking the Curriculum: Principles for Achieving Access in Deaf Education*. Gallaudet Research Institute/Occasional Paper Series, 89-3, Washington, D.C.: Gallaudet Research Institute.
4. Luetke-Stahlman, B. (1992). Three PSE studies: Implications for educators. Proceedings of the Seventh Annual Conference on Issues in Language and Deafness, October 3-4, 1992 Brenda Schick and Mary Pat Moeller, eds.
5. Luetke-Stahlman, B. (1998). Language Issues in Deaf Education. Hillsboro, OR: Butte Publications.
6. Mitchell, G. (1982). Can deaf children acquire English? An evaluation of manually coded English systems in terms of the principles of language acquisition. *American Annals of the Deaf, 127*(5), 331-336.
7. Padden, C. and Humphries, T. (2005). *Inside Deaf culture*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
8. Prinz, P., & Strong, P. (1998). ASL proficiency and English literacy within a bilingual deaf education model of instruction. Topics in Language Disorders, 18 (4), 47-60.
9. Reilly, J. and McIntire, M. L. (1980). American Sign Language and Pidgin Sign English: What's the difference.*Sign Language Studies, 27*, 151-192.
10. Rutherford, S. D. (1988). The culture of American Deaf people. *Sign Language Studies*, *59*, 129.
11. Schick, B. (1990). *Integrating the language of the schools and the language of the community*. Unpublished paper presented at the Show Me Symposium in Columbia, MO.
12. Schick, B., & Moeller, M. (1992). What is learnable in manually coded English sign systems? Allied Psycholinguistics, 14, 313-340.
13. Stokoe, W. (1960). Sign language structure: An outline of the visual communication system of the American Deaf. Studies in Linguistics, Occasional Paper8, Washington, D.C.: Gallaudet University Press.

Розглянуті проблеми комунікації та мовних потреб американських студентів з вадами слуху у духовно-моральному аспекті. Автор аналізує, як ці проблеми трактуються у американському соціокультурному та освітньому просторі США.

Ключові слова:*мовні потреби, комунікативні потреби, духовно-моральні потреби.*

Рассмотрены проблемы коммуникации и языковых потребностей американських студентов с недостатками слуха в духовно-моральном аспекте. Автор анализирует, как эти проблемы трактуются в социокультурном и образовательном пространстве США.

Ключевые слова: *языковые потребности, коммуникативные потребности, духовно-моральные потребности.*

Лайл Кауфман III–доктор філософії, міжнародний експерт з інклюзівної освіти студентів з вадами слуху, представник «Програми Фулбрайт в Україні» (США, штат Канзас, м. Канзас)

Рецензент – доктор педагогічних наук, професор Н.Є. Міропольська

UDK 376.1-056.263

AMERICAN DEAF SUBCULTURE: FORMING MULTILINGUAL PERSONALITY

O.Ye. Krsek

The problems of forming multilingual personality of students with hearingloss in the educational institutions of the USA have been considered. The author ananalyzes the ways of treating these problems in the sociocultural and educational area.

Key words: *multilingual personality, social and cultural area, educational area.*

Sociologi stsand anthropologists usually speak of culture as a characteristic of an entire society. But culture can also exist in smaller, more narrowly defined units. A subculture consists of the values, behaviors, and physical artifacts of a group that distinguish it from the larger culture. We can consider it as a culture within a culture. Certain racial and ethnic groups, religions, age groups, even geographic areas can all constitute subcultures. A subculture is a group of people with a culture which differentiates them from the larger culture to which they belong. Subcultures can exist at all levels of organizations, highlighting the fact that there are multiple cultures or value combinations usually evident in any one organization that can complement