

**The Chinese University of Hong Kong**  
**Department of Linguistics and Modern Languages**  
**First/Second Term, 2020 -21**

<b>Course code and Title:</b> BMBL3001 Sign Language in Education
<b>Description:</b> This course explores the impact of sign linguistics research on the shaping of new directions in education, in particular, the issue of language in education and the benefits of sign language in educating students with diverse abilities. Factors to be covered include society's perception about minority languages in bilingual education, attitudes towards and use of oral, written as well as the various modes of signing in different educational settings, code choice, code switching and code blending in bimodal bilingual communication, as well as effects of sign language on children's literacy, cognitive and sociopsychological development.

**Content, highlighting fundamental concepts**

Topic	Contents/fundamental concepts
Sign Language	A visual-spatial language adopted by members of the Deaf Community in daily interactions. It consists of a grammatical system which reflects universal principles of linguistic organization but which shows differences when compared with the grammar of the society's spoken language.
Sign bilingual education	An approach which supports the use of natural sign language in educating deaf students as first language, and the written mode of spoken language as second language.
Diverse abilities	Usually referring to individuals in society or educational settings that demonstrate different hearing, intellectual, and sociopsychological abilities
Code choice	It refers to the choice of a language code by individuals in communication; it's a reflection of the instinctive abilities of bilinguals/multilinguals due to their multiple competences

**Learning outcomes**

Students completing this course will achieve a basic understanding about: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. History of sign language in educating deaf students, especially the rise of sign bilingualism as a consequence of sign linguistics research</li> <li>2. Controversy between oralism and manualism in deaf education</li> <li>3. Different modes of bilingual education especially the issues surrounding the deployment of two languages in classroom teaching,</li> <li>4. Latest developments of educating typical and atypical children using a sign bilingual approach</li> <li>5. Incorporation of specific sign language and gesture in teaching content areas like mathematics, general science, etc.</li> </ol>
---

**Learning activities**

Lecture (hr) in /out class	Interactive tutorial (hr) in /out class	Lab (hr) in /out class	Discussion of case (hr) in /out class	Field-trip & Deaf activities (hr) in /out class	Projects (Presentation) (hr) in /out class	Web-based teaching (hr) in /out class	Other: Reading (hr) in /out class
24	10			5	3 9	5	30
M	M			M O	M O	M	M

M: Mandatory activity in the course

O: Optional activity

**Assessment scheme**

Tasks	Description	Weight	Mode of Assessment
E-learning & Class participation	Students' active participation in E-learning and class discussion	10%	Online

Tutorial Presentations and report	1) Students take turn to present an assigned reading in class and lead a discussion during the tutorial. (10%)  2) After class, they need to submit a 1000-word report summarizing the assigned reading and discussions during the tutorial. (10%)	20%	1) Online presentation  2) Online
Experiential Learning	Students join an educational activity which involves sign language and write a 500-word reflection on one aspect of such an activity that impacts them most	20%	Join an Zoom or watch a video about conducting educational activity and write a 500-word reflection on one aspect of such an activity that impacts them most
Mid-term exam	Evaluation of students' comprehension of subject contents based on the assigned readings	20%	Online Examination (Zoom + Blackboard/ uReply online quiz system)
Term project	The project adopts a problem-based learning approach requiring students to identify an educational issue relating to sign language, evaluate how it comes about and suggest how empirical findings in sign language in education research potentially resolves the problem. Word limits: 3000 words (1 inch margin, font 12, Times New Roman, double-spaced).  1)Oral presentation (10%): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● PPT contents &amp; argumentation 5%,</li> <li>● presentation and language of expression 5%</li> </ul> 2)Written report (20%): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Contents &amp; argumentation 15%,</li> <li>● organization &amp; language of expression 5 %</li> </ul>	30%	1) Online presentation  2) Online

\*The final grade attained will be adjusted downward for each unexcused absence or tardiness in submitting assignments.

\*Students are encouraged to be punctual and there is a 15-minute allowance beyond which time the attendance is counted as zero.

### Grade descriptors

	<b>Outstanding A</b>	<b>Excellent A-</b>	<b>Good B</b>	<b>Fair C</b>	<b>Inadequate D</b>	<b>Fail F</b>
<b>General Performance</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤Outstanding performance on all learning outcomes;</li> <li>➤Competent in theorisation, generalisation, hypothesization, and reflection upon issues;</li> <li>➤Skilled in creating, hypotheses and generating proposals to tackle issues with unanticipated extension.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤Generally outstanding performance on all (or almost all) learning outcomes;</li> <li>➤Skilled in comparing and contrasting arguments, explaining causes, analyzing and relating concepts to general theories;</li> <li>➤Good at applying issues to relevant social contexts and predicting logically related outcomes.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤Substantial performance on all learning outcomes, or high performance on some learning outcomes which compensate for less satisfactory performance on others, resulting in overall substantial performance;</li> <li>➤Able to enumerate, describe, list, and clarify concepts and topics;</li> <li>➤Capable of examining a topic from multiple perspectives.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤Satisfactory performance on a majority of learning outcomes, possibly with a few weaknesses;</li> <li>➤Able to state, recognize, recall, and tell single points of topics of discussion.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤Barely satisfactory performance on a number of learning outcomes;</li> <li>➤Barely able to state, recognize, recall, and tell single points of topics of discussion.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤Unsatisfactory performance on a number of learning outcomes, or failure to meet the specified assessment requirements;</li> <li>➤Missing the points.</li> </ul>

## Learning resources for students

There will be:

1. Handouts and reading materials to enhance understanding of the fundamental concepts about sign language research
2. Micromodules on various topics to clarify issues surrounding deafness and sign language to stimulate students' critical analysis of the social situations involving sign language.

### **A. Journals**

1. Journal of Sign Language Studies (<http://gupress.gallaudet.edu/SLS.html>)
2. Journal of Sign Language and Linguistics (<https://benjamins.com/#catalog/journals/sll/main>)
3. Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education (<http://jdsde.oxfordjournals.org>)
4. Journal of Speech, Language and Hearing Research (<http://jslhr.pubs.asha.org>)
5. Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism (<http://www.tandfonline.com/toc/rbeb20/current#.Usn5tqVmsWY>)

### **B. Books**

- Marschark, M., Knoors, H., & Antia, S. (Eds). (2019). *Co-enrollment education for deaf and hard-of-hearing learners*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Marschark, M., Tang, G., & Knoors H. (Eds). (2014). *Bilingualism and bilingual education*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Pickersgill, M., & Gregory, S. (1998) *Sign bilingualism: A model*. Wembley: LASER.
- Plaza-Putz, C., & Morales-López, E. (Eds). (2008). *Sign bilingualism*. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins.
- Swanwick, R. (2016). *Languages and languaging in deaf education: A framework for pedagogy*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

### **C. Papers**

- Adam, B. (2012). Language contact and borrowing. In Pfau, R., Steinbach, M., & Woll, B. (Eds.) *Sign language: An international handbook* (pp. 841-861). Berlin, Germany: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Archbold, S., & Mayer, C. (2012). Deaf education: The impact of cochlear implantation? *Deafness and Education Research*, 14(1), 2-15.
- Baker, C. (2001). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism*. Clevedon England, Buffalo: Multilingual Matters.
- Bauman, H-D. L. (Ed). (2008). *Open you eyes, Deaf studies talking*. Minneapolis, Minn: University of Minnesota Press.
- Benitez-Burraco, A. (2015). A biolinguistic approach to sign language. In Marschark, M. & Spencer, P. (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of Deaf studies in language* (pp. 256-272). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Bonvillian, J. D., Nelson, K. E., & Milnes Rhyne, J. (1981). Sign language and autism. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 11(1), 125-137.
- Campbell, R, MacSweeney, M., & Waters, D. (2007). Sign language and the brain: A review. *Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education*, 13(1), 3-20.
- Capirci, O., Cattani, A., Rossini, P., & Volterra, V. (1998). Teaching sign language to hearing children as a possible factor in cognitive enhancement. *Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education*, 3(2), 135-142.
- Corina, D. (2015). Neurolingusitic studies on sign language bilingualism. In Marschark, M. & Spencer, P. (Eds.). *The Oxford handbook of Deaf studies in language* (pp. 276 -287). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Goldin-Meadow, S. (2012). Homesign: Gesture to language. In Pfau, R., Steinbach, M., & Woll, B. (Eds.) *Sign language: An international handbook* (pp. 601-625). Berlin, Germany: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Knoors, H., & Marschark, M. (2015). Cognitive profiles of Deaf children. In *Teaching Deaf learners* (pp. 107-131) Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Mayer, C., & Leigh, G. (2010). The changing context for sign bilingual education programs: issues in language and the development of literacy. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 13(2), 175-186. Retrieved from <http://www.tanfonline.com/loi/rbeb20>.
- Marschark, M. (2010). Communication with Deaf children. In *Raising and educating a Deaf child* (pp. 63-91). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Marschark, M., Tang, G., & Knoors, H. (Eds.). (2014). *Bilingualism and bilingual education*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Murray, J.J., Snoddon, K., De Meulder, M., & Underwood, K. (2018). Intersectional inclusion for deaf learners: moving beyond General Comment #4 on Article 24 of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, DOI: 10.1080/13603116.2018.1482013

Shield, A., Meier, R. P., & Tager-Flusberg, H. (2015). The use of sign language pronouns by native-signing children with autism. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 45(7), 2128-2145.

Spencer, P. E., & Marschark, M. (2010). *Evidence-based practice in educating Deaf and Hard-of-Hearing students*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Tang, G. (2015). Hong Kong Sign Language. In Wang, S-Y. & Sun, C.F. (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of Chinese linguistics* (pp. 710-728). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Tang, G. & Yiu, C. K-M. (2016). Developing sign bilingualism in a co-enrollment school environment: A Hong Kong case study. In Marschark, M., & Spencer, P. (Eds), *The Oxford handbook of Deaf studies in language* (pp.197-217). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Tincani, M. (2004). Comparing the picture exchange communication system and sign language training for children with autism. *Focus on Autism and Other Developmental Disabilities*, 19(3), 152-163.

Woll, B., & Ladd, P. (2003). Deaf Communities. In *Handbook of Deaf studies and Deaf education* (Vol. 1, pp. 151-163). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Yiu, K-M., & Tang, G. (2014). Social integration of deaf and hard-of-hearing students in a sign bilingual and co-enrollment environment. In Marschark, M., Knoors, H., & Tang, G. (Eds), *Bilingualism and bilingual deaf education* (pp. 342-367). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

### Feedback for evaluation

1. There will be a midterm evaluation for the instructor to obtain students' feedback.
2. There is an end-of-term course evaluation.

### Course schedule

Week	Date	Topics	Readings
1		Sign Language in education: A historical perspective	Plaza-Putz, C. (2012). Deaf education and bilingualism. In Pfau, R., Steinbach, M., & Woll, B. (Eds.) <i>Sign language: An international handbook</i> (pp. 949-979). Mouton, Germany: De Gruyter.
2		Language of communication in the classroom	Mayor, C. (2015) Rethinking Total Communication: Looking back, moving forward. In Marschark, M. & Spencer, P. (Eds.). <i>The Oxford handbook of Deaf studies in language</i> (pp. 32-44). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
3		Changing contexts of sign bilingual education in the 21 <sup>st</sup> century	Knoors, H., & Marschark, M. (2012). Language planning for the 21st century: Revisiting bilingual language policy for deaf children. <i>Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education</i> , 17(3), 291–305.
4		Co-enrollment education: An introduction	Kirchner, C. J. (1994). Co-enrollment as an inclusion model. <i>American Annals of the Deaf</i> , 139(2), 163-164.
5		Co-enrollment education: latest development	Marschark, M., Knoors, H., & Antia, S. (Eds). (2019). <i>Co-enrollment education for Deaf and Hard-of-Hearing learners</i> . New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
6		Sign language and cognitive development	Marschark, M., & Hauser, P. C. (2008). <i>Deaf cognition: Foundations and outcomes</i> . New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
7		Sign language and sociopsychological development	Knoors, H., & Marschark, M., (2015). Learning and Social and Emotional Development. In <i>Teaching Deaf learners</i> (pp. 132-158) Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
8		Mid-Term Exam	

9		Beyond Deaf Education (1) : Sign Language for Typically Developing Children	Capirci, O., Cattani, A., Rossini, P., & Volterra, V. (1998). Teaching sign language to hearing children as a possible factor in cognitive enhancement. <i>Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education</i> , 3(2), 135-142.
10		Beyond Deaf Education (2) : Baby Signing for Infants	Fitzpatrick, E. M., THibert, J., Grandpierre, V., Johnston, J. C. (2014) How HANDy are baby signs? A systematic review of the impact of gestural communication on typically developing, hearing infants under the age of 36 months. <i>First Language</i> , 34(6), 486–509.
11		Beyond Deaf Education (3): Sign Language for Autistic Children	Denmark, T., Atkinson, J., Campbell, R., & Swettenham, J. (2014). How do typically developing deaf children and deaf children with autism spectrum disorder use the face when comprehending emotional facial expressions in british sign language? <i>Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders</i> , 44(10), 2588-2592.
12		Beyond Deaf Education (4): Sign Language for children with Intellectual Disabilities	Woll, B., & Grove, N. (1996). On language deficits and modality in children with down syndrome: A case study of twins bilingual in BSL and English. <i>Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education</i> , 1(4), 271-278.
13		Project Presentation	

#### **A facility for posting course announcements**

Blackboard will be used to distribute the reading materials and course handouts, as well as to support discussions among students.

#### **Academic honesty and plagiarism**

Attention is drawn to University policy and regulations on honesty in academic work, and to the disciplinary guidelines and procedures applicable to breaches of such policy and regulations. Details may be found at <http://www.cuhk.edu.hk/policy/academichonesty/>.

With each assignment, students will be required to submit a statement that they are aware of these policies, regulations, guidelines and procedures. For group projects, all students of the same group should be asked to sign on the declaration.

For assignments in the form of a computer-generated document that is principally text-based and submitted via VeriGuide, the statement, in the form of a receipt, will be issued by the system upon students' uploading of the soft copy of the assignment. Assignments without the receipt will not be graded by teachers. Only the final version of the assignment should be submitted via VeriGuide.