

Communication and Language

Berent, G. (1996). Learnability constraints on deaf learners' acquisition of English Wh-questions. *Journal of Speech and Hearing Research*, 39 (3), 625-642. [AN 1555]
This article explores deaf college student's knowledge of English wh-question formation in the context of government binding theory and as associated learnability theory.

Berent, P., Samar, V., Parasnis, I. (2000). College teachers' perceptions of English language characteristics that identify English-language learning disabled deaf students. *American Annals of the Deaf*, 145 (4), 342-358. [AN 1705]
In this study, a survey solicited the intuitions of experienced teachers and tutors of English to deaf college students regarding the degree of difficulty deaf students with and without LD might be expected to have in dealing with 30 specific English language phenomena. Spelling knowledge and a variety of English discourse, lexical, syntactic, and morphological phenomena emerged as candidates for further study as potential markers of LD in the deaf population.

Caccamise, F., & Mitchell, M. (1999). *Secretarial 3 & NTID/RIT Secretarial Videotapes*. Rochester, NY: National Technical Institute for the Deaf (NTID), Rochester Institute of Technology (RIT). [see: Available for Purchase]

Caccamise, F., Mitchell, M., Reeves, J., Herald, S., & Burch, D. (1998). *SIGNS for legal and social work terminology*. Rochester, NY: National Technical Institute for the Deaf (NTID), Rochester Institute of Technology (RIT). [see: Available for Purchase]

Caccamise, F., & Lang, H. (2000, 2nd ed.). *SIGNS for science and mathematics: A resource book for teachers and students*. Rochester, NY: National Technical Institute for the Deaf (NTID), Rochester Institute of Technology (RIT). [see: Available for Purchase]
Using a systematic process developed at NTID during the 1970's, skilled signers knowledgeable about legal, social work, secretarial, science and mathematics were interviewed in order to collect the signs they use for terminology in each of these areas. These signs, together with signs collected from previously published materials, were then shared with other legal, social work, secretarial, science and mathematics experts who provided judgments of their acceptability. Based on the results of this process, and respondents' sociolinguistic backgrounds, signs were selected for inclusion in these publications. In addition to information about this process and signs: (1) the legal-social work book includes suggestions and guidelines for effective use of sign language vocabulary for legal and social work terminology and information and readings from the National Association of the Deaf and the Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf, and (2) the science and mathematics book includes a selected reading list on science and mathematics education for students who are Deaf, resources and strategies for ASL interpreting of technical information, and sign formation guidelines based on the structure of naturally developed signs.

Caccamise, F., & Newell, W. (1996). Sign language communication skills: Assessment, development, and benefits. *Deaf Life*, 8 (12), 24-27. [AN 1699]

This article discusses the Sign Communication Proficiency Interview (SCPI), a conversational approach to sign language communication skills assessment that is based on the Language/Oral Proficiency Interview (L/OPI). Similar to the L/OPI, the SCPI permits interview content to vary according to the job responsibilities, background, and interests of each person interviewed. In addition to a description of the SCPI, this article discusses use of the SCPI: (1) as part of the job hire process and within integrated staff sign language communication skills assessment and development programs, (2) as a screening tool with student teacher applicants at schools serving students who are deaf, and (3) as a screening tool for interpreter training program applicants.

Finton, L. (1996). Living in a bilingual-bicultural family. In I. Parasnis (Ed.), *Cultural and language diversity and the deaf experience*. (pp.259-271). New York: Cambridge University Press. [AN 1562]

L. Finton shares her family's bilingual and bicultural life style.

Fischer, S. (1996). By the numbers: Language-internal evidence for Creolization. In W. Edmondson (Ed.), *International Review of Sign Linguistics*, 1, 1-22. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum. [AN 1473]

This paper uses evidence from the number system of ASL to argue in favor of a Creolization process in the development of the language as a whole. Evidence is also adduced from signs that incorporate numerals as well as changes in the person classifier.

Fischer, S. (1998). Critical periods for language acquisition. In A. Weisel (Ed.), *Issues unresolved: New perspectives on language and deaf education* (pp.259-271). Washington: Gallaudet University Press. [AN 1475]

This paper addresses the evidence in favor of critical periods for the acquisition of sign language; the author concludes that there are critical periods for signed language.

Fischer, S. (1996). The role of auxiliaries in sign language. *Lingua*, 98, 103-119. [AN 1476]

This paper examines agreement in signed languages, especially Japanese Sign Language, where it was found that if a verb lacks agreement, that agreement is assumed by a semantically empty verb similar to the English verb "do".

Fischer, S. (1997). Verbal and nonverbal signals in American Sign Language. *Human communication science: Technical report of the Institute of Electronics, Information, and Communication Engineers*, 96 (470), 1-9. Japan: IEICE. [AN 1598]

Users of all languages have access to both linguistic (verbal) and nonlinguistic (nonverbal) signals to convey messages. In the case of spoken languages, nonlinguistic signals may be overlaid on the same channel as linguistic ones, or they may be in a different channel altogether. In signed languages, only the former option is possible. It is important to realize that what may be nonlinguistic or paralinguistic for spoken languages can be linguistic or grammatical for signed languages.

Fischer, S., Delhorne, L., & Reed, C. (1999). Effects of rate of presentation on the reception of American Sign Language. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, 42 (3), 568-583. [AN 1668]

This paper reports on the results of a comparable study of the reception of American Sign Language. Fourteen native deaf ASL signers participated in an experiment in which videotaped productions of isolated ASL signs or ASL sentences were presented at normal playback speed and at speeds of 2, 3, 4, and 6 times normal speed. The results suggest a modality-independent upper limit to language processing.

Fischer, S., & Gough, B. (1999). Some unfinished thoughts on FINISH. *Sign Language and Linguistics*, 2 (1), 67-78. [AN 1674]

The sign in ASL with the most varied meanings (though many of the meanings are related), syntactic uses, and interesting grammatical ramifications is FINISH. There are about seven different meanings and at least four grammatical functions it can take. It interacts in very interesting ways with processes in ASL of negation, interrogation, and subordinate conjunction, and also with specific kinds of verbs.

Foster, S. (1999). Communication as social engagement: Implications for interactions between deaf and hearing persons. *Scandinavian Journal of Audiology*, 27 (Suppl. 49), 115-124. [AN 1617]

Communication involves sending and receiving signals. However, it is also a form of social engagement. Constraints on communication between deaf and hearing persons often result in strained interactions as well as loss of full information. In this paper, a meta-ethnographic approach is used to describe the impact of spoiled communication on social engagement between deaf and hearing persons.

Foster, S. (1997). Communication experiences of deaf people: An ethnographic account. In I. Parasnis (Ed.), *Cultural and language diversity and the deaf experience* (pp.117-135). New York: Cambridge University Press. [AN 1557]

In this paper, barriers to interaction associated with communication differences between deaf and hearing people are explored. The paper concludes with a discussion of the implications of these barriers for deaf people.

Lang, H., Foster, S., Gustina, D., Mowl, G., & Liu, Y. (1996). Motivational factors in learning American Sign Language. *Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education*, 1 (3), 202-212. [AN 1546]

This study focuses on factors that motivate and de-motivate professionals to learn American Sign Language. Principal motivating factors were intrinsic in nature (e.g., personal goals), while principal de-motivating factors were extrinsic in nature (e.g., workload and scheduling). Implications are drawn from the findings for the enhancement of sign language instruction programs.

Marschark, M., LePoutre, D., & Bement, L. (1998). Mouth movement and signed communication. In R. Campbell & B. Dodd (Eds.), *Hearing by eye: The psychology of lip-reading and audiovisual speech* (pp.243-264). London: Taylor & Francis. [AN 1691]

This chapter considers the possibility that during signed communication, there are other

things going on in addition to the "simple" connection between the manual articulatory apparatus of one person and the visual reception apparatus of another.

Metz, D., Caccamise, F., & Gustafson, M. (1997). Criterion validity of the Language Background Questionnaire: A self-assessment instrument. *Journal of Communication Disorders*, 10 (1), 23-32. [AN 1504]

This investigation examines relationships between self-assessed sign language and spoken language communication skills, and objective sign and spoken language communication skills assessments of young adults who are deaf or hard of hearing.

Monikowski, C., & Gustina, D. (1996). Communication policy for a unique bilingual community. In J. Liskin-Gasparro (Ed.), *American Association of University Supervisors, Coordinators, and Directors of Foreign Language Programs (AAUSC) Issues in Language Program Direction* (pp.173-191). Boston, MA: Heinle and Heinle Publishers. [AN 1570]

This article describes the development and implementation of a communication policy for a bilingual teaching community, where the students are deaf and the majority of the faculty are hearing. It discusses students from a variety of language backgrounds and combined forms of communication.

Reeves, J., Newell, W., Holcomb, B., & Stinson, M. (2000). Sign language skills classroom observation: A process for describing sign language proficiency in classroom settings. *American Annals of the Deaf*, 145 (4), 315-341. [AN 1704]

In collaboration with teachers and students at the National Technical Institute for the Deaf (NTID), the Sign Language Skills Classroom Observation (SLSCO) was designed to provide feedback to teachers on their sign language communication skills in the classroom. In this article, the impetus and rationale for developing the SLSCO is described. Previous studies related to classroom signing and observatin methodology are reviewed.

Stokoe, W., & Marschark, M. (1999). Signs, gestures, and signs. In L. Messing & R. Campbell (Eds.), *Gesture, speech, and sign* (pp.161-181). Oxford: Oxford University Press. [AN 1653]

This chapter focuses on the signs produced using either the vocal apparatus or the manual-brachial-facial apparatuses of human beings for the purposes of social communication. Included within that category are the signs of sign language: linguistic elements that semantically and syntactically comprise countless social communciation systems around the world and may have had special significance in the origins of human language.

Stuckless, R. (1999). Recognition means more than just getting the words right. *Speech Technology*, Oct/Nov, 30-35. [AN 1645]

This article discusses the current state of technology in the field of speech recognition, accuracy and readability.