Sign of the Times
The Quality Assurance of the Teaching and Assessment of South African Sign Language

UMALUSI

Council for Quality Assurance in
General and Further Education and Training

SIGN OF THE TIMES

The Quality Assurance of the Teaching and Assessment of South African Sign Language

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FOREWORD

In publishing this report, Umalusi wishes to signal its commitment to the ideal of a more responsible and inclusive national system of education. Through its quality assurance role, Umalusi aims to support the Deaf community in strengthening South African Sign Language. Together, we will learn from international best practices, especially from the innovative work that South Africans are doing in our own country, and use the lessons and knowledge learnt to strengthen the teaching and assessment of South African Sign Language as a Home Language.

This report represents not the end, but the beginning of a journey in understanding and enhancing the South African Sign Language Curriculum. This curriculum has been constructed not only as the bedrock for learning and teaching in the Deaf community, but it also provides access to Deaf learners to truly learn and be taught in their mother tongue.

Umalusi's work in quality assuring the curriculum and assessments of this new subject is an important role, and the organisation approaches the task with great seriousness. As this report reveals, Deaf education has not always been given the respect and prominence it deserves, and indeed Deaf voices have not always been heard in the planning of the system of learning and teaching.

It is with great pleasure that Umalusi can report that with the launch of the South African Sign Language Curriculum, a great step forward has been taken on the road to equity and equality of learning for the Deaf community. Challenges still remain, as this report will show, but we can look back on what has been achieved to date with pride and a feeling of hope as we travel along the road ahead of us.

Dr MS Rakometsi
CEO of Umalusi

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

AAP	Annual Assessment Plan
ASL	American Sign Language
Auslan	Australian Sign Language
AVT	Auditory Verbal Theory
CAPS	Curriculum and Assessment Policy Statement
CODA	Child of Deaf adult
CSL	Chinese Sign Language
BSL	British Sign Language
DBE	Department of Basic Education
DCDP	Deaf child of Deaf parent
DCHP	Deaf child of hearing parent
DeafSA	Deaf Federation of South Africa
DGS	German Sign language or Deutsche Gebärdensprache
DHH	Deaf or hard-of-hearing
DTA	Deaf teaching assistant
FAL	First Additional Language
FET	Further Education and Training
FM	Frequency modulation
FP	Foundation Phase
GENFETQA	General and Further Education and Training Quality Assurance Act
GSL	Greek Sign Language
HL	Home Language
HOD	Head of department
HOH	Hard of hearing
IDEA	Individuals with Disabilities Education Act
IEB	Independent Examination Board
IEP	Individual education program
IP	Intermediate Phase
ISL	Irish Sign Language
JSL	Japanese Sign Language
KSL	Kenyan Sign Language
LAK	Swahili Sign Language
LOLT	Language of learning and teaching
LOL	Language of literacy
LSF	French Sign Language
MID	Mild intellectual disabilities
NAD	National Association for the Deaf
NAO	Natural auditory oral
NDP	National Development Plan
NQF Level 5	National Qualifications Framework Level 5
NSC	National Senior Certificate
NZSL	New Zealand Sign Language
PanSALB	Pan South African Language Board
PAT	Practical assessment task
PGCE	Postgraduate Certificate in Education
QAA	Quality assurance of assessments

SADeaf	Singapore Association of the Deaf
SASA	South African Schools Act
SA-SAMS	South African Administration Management Systems
SASL	South African Sign Language
SBA	School-based assessment
SEE2	Signed Exact English 2
SGB	School governing body
SgSL	Singapore Sign Language
SLED	Sign language education and development
SP	Senior Phase
SQA	Scottish Qualifications Authority
SSD	Singapore School for the Deaf
SSE	Singapore Signed English
SLN	Netherlands Sign Language
TODHH	Teacher of Deaf or hard-of-hearing
TSL	Thai Sign Language
UK	United Kingdom
TASL	Test of American Sign Language

DEFINITIONS OF TERMS/CONCEPTS

Assistive listening devices	all types of electronic hearing aids, including personal aids, frequency modulation systems, infrared systems, special input devices for telephone or television, amplified alarms and signals, etc.
Audism	an attitude based on pathological thinking which results in a negative stigma toward anyone who does not hear
Bicultural	membership of two cultures, such as Deaf culture and hearing culture
Bilingual	being able to use two languages; for some Deaf children this will, for example, be the use of sign language and English
Classifiers	productive morpheme that represents the visual appearance, placement, movement and/or handling of objects and animate beings; classifiers do not occur in isolation but must be used with a noun referent; can be inflected to show pluralisation, position and verb movement
Cochlear implant	an electronic device surgically implanted to stimulate nerve endings in the inner ear (i.e. cochlea) in order to receive and process sound and speech
Comprehension question	same as in English Home Language but presented in sign language. It is different from in a spoken home language in the way it is presented in sign language and the way it is answered in sign language. Cognitive demands still apply
Contextual question	same as in English Home Language but presented in sign language
Drama	Same as in English Home Language but presented in sign language, however, this is a new concept in sign language. There is no prescribed sign language drama at present, but the Curriculum and Assessment Policy Statement gives direction on what is to be taught in drama.
Essay question	same as in English Home Language but presented in sign language
Frequency modulation system	an assistive listening device that transmits the speaker's voice to an electronic receiver in which the sound is amplified and transmitted to the student's ears via small earphones on the student's personal hearing aid. The device reduces the problems of background noise interference and distance from the speaker
Frequency	the number of vibrations per second of a sound. Frequency, expressed in Hertz (Hz), determines the pitch of sound
Gesture	movement of any part of the body to express or emphasise an idea, an emotion, or a function. Not part of a formal communication system
Glossing	a way of representing signs and non-manual features in printed words. For example, a signed word for mother is written as MOTHER (in capital letters)
Handshape	this parameter refers to the shape of the hands at onset; form adopted by the hand depending on the position of the fingers
Length of paragraph	a paragraph in sign language is referred to as a chunk and length is determined by time in minutes
Location	this parameter refers to where the sign is articulated, either on the body or the signing space

Morpheme	a linguistic unit of relatively stable meaning that cannot be divided into smaller meaningful parts
Movement	this is the parameter within which the direction, speed, repetition and manner are important when conveying the meaning in signing
News item	this is usually a non-fiction piece that is presented to inform the audience in sign language
Non-manual features	these actions are produced by any part of the body from the waist up, other than the hands, and carry grammatical meaning by using movements of the eyes, eyebrows, head, or shoulders and various kinds of facial expressions using lip, cheek, and tongue movement; no English equivalent
Palm orientation	this is the parameter that describes the direction of the palm and/or fingertips during the production of the sign
Parameters	these are the five characteristics or basic parts of a sign, namely handshape, location, palm orientation, movement and non-manual features
question papers	SASL 'papers' are presented as video texts
Semantics	the use in language of meaningful referents, in both word and sentence structures
Speech	a presentation in sign language that communicates to its viewers as a speech would to a hearing audience
Syntax	defines the word classes of language (i.e. nouns, verbs, etc.) and the rules for their combination (i.e. which words can be combined and in what order to convey meaning), also known as grammar; major sign categories i.e. lexical and parts of speech

LIST OF TABLES

SOUTH AFRICAN SIGN LANGUAGE FINGERSPELLING

South African Sign Language fingerspelling is a manual representation of the alphabet of a written language; there is a one-to-one relationship between the letters of the spoken language and the handshape. As such, South African Sign Language fingerspelling is not signed language, but it is used by signers to represent the written form when needed (e.g. proper nouns, acronyms and technical jargon).

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction

Historical Background

South African Sign Language (SASL) is one of the visual-spatial native languages used by the Deaf community in South Africa to learn, communicate, express thoughts, feelings and abstract ideas. The ability to communicate is a basic human ability, including those in the Deaf community. SASL is a distinct language which uses special features for communication different from those in all other spoken languages in South Africa. The distinguishing feature of signed languages is that they are communicated through the medium of space, not sound, and that they use hands, face, head and upper torso for their realisation.

The SASL is at present not an official language of South Africa, but it is recognised and protected in various legislative and governmental policies and is even acknowledged as a language equal in status to the 11 official languages in the country. The Department of Basic Education has recently developed and introduced the South African Sign Language Home Language Curriculum and Assessment Policy Statement for the Deaf to be offered in schools. The Policy for South African Sign Language Grade 9 was implemented simultaneously with South African Sign Language in the Foundation Phase. This means, South African Sign Language was introduced as a subject to pupils in Grades R to Grade 3 and Grade 9 in 2015. In 2016, South African Sign Language was introduced to the Intermediate Phase (starting at Grade 4) and in the Further Education and Training Phase (starting at Grade 10). Grade 12 Deaf learners will complete the National Senior Certificate with South African Sign Language Home Language in 2018.

Umalusi has to understand the curriculum for quality assurance purposes, and this was the impetus behind this research project.

Aim of the Study

The aim of the study was to provide guidance to Umalusi in its role as the quality assurer for SASL Home Language SBA and examinations. The scope of the SASL Project also encompassed understanding how Deaf learners are assessed as well as the kind of resources and materials required for assessment, including identifying potential national moderators and evaluators.

Data and Research Methodology

Data

Data collection involved the following:

Literature review (including of the SASL Home Language CAPS) focusing on teaching, learning and assessment processes and procedures for SASL as well as the quality assurance of the assessment of sign language by other countries.

Key informant interviews took place to obtain detailed information relating to formal assessments, marking of scripts, moderation and verification of SBA, moderation of question papers, and verification of marking, monitoring and evaluation of the state of readiness, examination writing and marking. Face-to-face, one-on-one and in-person interviews were conducted with the DBE (Item Development Unit) specialists and officials, experts from schools for the Deaf as well as experts from the University of the Witwatersrand. Interviews were also conducted with the SASL HL curriculum developers from the DBE.

Observation of teaching and assessment practices with the seven Deaf schools included in the study. During observation, the researcher's role remained one of an impartial, non-participatory observer. All the Gauteng Province schools that were visited gave permission for photos and videos to be taken. However, these photos and videos could not be made available for public consumption due to ethical reasons.

Method

Research Design
The SASL Project is largely located within the qualitative research paradigm and applies a case study approach involving the DBE (Item Development Unit), seven SASL schools for the Deaf selected from Gauteng Province and the University of the Witwatersrand.

Targeted and Accessible Population
In this study, all schools offering SASL HL in South Africa constitute the target population. These schools form a natural grouping per province and per phase in respect of this research topic. In terms of the accessible population, this consisted of all schools offering SASL HL in Gauteng Province.

Research Sample
Non-probability convenience sampling was used to select schools. The sample consisted of schools offering SASL HL in Gauteng Province. All seven schools for the Deaf in the Province participated.

Findings and Discussion

Results and Discussion of Findings

Seven schools for the Deaf were visited in Gauteng Province. Of these, two had Grade 9 as the highest grade, two Grade 10 and three had Grade 11. One of the schools has a Grade 10 bridging class. In 2018, Gauteng Province will have two schools with learners writing SASL HL examinations at an exit level (Grade 12). Two schools offer Grade 12 over two years. One of these schools will write SASL Home Language in 2019 and another will write SASL Home language in 2020 since its learners started SASL Home Language in Grade 10 in 2017.

Teacher Qualifications

It is clear that regarding teacher qualifications, expertise in relation to SASL qualifications is lacking. This is a worldwide challenge. Hearing teachers, most of whom are not fluent SASL users, continue to dominate the educational process.

Large numbers of teachers may be unaware of the linguistic differences between ASL and English-based sign systems. In addition, the privileging of English over ASL causes many teachers to change ASL from a rich, fully formed language to a manually coded version of English. For this reason, in South Africa SASL HL is strictly promoted over Signed English or any other spoken language. In other countries, like Singapore, they have SEE. This dilutes the purity and the linguistics of sign language. To overcome these risks of dilution, it is important that teacher preparation programmes adequately instil sign language proficiency (fluency) in their students. The DBE provides ongoing workshops and training for SASL teachers as does the University of the Witwatersrand.

Teaching and Learning

All the schools that were visited follow the SASL HL CAPS curriculum which has four learning outcomes: Observing and Signing, Visual Reading and Viewing, Recording, and Language Structure. The findings show that SASL HL is the LOLT in all the schools that were observed. In some schools, teaching and learning takes place through PowerPoint presentations. Teaching and learning focuses on the SASL Parameters including: reading, viewing, comparing, phonological awareness and the structure of the language.

The implementation of SASL HL needs teachers with both teaching and SASL skills, however there is a lack of qualified Deaf teachers to teach SASL as a result of barriers to tertiary education and teacher training for Deaf South. In the absence of a qualified Deaf teacher, the Curriculum Management Team (appointed by the Minister of Basic Education in 2010) proposed a bilingual-bicultural team teaching model in which a hearing teacher is paired with a DTA. In this model, the DTAs have

expertise in SASL and the qualified hearing teachers in teaching methodologies, classroom practice and the English-based curriculum.

Schools use DVDs from SLED for language structure. Learners watch and observe a signed story from the video and thereafter relate the story through signing whilst being videoed. One of the schools indicated that teachers use textbooks borrowed from English HL. There are no SASL HL textbooks. Whatever textbook is chosen, the curriculum of the SASL course should reflect four broad areas: grammatical features of SASL, the lexicon of SASL, practice with SASL conversational skills and cultural awareness.

Assessing SASL Home Language

The findings show that the learners' signing skills are assessed through Recording, Observing and Signing, and Visual Reading and Viewing. All assessments are recorded and rubrics are used for marking. No pen and paper were used during the assessment of SASL HL. One of the schools observed used a hard copy question paper and learners signed the answers. This situation is not ideal for SASL HL assessments. Preferably, learners should have access to laptops with webcams and all questions should be signed and recorded using the laptops. In all of the schools observed, SASL HL assessment takes place in a SASL laboratory and in the presence of both the qualified hearing teacher and the DTA.

The learners' SBA portfolios are kept on memory sticks and on computer hard drives. The memory sticks are retained by the school for security reasons. The teachers' files are kept as hard copies (memo) and digital copies of question papers. The learners' files are also kept as hard copies of marked answer sheets and digital copies of answers.

Internal and External Moderation

Schools use pre- and post-moderation tools for the internal moderation of the learners' assessments. Some schools have School Assessment Teams (SATs) that are responsible for the quality assurance of the internal assessment and moderation. In some schools, teachers teaching senior classes/grades moderate question papers for teachers teaching junior classes/grades. Information provided by one of the national examiners for SASL HL indicates that the HOD or another SASL teacher usually does internal moderation at school level. The requirement is that the moderator should have SASL HL proficiency and be knowledgeable about phase-specific content. The tools for internal moderations (SASL pre- and post-assessment moderation) were circulated to SASL HL teachers nationwide to use during moderation.

The SASL subject advisors had not been appointed during the time of the writing of this report. As a consequence, provincial or national external moderation had not

taken place. But, the DBE uses the spoken language subject advisors in the interim to check if schools comply with the CAPS policy.

Sources of Expertise

Data from the schools relating to sources of expertise to moderate the assessment tasks indicate that Deaf schools from the Gauteng Province draw their expertise from the University of the Witwatersrand and SLED. The University of the Witwatersrand and the University of the Free State are the only two universities in the country currently offering SASL training to teachers.

In terms of expertise for internal moderation, the HODs, and in some schools the principals, do pre- and post-assessment moderation of the SBAs. Teachers also moderate each other's work. However, the lack of qualified SASL HL teachers means this expertise is spread very thinly. Some schools draw additional expertise from teachers for other subjects such as English HL; however such teachers can only moderate the written form of the assessment since they are neither fluent in sign language nor are they sign language experts.

Some schools have teachers that are qualified in special needs education or inclusive education but with no specialisation in Deaf education or in SASL. One school had three qualified DTAs, two with SASL NQF Level 5 and one had a BEd, Honours in Deaf Education and SASL NQF level six. This is commendable. However, some schools rely on DTAs as native and fluent signers to do the moderation of the SBA tasks. Teachers in one of the schools visited confessed that they are unsure if they are moderating the assessment tasks correctly and would value some guidance in this regard.

Management of Mark Lists

HODs and principals moderate mark sheets and check if marks are correctly entered into the mark lists. Teachers stated that marks are weighted and captured into the mark lists. Schools use the SA-SAMS or administration system to capture marks for SASL HL assessments and assist teachers to follow assessment guidelines provided in the SASL CAPS. In some schools, mark lists are checked during the class visits.

Recommendations

This study makes the following recommendations:

External moderation
a) For the delivery of the SASL Home Language curriculum, the DBE also encourages a team-teaching model. A panel or team of external moderators is encouraged for SASL HL moderation. Each panel or team should comprise one Deaf SASL professional and two qualified SASL hearing professionals.

Training (Umalusi staff)

a)	It is recommended that Umalusi should give staff members basic training in SASL, especially those that will be dealing with question paper moderation, monitoring and evaluation as well as management of assessments in SASL HL.

Expertise

a)	The urgent appointment of SASL HL provincial subject advisors is recommended, since there are relatively few schools for the Deaf in South Africa and subject advisors are required by the SASL HL CAPS for IP, SP and FET Phase to moderate samples of tests and examinations to verify the standard of the tasks and internal moderation from 2018 going forward.

	The SASL HL teachers should all be qualified in SASL HL and/or in Deaf education. In addition, the SASL teachers should be trained in SASL literature on an ongoing basis.

Teacher development

a)	SASL teacher development should be prioritized and should include training in literature and the teaching of poetry, drama and short stories.

Assessment and question paper moderation

a)	The following expertise should be involved during test development or examination question paper setting: native signers (could be qualified Deaf academics or qualified CODAs) and qualified, hearing SASL professionals.

b)	Teaching, learning and assessment should help learners develop the following skills: comprehension, narrative, receptive and expressive skills. To achieve this, teachers should use text-based approach more frequently during teaching and learning with the use of DVDs and other resources.

c)	Discrepancies in the different assessment methods for SASL HL should be addressed. It is recommended that these be aligned to make use of only sign language with questions presented via laptops and answers recorded on laptops with webcams. No paper and pen should be used. This should be the practice from the FP to the FET Phase.

Marking

a)	The SASL markers must be fluent signers and should include Deaf persons.

b)	Marking should be done at national level because the number of candidates will always be very small as there are only a few schools for the Deaf in the country.

Technical

a)   The DBE should ensure that resources, such as the SASL laboratory, are technologically flawless and ready for the first Grade 12 SASL HL examination in 2018.

b)   Each school should employ a technical person to deal with any technological challenges that may arise while the SASL examinations are in progress.

c)   The DBE must appoint technical experts to deal with the editing of question papers that are developed in PowerPoint.

SASL FAL

a)   The curriculum for SASL FAL should be developed and be introduced in the mainstream schools so that hearing people can also communicate with Deaf people.

CHAPTER ONE: BACKGROUND

1.1 Historical Background

Deafness and Deaf people are as old as humanity itself but the earliest recorded history of communication and education of Deaf people was in the 16th century. Deaf children of very rich parents in Spain were placed under the care of a monk to be taught how to speak. Speech was required in order to acquire wealth. The oral method involves teaching or communicating with Deaf people through the medium of spoken language (speech). This method was highly developed in Germany and became known as the "German Method".

However, little is known about the history of the Deaf in South Africa prior to colonisation (Heap, cited in Aarons and Akach 2002). After colonisation, and at the onset of government-funded education, the state authorities took little or no responsibility for establishing schools for the Deaf, and this was left almost entirely to the various churches. However, a major influence on signed languages was experienced when a worldwide Deaf education conference was held in Milan in 1880. The year 1880 was a watershed year in deaf education when oralism (non-use of signed languages) became the formally adopted system of education. During the debate around oralism, all Deaf delegates were excluded from the voting process and the result was that the World Congress of Educators of the Deaf voted for a policy of strict oralism in schools for the Deaf. This was an attempt to eradicate Sign Language from the face of the earth. This led to signed language going "underground". However, Deaf people did not stop signing to one another. Another result of the decision to follow the oralism approach was that Signed languages became stigmatised, and Deaf people, particularly those who wanted to consider themselves educated, did not sign in public (Aarons and Akach 2002:131). The decisions that were taken in Milan Congress affected South African schools a few years later. More and more teachers were trained using oral methods, and Sign Language became marginalized in terms of its use as a language of communication and education (Storbeck, Magongwa & Parkin, 2009). Sorbeck, et al (2009) further report that within the teaching community, conflict arose as the modality debate heightened, and within the broader Deaf communities (including parents and extended families), there were splits on the basis of their acceptance or rejection of sign language and the oral method. Furthermore, Storbeck, *et al* (2009:135) report on the first establishments of the schools for the Deaf in South Africa as follows:

> *In answer to this international declaration, The Worcester School for the Deaf and Blind was established in 1881 (by the Dutch Reformed Church in the Western Cape) and combined oral and manual methods. In 1884, German Dominican nuns established a school at King Williams Town in the Eastern Cape, which followed a policy of strict oralism. Both these schools were for "European deaf children" only. In 1933, the Dutch Reformed Church set up another school*

in the Cape, this time for "colored deaf" children known as Nuwe Hoop, and it, too, combined oral and manual methods. The first school for Black deaf children, Kutlwanong, was opened in 1941 in Gauteng. This school used a system of signs invented in Britain known as the Paget-Gorman System, a sign system that is a manually coded form of English using 37 basic hand signs and 21 distinct hand postures. Although it did not correspond to the natural signs of the Deaf community, it did allow for the development of a strong visually based communication code that facilitated rather than repressed a strong Deaf culture.

In addition, Minna Steyn (2014), coordinator of the Deaf Education pilot project, reported to the IOL (Independent Online) news and Cape Argus (daily newspaper) that Deaf children were taught in the language of instruction at their school – for example, English or Afrikaans – combined with signs, but were not offered sign language as a mother tongue. Deaf children in schools were not taught in their first language, South African Sign Language.   This was the practice before the development of the South African Sign Language Home Language curriculum.

Based on the given background the history of Deaf education in South Africa is influenced by apartheid, which characterized the country from the 1940s. During apartheid, segregation was based on race and culture (Magongwa, 2017). Magongwa (2017) further asserts that this situation affected both language development and access to education by Deaf people. Today however, most Deaf people take pride in their signed language – a complete turnaround from the stigma attached to its use in the past. The history of the signed language used in South Africa is closely linked to the development of schools for the Deaf in this country (Aarons and Akach 2002:130). As time went by, South African Sign Language was developed.

South African Sign Language (SASL) is one of the visual-spatial native languages used by the Deaf community in South Africa to learn, communicate, express thoughts, feelings and abstract ideas. The ability to communicate is a basic human ability, including those in the Deaf community. SASL is a distinct language which uses special features for communication different from those in all other spoken languages in South Africa. The unique structure and grammar of the language makes it a special case for investigation with the hope of understanding its history, development, use and status in the Deaf community and the broader South African context in order for Umalusi to fulfil its mandate as the Quality Assurer of General and Further Education and Training (GENFET).

The National Development Plan (NDP) emphasises the importance of African (or 'mother tongue') languages as integral to education, science and technology, and the development and preservation of these languages. SASL has historically been excluded from this 'mother tongue' emphasis due to the non-availability of SASL

curriculum. This in turn has resulted in the marginalisation of Deaf learners in respect of their access to information and quality education.

Umalusi has to understand the curriculum for quality assurance purposes. The quality assurance processes include moderation and verification of School-Based Assessments (SBA), moderation of final examination question papers, and discussion of marking guidelines, verification of the marking of final examination scripts, post-examination analysis and standardisation of marks. The quality assurance process also includes monitoring and evaluation of the state of readiness of provincial departments, districts and schools. The writing and marking phases also need to be monitored and evaluated for quality assurance purposes. These standard practices will have to be adapted to deal with SASL Home Language (HL). Adaptation will also mean modifying or reviewing some of the instruments that are used during, for example, monitoring and evaluation of the state of readiness.

1.2   Motivation

SASL is at present not an official language of South Africa, but it is recognised and protected in various legislative and governmental policies and is even acknowledged as a language equal in status to the 11 official languages in the country. SASL is also not the only sign language used in South Africa, however it is being promoted as the language to be used by all Deaf people in South Africa.

Since SASL has been used as a mode of communication and learning, it therefore becomes important for Umalusi to understand the curriculum on which it is grounded and how it is being assessed.

SASL is a visual gestural language which has significant implications for its assessment. Currently, there are no nationally approved signed question 'papers' and assessments available to provide a picture of the standard and level of competence required to achieve the minimum requirements for SASL at a particular phase of learning. The Department of Basic Education (DBE) is, however, in the process of developing SASL exemplar papers for Grade 10. Once these papers are finalised, they will provide insightful information on how the learners are to be assessed.

1.3   Purpose

The purpose of this research, was to provide guidance to Umalusi in its role as the quality assurer for SASL Home Language SBA and examinations. In doing so, the research sought to understand the theoretical framework that underpins the SASL curriculum, how the content of that curriculum materially differs from other HL curricula, and how this impacts on delivery and implementation. The scope of the SASL Project also encompassed understanding how Deaf learners are assessed as well as the kind of resources and materials are required for assessment, including identifying potential national moderators and evaluators.

1.4   Research Questions

Since the Curriculum Assessment and Policy Statement (CAPS) curriculum for SASL HL is the first of its kind, and since the assessment of SASL presumably takes on novel forms, this research was designed to provide answers to the following research questions:

- What is the structure of the new South African Sign Language Home Language curriculum?
- What recommendations are given to Umalusi regarding the quality assurance of assessments of the South African Sign Language Home Language?

The answers to these questions are intended to inform how Umalusi understands the process and responds to these new challenges.

CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE SURVEY – APPROACHES TO DEAF EDUCATION IN SOUTH AFRICA

2.1   Introduction

This chapter presents the document analysis of the CAPS for SASL HL curriculum. The CAPS for SASL HL was published in 2014, covering all four phases of education – foundation, intermediate, senior and FET. CAPS are developed for each subject by the DBE with the purpose of outlining the knowledge, skills and values learners should develop through the subject teaching. Since teaching and assessment are regarded as two sides of the same coin, the quality assurance of a subject must find its roots in its CAPS. Thus, whilst this study focuses primarily on the assessment of the SASL HL curriculum, understanding its CAPS must be the starting point. This chapter provides a review of the SASL CAPS document, highlighting its specific aims, approach to teaching and learning, assessment and the nature of the learning and teaching support materials (LTSM). Suitable environments for testing and examining Deaf candidates and information from best practice are also discussed. Lastly, this chapter discusses the development and quality assurance (pre- and post-assessment moderation) of SASL assessment or examination tasks, the expertise involved in the development of the assessment tasks and the training required. Formal assessment provides educators with a systematic way of evaluating learners' progress in a grade and in a particular subject. Examples of formal assessments include tests, examinations, practical tasks, projects, signed presentations, demonstrations and performances. Formal assessment tasks form part of a year-long formal Programme of Assessment (POA) in each grade and subject. Learners enrolled in Schools for the Deaf often face multiple barriers to learning, e.g. autism, physical and mental challenges, mild intellectual disabilities (MID). Their degree of deafness also varies, some may have severe hearing disabilities or be completely deaf whilst others are partially deaf. Both hearing and deaf teachers with differing levels of subject and/or SASL knowledge teach these learners.

2.2   What is a Language?

Many researchers especially the linguists have defined language in various ways. Chomsky (1957:13, as cited in Lyons, 1981, p. 7)) defines language as "a set (finite or infinite) of sentences, each infinite in length, and constructed out of finite set of elements". According to Bloch and Trager (1942): "*A language is a system of arbitrary vocal symbols by means of which a social group co-operates*". Halliday (2003) states that "*A language is a system of meaning- a semiotic system*". Ergin(1990) defines "*Language is a natural means to enable communication among people, a living entity that it has its own peculiar laws, by means of which alone can it develop, a system of contracts whose foundation was laid in times unknown, and a social institution interwoven with sounds*".

According to the DBE (2017), a language is a system of symbols and grammatical signs that is used and shared by members of a community. The DBE also indicates that language changes over time and differs according to place. Furthermore, DBE (2017) maintains that language is used for interaction, communicating ideas, emotions and intentions as well as passing on of culture between generations. Schembri (2013) states that spoken languages are naturally developed, complex systems that use a set of conventionalised sound-based symbols and grammatical rules. They are used to express an open-ended range of ideas, thoughts and feelings. Schembri (2013) argues that spoken languages are used in combination with a range of vocal elements – changes in volume, intonation – and non-vocal elements, such as hand gestures, facial expressions and body postures.

Sign languages are no different from spoken languages in the majority of the key features listed above, except in terms of the channel in which the language occurs. Instead of sound-based symbols (words), sign languages use signs. According to Schembri (2013), signs are a set of specific handshapes, produced in particular locations on or around the signer's body, combined with specific movements.

2.3   What is Sign Language?

Sign language is "the Language used by the Deaf in which hands and body gestures are the forms of morphemes and words. Sign language is a visual-gestural system that uses hand and body gestures as the forms used to represent words" (Fromkin, 1998). Sign language has its own grammar and linguistic structure which is different from those of spoken languages (SADeaf, 2008-2017). Sign language does not refer to miming or gestures alone, though it does incorporate these. Sadler and Lillo Martin (2006) argue that sign languages arise spontaneously whenever Deaf people have an opportunity to meet regularly. They are acquired by children raised in Deaf families without instruction, and a long timetable, similar to that of hearing children acquiring spoken language, exists for the acquisition of sign language. Sign language appears as effortless and as user-friendly as its spoken counterpart.

Many people have the impression that sign language is a universal language. It is not universal and sign languages differ across countries (Goy, 2017). Each Deaf community around the world has its own unique sign language with its own lexicon and grammar (SADeaf, 2008-2017). Sign language can, thus, be defined as a general term which refers to a group of languages that are manually produced and visually understood (SADeaf, 2008-2017). Signed language is natural to Deaf persons, who do not orientate their lives to the world of sound.

2.4   What is SASL?

SASL is a visual-gestural language created and used by Deaf South Africans to communicate with one another. SASL is the language typically utilised in Deaf communicative interactions in South Africa and is unrelated linguistically to any of the

spoken languages in the country (Reagan, 2008). Reagan (2008) maintains that SASL is a distinct language in its own right, not a derivational, pidgin or contact language. It is a rule-governed, grammatical, systematic and non-arbitrary communication system similar in nature to other natural sign languages. According to Sutton-Spence and Woll (1999), SASL is the natural language of signs that has developed in South Africa over centuries.

SASL is a language that is perceived through the eyes (visually) and not through the ears (aurally). That explains the 'visual' nature of SASL. Signs are made up of specific hand-shapes at precise locations with particular hand orientation and movements. Apart from these obvious movements of the hands and arms, the entire face and upper body are also used in the formation of signs and the grammar of sign language. Facial expressions and movements of the head and upper body play a central role in the grammar and intonation of sign language. This is in contrast to aural-oral languages that use the voice and mouth to articulate and the ears to perceive (Moskovitz, 1996). An important aspect of SASL is that signers are able, by using space, to show multiple ideas simultaneously (e.g. one hand can be used to show a person approaching someone and at the same time the other hand shows the other person sitting down). This is not possible in spoken language which is linear in construction.

According to Penn (1993:12), "Sign Language is a real language, equivalent to any other language. Deaf persons can sign about any topic, concrete or abstract, as economically and as effectively, as rapidly and as grammatically as hearing people can. Sign language is influenced by equivalent historical social and psychological factors as spoken language – there are rules for attention-getting, turn-taking, story-telling; there are jokes, puns, and taboo signs; there are generational effects observed in Sign Language and metaphors and 'slips-of-the-hand'".

Signs in SASL are made up of five parameters: hand-shape, location, movement, palm orientation and the non-manual features such as specific facial expressions that carry important grammatical information. SASL has its own distinct linguistic structure that includes syntax, morphology, phonology and language conventions. It is not based on any written or spoken language.

2.5   Specific Aims of Learning SASL HL

According to CAPS, learning a language should enable learners to (DBE, 2014a; 2014b; 2014c; and 2014d):

- Acquire the language skills required for academic learning across the curriculum
- Observe, sign, 'read'/view and record the language with confidence and enjoyment. These skills and attitudes form the basis for life-long learning
- Use language appropriately, taking into account audience, purpose and context

- Express and justify, in sign, their own ideas, views and emotions confidently in order to become independent and analytical thinkers
- Use language and their imagination to find out more about themselves and the world around them. This will enable them to express their experiences and findings about the world
- Use language to access and manage information for learning across the curriculum and in a wide range of other contexts. Information literacy is a vital skill in the 'information age' and forms the basis for life-long learning
- Use language as a means for critical and creative thinking; for expressing their opinions on ethical issues and values; for interacting critically with a wide range of texts; for challenging the perspectives, values and power relations embedded in texts; and for 'reading' texts for various purposes, such as enjoyment, research and critique

The CAPS documents for other HL curriculum, such as that for English HL, do not indicate the specific aims of a HL. However, the specific aims of SASL HL were adapted from the specific aim for learning additional languages. For example, a First Additional Language (FAL) should enable learners to:

- Acquire the language skills necessary to communicate accurately and appropriately, taking into account audience, purpose and context
- Use their Additional Language for academic learning across the curriculum
- Express and justify, orally and in writing, their own ideas, views and emotions confidently in order to become independent and analytical thinkers
- Use Additional Language and their imagination to find out more about themselves and the world around them. This will enable them to express their experiences and findings about the world orally and in writing
- Use Additional Language to access and manage information for learning across the curriculum and in a wide range of other contexts. Information forms the basis for lifelong learning
- Use their Additional Language as a means of critical and creative thinking: for expressing their opinions on ethical issues and values; for interacting critically with a wide range of texts; for challenging the perspectives, values and power relations embedded in texts; and for reading texts for various purposes, such as enjoyment, research, critique

2.6   Notes on Terminology

Deaf (with a capital **D**) is used to denote a distinct cultural and linguistic group of Deaf people who use SASL as their language of choice. The Deaf community has a distinct identity and their experience of the world is particularly shaped by the fact that their communication is expressed by their bodies and perceived visually. This group may include hearing children of Deaf parents and other hearing people who are users of SASL and immerse themselves in the Deaf community e.g. SASL interpreters.

However **deaf** (with a lower case **d**) is an adjective referring to hearing loss from an audiological point of view. Many deaf people use spoken language to communicate. This group includes people who have lost their hearing through age, illness and trauma, for example.

Some verbs in common usage have a connotation of being associated only with spoken languages. These verbs appear in the curriculum documents in inverted commas and must be used and understood in a signed context. Examples: 'listen to', 'tell', 'listening', 'say', 'a speech', 'something to say', 'read', 'voice'.

Throughout the SASL CAPS document, the term 'text' is used to denote a body of work which should be understood as signed texts. These texts, e.g. stories, poems, reports, are presented in live SASL or may be recorded in SASL. These are NOT written texts.

Where it is necessary for clarity, the capitalised first letter of the word is used to denote the skill or outcome and the one in lower case is the action or the verb i.e. Signing (the skill) versus signing (the action). Where SASL GLOSS (the signs represented in English written form) is used, it is presented in upper case as per convention.

2.7   SASL HL Skills

The skills outlined in the CAPS English HL document were used and adapted for SASL HL. The skills are shown in the table below.

Table 2.1: Skills used in SASL HL and English HL

CAPS English HL	CAPS SASL HL
Phonological awareness (FP only)	Phonological awareness (Grades 2 and 3)
Language structure and use (not for FP)	Language structure and use (not for FP)
Tone	Signing mode
Oral	Observing and Signing
Listening and speaking	Observing and Signing
Writing	Recording
Speaking	Signing
Listening	Observing
Novel	Longer story
Writing and presenting	Recording
Visual Reading and Viewing	Reading and viewing
Poetry: The length of the literary essay is measured in words (count the number of words)	Poetry: The length of the literary essay is measured in time (minutes)

There is an important distinction between Observing and Signing and Visual Reading and Viewing skills, i.e. **live** signing versus **recorded** signed texts.

Table 2.2: SASL HL Skills and Description

CAPS SASL HL	Description
Observing and Signing	This skill is used with **live (face-to-face)** signing of a variety of signed texts
Visual Reading and Viewing	This is used with **recorded SASL** materials
Phonological Awareness (working with parameters)	Distinction between spoken and signed language phonology – phonemes (smallest building blocks/units of a language) sound vs. parameters.
Recording	Signed texts are presented and recorded by learners
Language Structure and Use	From Intermediate to FET Phase. In the FP, this skill is integrated in the other skills and not taught separately.

The content (knowledge, concepts and skills) contained in the NCS has been organised in the CAPS per term.

2.8   An Integrated Approach – FP

The SASL HL CAPS document indicates that the language programme in the FP is integrated into all other subject areas and language is used across the curriculum (DBE, 2014a). The DBE (2014a) further states that many of the Observing and Signing language skills are developed within Mathematics and Life Skills, which is made up of many subjects such as Creative Arts and Beginning Knowledge including Personal and Social Well-being, Natural Sciences and Technology and the Social Sciences. Themes and topics can be selected from these subject areas to provide contexts for teaching the language skills. In the FP, the focus is on Observing and Signing since many learners are being introduced to SASL HL for the first time. For this reason, there is no bilingualism in the FP in Deaf schools. Children are constantly developing their Observing and Signing skills for the acquisition of SASL HL. The DBE (2014a) states that Observing and Signing are skills crucial to all learning and it is important that these skills are developed early in a child's academic life. Hence, in the FP, there is time specifically dedicated to the development of these two important skills.

2.9   SASL Approaches to Teaching and Learning

The DBE (2014b; 2014c and 2014d) indicates that the approaches to teaching language are text-based, communicative- and process-orientated. The text-based and communicative approaches are introduced in the IP and the process approach is introduced in the SP (Grades 7-9). The text-based approach and the communicative approach are both dependent on the continuous use and production of texts.

According to the DBE (2014b; 2014c and 2014d), a text-based approach explores how texts work. The DBE further maintains that the purpose of a text-based approach is to enable learners to become competent, confident and critical 'readers', authors, viewers and designers of texts. It involves observing, 'reading', viewing and analysing texts to understand how they are produced and what their effects are. Through this

critical interaction, learners develop the ability to evaluate texts. The text-based approach also involves producing different kinds of texts for particular purposes and audiences. This approach is informed by an understanding of how texts are constructed.

A communicative approach suggests that when learning a language, a learner should have an extensive exposure to the target language (SASL) and many opportunities to practise or produce the language by communicating for social or practical purposes. Language learning should be carried over into the classroom, where skills are learned through frequent opportunities to view and record texts (DBE, 2014b; 2014c and 2014d).

Furthermore, the DBE (DBE, 2014b; 2014c and 2014d) states that language teaching happens in an integrated way, with the teacher modelling good practice and the learners practicing the appropriate skills in groups before applying these skills on their own. The structure of each lesson should be one that engages the whole class, before practising in groups and applying the new skill individually.

The process approach is used when learners produce signed and recorded texts. The learners engage in different stages of the Observing, Signing, Visual Reading and Recording processes (DBE, 2014c and2014d). They must think of the audience and the purpose during these processes. This will enable them to communicate and express their thoughts in a natural way. For example, the teaching of recording does not focus on the product only but also focuses on the process of recording. Learners are taught how to generate ideas, to think about the purpose and audience, to record drafts, to edit their work and to present a recorded product that communicates their thoughts (DBE, 2014c and2014d).

2.10   Sign Bilingualism as Described by the SASL HL CAPS

According to the DBE (2014b; 2014c and 2014d), sign bilingualism is the use of two languages in different modalities, that is a signed and either a spoken or written language, and is distinctly different from using two spoken languages. In Deaf education, sign-bilingualism uses the signed language of the Deaf community and the written/spoken language of the hearing community amongst whom the Deaf live. In South Africa, the signed language is SASL and the written/spoken would be one or more of the several indigenous languages, such as Afrikaans, isiZulu, Sesotho, Xhosa or English. Acquisition of the signed language is prioritised and there is a parallel strong influence on teaching reading and writing of the second language which is introduced through the signed language to explain syntax and abstract concepts. The intention of the sign bilingualism philosophy is to enable Deaf children to become bilingual and bicultural, and to participate fully in both the hearing society and the 'Deaf World'. Rather than regard deafness as an obstacle to linguistic development; educational achievement, social integration and linguistic pluralism is encouraged.

The DBE (2014b; 2014c and 2014d) further states that researchers are of the view that for the Deaf child to achieve first language competence in the formative years, the child must be assured the right of access to signed language early in life in an environment with skilled signers. The national signed language should be the language of teaching and learning (LOLT) for all subjects in the academic curriculum, while one of the spoken languages will be the language of literacy (LOL). In facilitating bilingual educational programmes, both languages should exist independently but be equal in status. Learners are taught face-to-face through the medium of SASL and will read text and write in English or in the indigenous spoken language of the respective ethnic group in which they were born or raised.

For the IP (Grades 4-6), learners are taught face-to-face through the medium of SASL and will read and write in the language approved by the school governing body (SGB). Cripps and Small (not dated) maintain that bilingual education increases the chances of success for all children, Deaf and hard-of-hearing, when it comes to acquiring and mastering of a language.

2.11   The Relationship between the LOLT and the LOL

According to the DBE (2014b; 2014c and 2014d), for Deaf learners the medium of learning and teaching is SASL. Since SASL does not have a written form, the FAL serves as the language of literacy. Therefore, both languages are used alongside each other in a bilingual-bicultural approach to teaching and learning. The DBE (2014b; 2014c and 2014d) further states that all face-to-face teaching and learning takes place through the medium of SASL while written text is in the FAL (such as English or any other spoken/written language).

In addition, the DBE (2014b; 2014c and 2014d) asserts that in South Africa many children start using their additional language, English, as the LOLT in Grade 4. This means that they must reach a high level of competence in English by the end of Grade 3, and they need to be able to read and write well in English. For Deaf learners, however, the LOLT remains SASL through to Grade 12, alongside a written language which is the LOL and which provides access to written text. For this reason, Deaf learners, too, need to be able to read and write well in English. SASL is used as the vehicle to convey the knowledge and skills contained in all subjects across the curriculum. This is done with the aim of improving the quality and the equality of education. The DBE (2017) indicates that teachers should be competent, fluent in signing and have content knowledge for the subject. The introduction of the FAL helps Deaf children to be able to communicate with the hearing community. The FAL is introduced to learners in the IP, i.e. from Grade 4.

SASL should also be used as the LOLT to teach the additional language. The following specific guidelines should be followed (DBE, 2017) while teaching the additional language:

a) Avoid signing in English word order
b) Mixing languages makes neither accessible
c) Use SASL fully to explain content
d) Contrast structure of SASL with written English
e) Use written English as much as possible
f) Stress that although the two languages have different structures, the meaning is the same
g) Do not expect the learner to read aloud when teaching reading but rather to read silently and express the meaning in correct SASL structure

In the IP and SP, Deaf learners begin to learn and to strengthen their reading and writing skills in the FAL (DBE, 2014b; 2014c and 2014d). At this stage, the majority of Deaf children are learning both through the medium of SASL and through their FAL. The SASL CAPS for the IP indicates that greater emphasis is, therefore, placed on using SASL and the FAL for the purposes of thinking and reasoning (DBE, 2014b). The emphasis is on bilingualism. This enables learners to develop their cognitive academic skills or cognitive academic language proficiency (CALP) which they need to study subjects like Science. They also engage more with signed and written literary texts and begin to develop aesthetic and imaginative ability.

The SASL HL CAPS for Intermediate, Senior and FET Phases indicates that SASL is offered as a subject at HL level. This is in anticipation of the officialisation of SASL at which time it can be offered as a language (DBE, 2014b, 2014c and 2014d). HL is the language first acquired by learners. However, many South African schools do not offer the HLs of some or all of the enrolled learners but rather have one or two languages offered at HL level. As a result, the labels HL and FAL have come to refer to the proficiency levels at which the language is offered and not the native (home) or acquired (additional) language. For the purposes of this research report, any reference to HL should be understood to refer to the level of the language and not to whether the language is used at home or not. SASL is offered as a HL as it is the language in which Deaf learners are most naturally proficient (DBE, 2014b, 2014c and 2014d). Furthermore, DBE (2014b, 2014c and 2014d) argues that the HL level provides for language proficiency that reflects the basic interpersonal communication skills required in social situations and the cognitive academic skills essential for learning across the curriculum. Emphasis is placed on the teaching of Observing, Signing, Visual Reading and Recording skills, and provides learners with the opportunity to develop a literary, aesthetic and imaginative ability to recreate, imagine and empower their understandings of the world they live in.

The focus in the first few years of school is on developing learners' ability to understand and speak the language – basic interpersonal communication skills (BICS). In Grades 2 and 3, learners start to build literacy on this oral foundation. They also apply the literacy skills they have already learned in their HL. However, for the majority of Deaf learners the FAL can only be accessed in its written form and is their LOL.

By the time learners enter the SP, they should be reasonably proficient in their FAL in regard to both interpersonal and cognitive academic skills (DBE, 2014b; 2014c and 2014d). Nonetheless, the reality is that many Deaf learners are still not adequately competent in the FAL at this stage. The challenge in the IP, therefore, is to provide support for these learners at the same time as providing a curriculum that enables learners to meet the standards required in further grades. These standards must be such that learners can use the FAL at a high level of proficiency to prepare them for further or higher education or the world of work.

2.12   SASL HL Teaching Model

The literature indicates a lack of qualified Deaf teachers to teach SASL. In the absence of a qualified Deaf teacher, a bilingual-bicultural team teaching model is encouraged in which a hearing teacher is paired with a Deaf teaching assistant (DTA) (Morgan, Glaser and Magongwa, 2016; Akach, 2010). Morgan, Glaser and Magongwa (2016) maintain that a proficient Deaf SASL teacher is a role model to Deaf learners and that for cultural reasons it is imperative that no hearing teachers teach SASL alone. Learners improve performance in language acquisition, grammatically correct signing structures and skills as well as academic and social adaptation and improvement through the benefits of team teaching (DBE, 2017). DBE (2017) further posits that team teaching provides both teacher and teaching assistant with greater opportunity to capitalise on the unique, diverse and specialised knowledge, skills and instructional approaches of each other. Moreover, DBE (2017) states that no child is left behind as the teaching assistant can assist where a learner needs more explanation or guidance.

According to DBE (2017), team teaching can broadly be defined as the interaction between two individuals encompassing a variety of behaviours. This interaction includes communication, information sharing, coordination, cooperation, problem solving and negotiation. DBE (2017) maintains that joint planning, decision making and problem solving may occur in a variety of formal or informal group configurations for accomplishing common goals.

SASL HL is a subject that ideally requires a teacher who is a native user of sign language with the linguistic proficiency to teach SASL. However, qualified hearing teachers who are the children of Deaf adults (CODAs) or hearing children of Deaf parents (HCDP) may teach without a DTA, but, for the sake of role modelling, they may also need a DTA. Qualified hearing teachers who are CODAs are native signers and have the methodology to teach the SASL subject.

Many hearing teachers, although qualified to teach SASL as a subject, might not have native/fluent signing skills. Learners need exposure to native SASL signing in order to acquire SASL, use it fluently to relate to others and participate in the Deaf community and wider society. Team teaching in the SASL class consists of (DBE, 2017):

- Pairing a teacher (qualified) and a Deaf person (native signer) but not a qualified teacher. It should be a joint effort
- Assisting each other bilingually i.e. spoken language/SASL

Learners make academic gains on curriculum-based assessments. Team teaching leads to teachers being innovative and coming up with solutions that traditional class teaching often fails to provide. Team teaching provides empowerment by having the opportunity to collaboratively make decisions while simultaneously sharing and increasing skills of SASL teachers, DTAs and Deaf learners.

2.13   Formal Assessment and its Purpose

Referring to international practice, Herman, Holmes and Woll (1999) state that a number of assessments have been developed for different sign languages. They explain that sign language assessments serve a variety of functions, such as to support linguistic research; to facilitate comparisons of Deaf children's knowledge of sign language structures with literacy performance; to provide functional tools for use in educational settings; as a means of recording a child's progress; and to assist in planning intervention.

The DBE in South Africa (DBE, 2014a; 2014b and 2014d) maintains that the purpose of designing a POA is to ensure validity, reliability, fairness and sufficiency of assessment by giving explicit guidance on the types of activities and the percentage allocated to each language skill within a task. All assessments should meet criteria of validity and reliability (Herman, Holmes and Woll, 1999). Herman, Holmes and Woll (1999) further maintain that the assessors themselves should ensure that assessment methods are valid and that the assessment indeed measures what it claims to measure. The procedure must be reliable; it must provide comparable results if repeated. Formal assessment must also cater for the range of cognitive levels and abilities of learners. Regarding cognitive demands in tests/assessments, SASL HL as other written/spoken languages, use Barret's Taxonomy.

2.14   SASL HL Skills and Assessment in the FP

According to the DBE (2014a), assessment is a continuous planned process of identifying, gathering and interpreting information about the performance of learners. It involves four steps: generating and collecting evidence of achievement; evaluating evidence; recording the findings and using information to understand and thereby assist the learner's development in order to improve the process of learning and teaching.

The CAPS for SASL HL states that assessment should be both informal (Assessment for Learning) and formal (Assessment of Learning) (DBE, 2014b; 2014c and 2014d)). In both cases, regular feedback should be provided to learners to enhance the learning

experience. Assessment in SASL can either be conducted through live signing or signing that is recorded.

Regarding Observing and Signing, the Policy Statement notes that "for SASL all Observing and Signing activities are done with live (face-to-face) signing (as opposed to recording texts)" (DBE, 2014a: 10). Observing and Signing tasks replace the orals; Recording tasks are the equivalent of Writing tasks. Observing and Signing skills are considered as crucial skills to all learning. With regard to Visual Reading and Viewing, the DBE (2014a:10) further states "for SASL all Visual Reading and Viewing activities are done with recorded SASL materials (as opposed to live texts)". For Observing and Signing and Visual Reading and Viewing the learner always produces live signing. Assessment can be made either during the live signing or immediately after by recording on a rubric/checklist; or the live signing can be recorded by the educator for assessment later on. These recordings can also be used for moderation, as a basis for feedback to the learner and can become part of the learner's portfolio of work.

For Recording, all work produced is recorded by the learner and handed to the educator for assessment. Learners' Observing skills, signing competence, ability to answer questions, participation in discussions and Recording skills should be observed daily where necessary. Recording (as a skill) is a process involving children in planning/pre-recording, drafting (recording), revising, editing, final recording and publishing texts for others to read (DBE, 2014a). Children are taught to be effective viewers and authors. Visual reading is either shared, group guided, paired or independent.

It is important, too, that learners' understanding of what they are viewing is assessed and not just their ability to recognise signs. Assessment of Visual Reading should, therefore, also take place regularly and not just be a once-off assessment. Formal Visual Reading assessment should focus on activities which help the educator to determine how much the learner has understood, for example "retelling" a story or answering questions (Herman, Holmes and Woll, 1999).

The SASL HL for FP curriculum indicates that there is no formal assessment in Grade R with formal assessment starting from Grade 1. Formal assessment is formative and is incorporated in the teaching plans. There is no summative assessment in the FP. The following skills are tested: Observing and Signing, Visual Reading and Viewing, Recording and Phonological Awareness.

The DBE (2014a) indicates that Grades R-1 learners do not learn Phonological Awareness skills; hence this is not assessed in Grade 1. Phonological Awareness skills in Grades 2 and 3 encompass the knowledge of sub-lexical structures of words/signs used in language. For spoken language, phonological awareness is the knowledge of sounds used in words, such as syllables, rhymes, alliteration and phonemes. For signed language, it is the knowledge of basic parameters, such as handshape, movement, location, palm orientation and non-manual features (DBE, 2014:15).

Phonological Awareness focuses on understanding, identifying, differentiating and manipulating. Phonological Awareness allows children to understand how a word/sign is produced separately from its meaning.

The section on FP in the SASL HL CAPS does not deal explicitly with assessment. The points cited above form an extension to the teaching plans in Section 3.4 for Grades 1-3. It is presumed from the document that all assessment in FP would be undertaken as continuous assessment during the course of class activities. The Policy Statement also makes no reference to qualitative reporting to the children and their parents regarding learner performance in SASL during the FP. This appears to be an omission as feedback would presumably be of value to both.

2.15 SASL HL Skills and Assessment in the IP

The CAPS for SASL HL indicates that "the formal Programme of Assessment for Grades 4-6 comprises of seven (7) tasks which make up 75% of the promotion mark and one end-of-year examination for the final 25%" (DBE, 2014:42). This is identical to the assessment requirement for other HL in the IP.

2.15.1 Examinations

The DBE (2014b) states that the content for the examination should be drawn from the work done in the period preceding the examination and should be a selection of skills and activities that will enable the learner to show that he/she is ready to engage with the work in the next period/year.

The examination will consist of the following (DBE, 2014b):

- Visual Reading Comprehension, including vocabulary work
- Recording of a short creative text, including appropriate and correct usage of SASL grammar and conventions
- Recording of a short transactional (information/media/social) text, including appropriate and correct usage of SASL grammar and conventions
- Language Structures and Conventions to show knowledge and understanding of SASL grammar and conventions
- Observing and Signing skills are assessed as Paper 1, prior to the formal examination time-table. However, it is expected that a summative mark, based on the formal assessments done for Observing and Signing, is allocated as an examination mark

The last bullet suggests that Observing and Signing marks are used for SBA as well as summative marks, however this constitutes double dipping. Circular S4 of 2017 (paragraph 4) for FET Phase Languages corrected this erroneous use of the "Oral" or Observing and Signing mark as part of the SBA as well as part of the examination component. Circular S4 of 2017 should be amended accordingly for the IP. The Policy

Statement further provides the POA for the IP showing the expected tasks per term per grade (Grades 4-6). In Grade 6, Recording (essays and transactional texts) is a stand-alone paper and Visual Reading (comprehension and language in context) is a stand-alone paper. The weightings are also different except for the weighting of Paper 1 (Observing and Signing).

The CAPS also indicates the number and types of tasks to be included in the SBA per term and the weighting of SBA.

The end-of-year examination for Grades 4-5 comprises two papers - Paper 1: Observing and Signing; Paper 2: Integrated Paper (Comprehension, Language and Recording – essays and transactional texts). The weightings are as follows: SBA weighs 75% and examination weighs 25%. Grade 6 has three papers - Paper 1: Observing and Signing, Paper 2: Recording – essays and transactional texts, and Paper 3: Visual Reading Comprehension and Language in context. The weightings of SBA and examination for Grade 6 are the same as the weightings for Grades 4-5.

Generic descriptions for moderation are included in the CAPS. It notes that moderators at school level must give quality comments, based on the requirements, to ensure that the assessment practice at school is enhanced (DBE, 2014b:55). With regard to SASL, this would require the moderator commenting on (amongst others): the level of questioning in comprehension testing; the frequency of extended recording; the quality of assessment instruments; the developmental opportunities afforded; and the teacher's engagement with the learner's recorded work as evidence of performance (DBE, 2014b:55).

2.16   SASL HL Skills and Assessment in the SP

According to the SP CAPS document for SASL HL, assessment in SASL can be conducted either on live signing or on signing that is recorded. However, for Observing and Signing, and Visual Reading and Viewing, the learner always produces live signing. It can either be assessed during the signing or immediately after by recording on a rubric/checklist or the live signing can be recorded by the teacher for assessment later on. These recordings can be used for moderation, as a basis for feedback to the learner and can become part of the learner's portfolio of work. For Recording, all work produced is recorded by the learner and handed to the teacher for assessment (DBE, 2014c:66).

Furthermore, assessing the different language skills should not be seen as separate activities but form part of an integrated activity. Assessment rubrics should, thus, address the different language skills in the task (DBE, 2014c:66). In this respect, the approach to assessment is no different to that taken in the other HLs.

Learners' Observing skills, signing competence, ability to answer questions, participation in discussions and Recording skills should, where necessary, be observed

daily (DBE, 2014c:66). Formal visual reading assessment should focus on activities that help the teacher to determine how much the learner has understood, for example "retelling" a story or answering questions (DBE, 2014c:66). Assessment of recorded work will focus primarily on the learner's ability to convey meaning as well as on how correctly they have signed, for example correct language structures and conventions used (DBE, 2014c:66).

2.16.1 Formal Assessment

All assessments in the SP are internal. The formal POA for Grades 7-9 comprises of eleven formal assessment tasks which make up 100% of the mark. The SBA accounts for 40% of the total and the end-of-year examination 60% (DBE, 2014c). Once again, the number of tasks is the same as that in the other HLs.

Each Grade in the SP has ten formal assessment tasks for SBA packaged as follows:

- Grade 7 – four Observing and Signing tasks, two Recording tasks, three Visual Reading tests and a June examination (Paper 2: Visual Reading Comprehension, Language and Paper 3: Recording).
- Grade 8 and 9- four Observing and Signing tasks, three Recording tasks, two Visual Reading tests and a June examination (Paper 1: Observing and Signing, Paper 2: Visual Reading Comprehension, Language and Paper 3: Recording).
- Grade 9 - four Observing and Signing tasks, three Recording tasks, two Visual Reading tests and a June examination (Paper 1: Observing and Signing, Paper 2: Visual Reading Comprehension, Language and Paper 3: Recording, Paper 4: Response to Literature).

2.16.2 End-of-year Examination

The DBE (2014c) states that the end-of-year examination should comprise of Observing and Signing, Visual Reading and Recording tasks. The Observing and Signing task, which is Paper 1, accounts for 20.8% of the final mark. This should be generated from the four Observing and Signing tasks undertaken during the course of the year (DBE, 2014c). This, however, constitutes double dipping. The Recording tasks, which should be administered under controlled conditions, comprise of two papers for Grades 7 and 8 and three for Grade 9.
Examination Papers:

Grade 7 and 8
- Paper 1 – Observing and Signing
- Paper 2 – Visual Reading Comprehension, Language
- Paper 3 – Recording

Grade 9
- Paper 1 – Observing and Signing

- Paper 2 – Visual Reading Comprehension, Language
- Paper 3 – Recording
- Paper 4 – Response to Literature

Recording, reporting and moderation are done the same way as in the IP (DBE, 2014c:68) as well as in the same manner as for other HLs.

2.17 SASL HL Skills and Assessment in the FET Phase

2.17.1 Formal Assessment Grades 10 -11

SBA comprises 25% and the end-of-year examination 75% of the final mark. The end-of-year examination has four papers.

- Paper 1 – Language in context
- Paper 2 – Literature
- Paper 3 - Recording
- Paper 4 – Observing and Signing (tasks also form part of SBA)

All assessment tasks that make up the formal POA for the year are regarded as formal assessment. Formal assessment tasks are marked and formally recorded by the teacher for progression and certification purposes. All formal assessment tasks are subject to moderation for the purpose of quality assurance and to ensure that appropriate standards are maintained. While preparations for formal assessment tasks can be done outside the classroom, the final version should be done under controlled conditions in the classroom.

2.17.2 Content to be Covered during Examination

Assessment addresses the content that is covered. Due to the conceptual progression of the content across the grades, content and skills from Grades 10-12 will be assessed in the external papers at the end of Grade 12.

Observing and Signing Assessment Tasks: Paper 4
The Observing and Signing assessment tasks undertaken during the course of the year constitute the end-of-year external assessment for Grade 12. It makes up 50 of the 300 marks in the end-of-year external assessment. The details for the Observing and Signing tasks, which are administered during the year, are as follows:

Observing and Signing tasks undertaken during the course of the year constitute part of the end-of-year internal assessment as well as part of the SBA. Circular S4 of 2017 (paragraph 4) for FET Phase Languages corrected this erroneous use of the 'Oral' or Observing and Signing mark as part of both components. By way of correction, Circular S4 of 2017 states that the marks attained for all the oral tasks should not form part of the final SBA mark but should be used for the oral examination component

instead. The circular further states that the oral mark will still be used for term reporting but only accrue to the oral examinations component.

Formal assessment in Grade 12 is the same as for Grades 10 and11, except that there are two examinations and one test.

2.18 Essential Issues in Sign Language Assessment

The literature indicates that, in regard to test development, certain guidelines need to be followed. Haug *et al* (2016), in their document entitled: "Guidelines for sign language test development, evaluation and use", provide the ethical issues in testing and working with Deaf communities including specific aspects relating to sign language test development as well as general issues around testing Deaf children in different contexts. Haug *et al* (2016) also give guidelines pertaining to technical issues for test takers that use technology-based testing. A summary of the main issues raised by Haug *et al* (2016) is presented below.

Ethical Issues in Testing and Working with the Deaf Community
Test administrators should be qualified to use sign language tests, e.g. level of sign proficiency, adequate training in sign language assessment and interpretation of test results etc. They should set and maintain high personal standards of competence in the delivery of sign language assessments and interpretation of test results. It is important that they should also keep up to date with relevant changes and advances relating to test use and development. These may include changes in legislation and policy which may impact on tests and test use as well as test norms. Test administrators are responsible for ensuring that test materials (e.g. test instructions and items) and test data are kept secure at all times with limited access. In addition, they should respect any relevant copyright law and agreements, including any prohibitions on the copying or transmission of materials in electronic or other forms to other people, whether qualified or otherwise.

Issues Regarding Sign Language Test Development
Native signers should be involved at each stage of the process, from development to dissemination. These should ideally include Deaf native signers with academic training or other relevant training or experience. This is motivated by the fact that, for some sign languages, limited research is available. Input is required from native signers to ensure that test items appropriately reflect the structure of the particular sign language. It is also essential to involve Deaf/hearing people with different areas of expertise (such as linguists) psychologists, high-level interpreters, media design experts and computer programmers (for Web-/mobile-assisted sign language testing). The materials used in test development should be age appropriate for the test-takers, and be visually clear and accessible to the target population, e.g. avoid high memory load, do not require written response.

Test developers should assure that the choice of elicitation techniques, item formats, test conventions and procedures are readily accessible to all intended populations (e.g. children, adults). They should also ascertain that item content and stimulus materials are familiar to all intended populations (e.g. images that are suitable for children might not be appropriate to be used with adults and vice versa). The language used in the directions and items themselves, as well as in the handbook/manual, should be appropriate for all cultural and language populations for whom the test or instrument is intended. In case of a test adaptation, test developers/publishers should ensure that the adaptation process takes full account of linguistic and cultural differences among the populations for whom adapted versions of the test or instrument are intended.

General Issues in Testing Deaf Children in Different Contexts

When carrying out assessments, it is important to use different approaches to obtain as much information as possible about the child's language skills. Instruments, test environment and the varying of tests are some elements to consider:

- *Instruments:* the assessors should include both receptive and productive instruments to assess sign language. Whenever possible, different instruments that focus on different aspects of sign language, such as vocabulary, grammar, narrative skills, should also be included.
- *Environment:* the child is likely to be most relaxed in a familiar setting and will likely respond differently depending on the test environment, e.g. clinical, school or home settings). It is important to realise that all testing is 'inauthentic' to a degree, however the closest to natural setting as possible should be the goal.
- *Varying tests:* assessors should try to use more than one sign language test, if available. Different tests may yield different results or test slightly different aspects of a child's language skills.

Appropriate Standards for the Assessors

Assessors should have a high level of sign language skills, preferably fluency in the given sign language. They should also have the ability to communicate flexibly to meet the needs of individual Deaf children - many Deaf children today have exposure to a sign language (e.g. BSL) /sign system (e.g. Signed English skills) /sign accompanying spoken language (e.g. Sign Supported English). In addition, they should also have experience of working with Deaf children. Deaf and hearing teamwork is important when carrying out language assessments as each member of the team will have a different set of skills.

> *The competent test administrator makes necessary practical arrangements by ensuring that:*
> - *Locations and facilities for testing are arranged well in advance, and the physical environment is accessible, safe, quiet, free from distractions and appropriate for the purpose*
> - *The staff involved in the administration are familiar with the test and have the language skills required*
> - *Appropriate arrangements should be made for the testing of people with additional needs, e.g. visually accessible stimuli, slower presentation rate of test items, support in place to assist with test takers who have additional needs*
> - *Invigilators should preferably be sign language experts or specialists qualified in the subject*
>
> *(Adapted from Haug et al, 2016, p.10-11)*

2.19   Moderation of the Sign Language Assessment Tasks

According to the DBE (2014b; 2014c and 2014d), moderation refers to the process of ensuring that all assessment tasks are fair, valid, reliable and sufficient. Validity means that the task should measure the attainment of skills that were taught in line with the skills indicated in the CAPS document. The task must measure the level of achievement of specific skills. In setting comprehension questions, for example, the learners' ability to analyse and synthesise information given in a signed text followed by general knowledge related to the text should be tested.

Evaluation or moderation of the sign language assessment tasks is an essential task to be undertaken in all formal assessments. The quality assurance of the assessment tasks involves pre- and post-assessment moderation done by school Heads of Departments (HODs). Pre-assessment moderation is the moderation of the test instrument or test question paper. Post-assessment moderation is the moderation of the learners' scripts or responses after being marked. In case of an overcrowded class, the moderator takes a sample of learners' scripts to moderate. In regard to sign language class enrolment or teacher-learner ratio, the acceptable ratio is 1:5. In such cases, the moderator may moderate all the learners' work.

As pertains to the pre-assessment moderation, Haug and Mann (2008) assert that test developers need to provide evidence for the effectiveness of their instrument based on appropriate psychometric measures. They further state that the measures most commonly applied to describe how test takers' behaviour relates to the evaluation of their performance are reliability, validity and standardisation. The reliability of a test over time is known as 'test-retest reliability' (Kline, 2000: 7), for which subject scores that were obtained on two or more different occasions are correlated. The higher the correlation, the more reliable the test is. 'Interrater reliability' refers to the level of

agreement between two or more raters on a test taker's performance (Davis, Brown, Elder, Hill, Lumley, McNamara and Milanovic, 1999:88). For example, to compare the scoring of certain grammatical features that a Deaf child performed on a production task that has been videotaped, then rated by two different raters and then compared.

The main claim for test validity is that it really measures what it claims to measure (Kline, 2000). For a Deaf test taker, this could mean whether an assessment of sign language vocabulary really measures the vocabulary knowledge in Deaf children or not. There are several types of validity, for example item or content validity, concurrent validity, predictive validity and construct validity. Each of these types of validity requires different evidence. One of the prerequisites for assuming 'item' or 'content validity' in a test of sign language skills is the close collaboration with Deaf native signers during the development (Singleton and Supalla, 2003:297). Literature, however, indicates that only a few tests for ASL or other sign languages have any measures of reliability and validity compared to tests for spoken English, such as the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (Dunn and Dunn, 1997), making this one of the major drawbacks for current sign language research.

2.19.1 Moderation of Assessment Tasks Grades 4-9

Moderation should be implemented at school, provincial and national levels. Comprehensive and appropriate moderation practices must be in place for the quality assurance of all subject assessments (DBE, 2014b and 2014c). Moderation should be done at least once per term. Moderators at school level must give quality comments based on the requirements above to ensure that the assessment practice at school is enhanced. Moderation cannot simply be a monitoring exercise to check the number of tasks completed or the correct application of a memorandum. In SASL, it means that the moderator must give good comments on the levels of questioning in comprehension testing; the frequency of extended recording; the quality of assessment instruments and the developmental opportunities afforded; and the teacher's engagement with learners' recorded work as evidence of performance.

The moderation process must also ensure that the ratings given are consistent across all classes in the grade and all grades in the phase. For example, a rating of three given by one teacher should represent the same level of skill and knowledge as the same rating given by another teacher. It is, therefore, important for subject heads to do internal moderation regularly.

2.19.2 Moderation of Formal Assessments (SBA) in Grades 10-12

The DBE (2014d: 60) states that subject advisors must moderate samples of tests and examinations to verify standards and guide teachers on the setting of these tasks. The Grade 10 and 11 tests and examinations are internally moderated. The provincial subject advisor must moderate a sample of these tasks during his/her school visits to

verify the standard of tasks and the internal moderation. Grade 12 tests and examinations must be moderated at provincial and national level. The provincial education departments manage the moderation process at Grade 12 level.

Each Observing and Signing task used in the POA must be submitted to the subject head for moderation before learners attempt the task. Teachers assess the Observing and Signing assessment tasks. The provincial subject advisor must moderate a sample of Observing and Signing assessment tasks during his/her school visits. In Grade 12, Observing and Signing tasks should be internally set, internally assessed and externally moderated.

At the time of research, the DBE had yet to appoint the SASL HL subject advisors. As an interim measure, the spoken/written language advisors were being used to monitor compliance to CAPS by the Deaf schools.

2.20   Standardisation

The process of standardisation is another issue that can affect the psychometrics of a test (Haug and Mann, 2008). This process depends on several variables including:

a)   The size of the population that the sample represents (here, the population of Deaf children)
b)   The homogeneity (or heterogeneity) of the population (Kine, 2000:51; e.g. differences in parents' hearing status and diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds)

However, the standardisation process used by Haug is different to the standardisation process used by Umalusi. Haug and Mann (2008) raise two questions for the developers of sign language tests: (a) what sample size is ideal to be representative of the entire population?; and (b) what is the reference group for which the test will be standardised, taking into consideration the heterogeneity within the Deaf population? They assert that most of the originally developed tests to measure Deaf students' skills in a natural sign language (e.g. ASL) do not meet the standardisation requirements. In addition, Haug (2011) maintains that in many countries the sign language evaluation carried out in preschools and primary schools is far from satisfactory. Singleton and Supalla (2003:289) point out that in practice many schools in the US use informal descriptive evaluations of Deaf children's signing skills, but these "assessment approaches are inadequate because they introduce multiple threats to the reliability and validity of the assessment results". *Haug et al (2016)* further make the following assertion:

One of the ethical issues in testing and working with the Deaf community is determining whether the test's technical and user documentation provides sufficient information to enable evaluation of the following:

a) *Coverage and representativeness of test content, representative norm groups, difficulty level of content, etc.*
b) *Accuracy of measurement and reliability demonstrated with respect to relevant populations*
c) *Validity (demonstrated with respect to relevant populations) and relevance for the required use*
d) *Freedom from systematic bias in relation to the intended test taker groups*
e) *Practicality, including time required, costs and resources needed*
f) *Whether the test avoids judgement solely on the basis of face values, test-user testimonials, or advice from those with a vested commercial interest*

(Adapted from Haug et al, 2016:4)

2.21   Minimum Resources Required for SASL Home Language

In order for a school to offer SASL as a subject, schools, teachers and learners need to have the following minimum resources (DBE, 2017):
The school minimum resources are at least five laptops with webcam; digital versatile disc (DVD) player/recorder; computer laboratory; software; and internet access (1 gigabyte per month).

The teacher's minimum resources are:

- A CAPS document
- Language in Education Policy
- Language textbook for resource purposes
- SASL dictionary
- Literature genres
- Laptop with webcam
- Video/DVD player/recorder
- Software for editing, e.g. Photo Shop
- Memory stick or external hard drive
- Data projector and digital camera
- Whiteboard

The learner minimum resources are:

- A memory stick
- A range of SASL materials/texts for Visual Reading and Viewing

2.22   SASL Laboratory Descriptions

Recommendations from the teacher workshops held as part of this research study suggested that the set-up for the examination room/SASL HL laboratory used for assessment should include:

- Blinds or curtains
- Adequate light
- Partitions for candidates' cubicles
- Laptops with a webcam
- Memory sticks

General observations of SASL HL laboratories made during the school field visits in Gauteng Province support these recommendations. The following was observed:

- Cubicles should be set up or erected in such a way that candidates cannot copy the answers from each other. Cubicles should have a plain and simple background of a preferred colour. The background and colour should not have a negative effect on the signed answers and should not give challenges to the markers
- The SASL laboratory should have curtains or blind on the windows to minimize the sunrays entering whilst allowing sufficient light into the SASL laboratory
- SASL HL assessments should make use of laptops with webcams. There should be no hard copy question papers. All questions should be signed and answers signed as well

Haug *et al.* (2016:11) argue that, whilst computer-based assessments are becoming more and more popular due to their efficiency, they do not always capture the child's ability to use language interactively. In this regard, they provide the following technical issues or guide to technology-based testing for competent test administrators:

- Ensure the system (e.g. computers to be used for test administration) meet the hardware and software requirements defined by the test developer prior to administering any tests. For web-based tests, this includes making sure there are no browser (type of browser like Firefox or Chrome and version of browser) or operation system (e.g. Windows, Linux, Apple) restrictions
- Make sure to have high-speed Internet access when the test includes sign language videos
- In cases where the test includes online video-recording, check if a webcam is available and works with the used browser. Make sure to have appropriate lighting conditions and background when sign language videos are recorded
- Know how to access technical support (online as well as at the testing site) in case of any problems
- Have read in advance the instructions and looked at any supporting materials needed to successfully complete the test. This includes completing any online tutorials (where available)
- Be familiar with operating the computer or other device and the software functions required by the test
- Inform test takers about the purpose of the test, the content included in the test and the type of test (e.g. picture-matching, multiple choice), where appropriate
- Provide clear instructions on how to take the test
- Make sure the test is administered in a comfortable and quiet environment with minimal distraction and appropriate lighting conditions
- Make sure to follow the standard administration procedures
- Make sure that the test takers do not have access to other programmes on the computer to look up information while being tested (i.e. they should only have access to the test)
- Make sure that the test takers cannot store/copy the test on devices they bring (e.g. external hard-drive)
- If possible, make sure that the computer has some sort of logbook file to prevent a test takers claim that "the recording is lost"
- Make sure that test takers do not see each other as information in sign language is easily passed through over a distance, for example when assessing an adult learner in a sign language interpreter training program

(Adapted from Haug *et al*, 2016:11)

In brief, the SASL laboratory should have private spaces for each individual candidate and be technologically flawless.

2.23   Recording and Reporting for Grades 4-12

Recording is a process in which the teacher documents the level of a learner's performance in a specific assessment task. It indicates learner progress towards the achievement of the knowledge as prescribed in CAPS.

Reporting is a process of communicating learner performance to learners, parents, schools and other stakeholders. Learner performance can be reported in a number of ways. These include report cards, parents' meetings, school visitation days, parent-teacher conferences, phone calls, text messages, emails, letters and class or school newsletters. Teachers in all grades report in percentages against the subject. Seven levels of competence have been described for each subject listed for Grades R-12.

The statement of results and certificate will reflect or indicate performance in the SASL HL subject.

CHAPTER THREE: LITERATURE SURVEY – INTERNATIONAL APPROACHES TO DEAF EDUCATION

3.1   Introduction

This chapter reviewed the international practice relating to sign language teaching, learning and assessment. A summary of the main findings, concentrating on global practice relating to teaching, learning and assessment, and approaches to Deaf education was presented. This chapter looked at the teaching, learning and assessment of the following countries: Singapore, America, Netherlands, United Kingdoms and Scotland, the intention being that South Africa should also learn from the international practice. The last sections of this chapter looked at SASL assessment in South Africa and also the challenges associated with SASL assessment internationally and nationally.

3.2   Deaf Education

Simms and Thumann (2007) report that:

> for more than a century, educators have recognised the low academic achievement of Deaf children in the US. They further state that teacher training programmes in Deaf education have historically emphasised medical-pathological views of Deaf people and Deaf education, rather than appropriate pedagogies that draw upon and build on Deaf students' linguistic and cultural knowledge (p. 302).

The pathological perspective continues to be perpetuated in many teacher training programmes. This history of Deaf education suggests that audism (placing a higher value on hearing and oral/aural education (Lane, 1992)) continues to significantly affect Deaf people. Specifically, audism affects teacher preparation and teaching practices by impeding student achievement through low expectations; emphasising English over American Sign Language (ASL) in instruction; tolerating poor ASL skills; and sustaining a field dominated by hearing researchers, administrators and teachers (Simms and Thumann, 2007). They also indicate that these factors have deleterious effects on the educational, social and personal development of Deaf individuals. Furthermore, Simms and Thumann (2007) report that a recent and growing interest in educating Deaf children bilingually acknowledges the value of ASL *and* English in the classroom. This approach is in line with South African practice.

3.3   Bilingualism in Deaf Education

Reagan (2008) posits that a growing number of educators of the Deaf have suggested that the most appropriate approach to Deaf education is one that is essentially bilingual and bicultural in nature – utilising sign language and at least one

spoken language, and teaching children to function in both the Deaf and hearing worlds. The Bilingual-Bicultural Approach incorporates ASL as the LOLT and English as a second language. Deaf culture is also imparted to the children through lessons on Deaf history as well as the contributions, values and customs of the Deaf community. In this approach, the deaf child learns language mainly through the visual mode. ASL, which Gallimore and Woodruff (1996) believe is the only complete language that is entirely visible, allows the child access to a complete language. Speech reading (also known as lip reading) and manually coded English systems do not.

According to Simms and Thumann (2007), since 1990 there has been a growing shift toward the ASL/English bilingual approach to education of the Deaf. Historically, this approach was referred to as the bi-bi (bilingual-bicultural) approach to education of the Deaf, but it is now referred to as ASL/English bilingual education. In following the ASL/English approach, teachers in the schools serving deaf and hard of hearing (HOH) children are expected to use ASL as the language of instruction and teach English through writing and reading, rather than require children to learn to speak or use signed English (Simms and Thumann, 2007). This approach provides a potential means of surmounting the linguistic and educational barriers that are faced by deaf and HOH children and establishes a bilingual perspective (Johnson, Liddell and Erting, 1989). The impetus for the ASL/English bilingual movement began as a genuine desire of the Deaf community, Deaf educators and their hearing allies to address the persistent low achievement levels among Deaf children. Cummins (1986) expressed the belief that students who were empowered by their school experiences developed the ability, confidence and motivation to succeed academically. Simms and Thumann (2007) further assert that this empowerment occurs when the teachers and the students share common language; when communication is effective, expedient and clear; and when a sense of belonging and group identity is instilled. In addition, they also state that natural communication through ASL provides Deaf children with the opportunity to interact freely with knowledge about the subject matter as well as with teachers and peers.

It is within this understanding that South Africa encourages team teaching models for Deaf education whereby a qualified hearing educator works together in the class with a DTA. The pedagogically equipped educator and the DTA, who is a fluent signer, together allow teachers and students to share a common language. This in turn facilitates the students' sense of belonging. In this model, the DTA also serves as a role model for the Deaf child.

Children acquire sign language through different modalities. Deaf children of native signing Deaf parents may acquire this as their first language whereas Deaf children of hearing parents may only acquire sign language when they enter school (Haug, 2011). Haug (2011) notes that this latter group of Deaf children, who are born Deaf and have hearing parents, might have delayed first language acquisition. As such, they comprise a special population for whom language is a crucial variable. Research has revealed that Deaf children who acquire a sign language as their first language

from their Deaf parents constitute only about 5% of the population of Deaf children (Mitchell and Karchmer, 2004). For the remaining 95% who come from hearing families, acquiring a language is often a great challenge (Marschark, 2002). Haug (2011) argues that the majority of Deaf children of non-signing hearing parents do not have full access to a sign language until after they have passed the most critical early ages of language acquisition.

The ASL/English model of staff development was designed to improve the language teaching practice of teachers who work with Deaf and HOH children. The model includes not only theories of bilingualism (Collier, 1995; Cummins, 1979, 2000; Krashen and Terrell, 1993) but also theories about first- and second–language acquisition, English as a second language (ESL), language planning, literacy development and bilingual assessment. This implies that ASL is offered as the HL and is the LOLT. In this understanding, it is equally true, when using South African terminology, to say that English is offered as the FAL. Indeed, sign language education in the US and in South Africa have much in common. Research indicates that the ASL/English bilingual movement has been adopted by several schools for the Deaf in states including Indiana, California, Massachusetts, Texas, New Mexico, Maryland, Minnesota, Colorado, Utah, New York, Kansas, and Arizona (Reynolds and Titus, 1991; Strong, 1995).

Regarding ASL teacher preparation, Gallaudet University has offered teacher preparation for those wishing to teach Deaf children since 1891 (Simms and Thumann, 2007). In South Africa, both the University of the Witwatersrand and the University of the Free State offer teacher preparation for the teaching of SASL. Simms and Thumann (2007) believe that educators of the Deaf must be fluent in ASL and English as well as have an understanding of Deaf culture. Furthermore, they believe that educators must demonstrate knowledge and application of linguistics, human development, curriculum and instruction, and ASL/English bilingual Deaf education. This approach has been adopted in South Africa for SASL HL.

In American colleges and universities, ASL is one of the most commonly taught second languages (Goldberg, Looney and Lusin, 2015). It is widely used by both hearing and Deaf people and taught in numerous primary, secondary and post-secondary academic programmes. ASL is a native language for many individuals and is considered the core language of the Deaf community in the US (Padden and Humphries, 1988). With regard to the assessment of ASL, Bochner, Samar, Garrison and Searls (2015) maintain that the assessment of language proficiency is necessary for appropriate course placement, measurement of educational attainments over time, research and other academic purposes. ASL assessment is done using video recording of a conversation between an interviewer and the respondent.

The key premise upon which all bilingual Deaf education programmes are based is establishing a first language foundation in a natural signed language (Enns and Herman, 2011). Bilingual programmes emphasise first language acquisition in signed language because these languages are considered the most natural and accessible

languages for Deaf children (Johnson, Liddell and Erting, 1989). Enns and Herman (2011) further posit that without an established first language, the entire programme is brought into question. They assert that the primary objective of bilingual Deaf education programmes is to facilitate the normal acquisition of language, cognition and social structures through an accessible first language and to build the skills of academic learning and literacy upon this foundation. Therefore, if Deaf students enter school without an established language base, developing their signed language skills must be the focus of education before proceeding with other curricular areas.

Plaza-Pust and Morales-Lopez (2008:350) list the shortcomings of existing bilingual programmes: "The status assigned to the different languages and communication systems, teacher training, the materials used and assessment methods available strike us in their potential negative effects concerning the eventual outcome". Plaza-Pust and Morales-Lopez (2008) further maintain that there is a dire need for sign language tests for bilingual programmes.

3.4   Natural Sign Languages and Manual Codes for Spoken Languages

Reagan (2008:172) argues that not all signing constitutes sign language and that the diversity amongst sign languages is significant. According to Reagan (2008), not only are different natural sign languages used amongst Deaf people and hearing people in their interactions, even manual sign codes for spoken languages are used in educational settings (cf. Bornstein, 1990). Reagan suggests that: (a) a variety of different sign languages have developed that are independent of each other and of any other spoken or written languages; (b) some signing that is not related to any of these sign languages is nonetheless used to code a spoken or written language, such as English (this coding is an alternative mode of communicating a non-sign language and takes note of the structure of the language being coded); and (c) pidgins which use features of both sign languages and coding and are often used in signing between the Deaf and the hearing communities.

Singapore Sign Language (SgSL) is an interesting example of a sign language developed from a tapestry of languages, each with its own unique syntax, history and ideology (Goy, 2017). The Singapore Association for the Deaf (SADeaf) (2008-2017) states that SgSL is Singapore's native sign language which has developed over the last six decades, since the founding of the first school for the Deaf in 1954. It is influenced by Shanghainese Sign Language (SSL), ASL, Sign Exact English (SEE) and locally developed signs. The table below describes how each of these languages/gestures has influenced SgSL (SADeaf, 2008-2017).

Table 3.1: Singapore Sign Languages and Gestures

Language/Gesture	Description
Singapore Sign Language (SgSL)	• A language of the Deaf community in Singapore • Visual mode of communication • Has own grammar and linguistic structure which is different from those of spoken/written languages • Does not relate grammatically to any spoken language
Shanghainese Sign Language (SSL)	• Old version of current Chinese Sign Language (CSL) used in 1950s before it evolved to CSL used by Deaf community in China • Visual mode of communication • Does not relate grammatically to any spoken language
American Sign Language (ASL)	• A language of Deaf community in the US and most of Canada • Visual mode of communication • Has own grammar and linguistic structure which is different from those of spoken/written languages • Does not relate grammatically to any spoken language
Sign Exact English (SEE)	• Not a language • Manually coded English system • Expanded with prepositions, pronouns, affixes, tenses and finger-spelled words to visually represent the English language • A sign system which, as its name implies, follows English exactly in terms of word order and grammar • Similar to Morse code, Braille in English
Pidgin Sign English (PSE)	• Not a language • Mixture of sign language and English, in English order • Used by most people • Used by Deaf people and hearing people to communicate with each other in both social and formal situations

3.5   Approaches to Deaf Education in Singapore

Over the years, a number of changes in Deaf education in Singapore have taken place with several approaches to Deaf education now being used. This was made possible by an increased awareness of hearing loss management and, consequently, more Deaf children being enrolled in schools. The choices of educational programmes for the Deaf in Singapore parallel those in the US. The manuscript written by Phua Su Yin (2013) examined the language production of Deaf children in Singapore, where English is the medium of instruction in all schools. In schools for the Deaf in Singapore, Signing Exact English 2 (SEE 2) is the language of instruction in classes. SEE 2 is a manually coded English sign system, meant to represent formal English language, with one sign for each morpheme. It is a system of word-for-word signing that follows the English sentence structure (Goy, 2017). SEE 2 was originally developed to help Deaf learners improve their grasp of English (Gustason and Zawolkow (1993). In South Africa, SASL Home language is the medium of instruction in the schools for the Deaf. It is therefore interesting to know how Deaf children acquire sign language in Singapore. Singapore is a multicultural and multilingual society and hence the Singapore Sign Language (SgSL) is influenced by

Shanghainese Sign Language (SSL), American Sign Language (ASL), Signing Exact English 2 and locally developed signs.

Phua Su Yin (2003:13) gives the following narrative regarding the language challenges in Singapore: "In a multicultural and multilingual society such as Singapore, there are also normal hearing children who have never been exposed to English before beginning school, as they speak another language at home. Some common home languages are Mandarin, Malay and Tamil. Even if English is spoken, it is usually the colloquial variety – Singapore Colloquial English (SCE), so it is no surprise that normal hearing children are also unfamiliar with Standard Singapore English (SSE). Many deaf children's parents at Singapore School for the Deaf (SSD) do not speak English, so they find it immensely difficult to learn SEE 2, and they are not able to teach their children SEE 2. Most of the deaf children have never been exposed to Standard English before coming to SSD, and most will never use it at home. Imagine what an effort it is for them to learn the rules of a spoken language such as English in order to learn new concepts in school, and how frustrating it is for parents who cannot help their child with school work. Inevitably, most deaf children in SSD do not perform well in primary school."

The study by Phua Su Yin (2003) recommends that, before a bilingual (native sign language and English) educational approach can even be considered, it is necessary to establish the presence of a possible native sign system. Given that this takes time, the next best solution is to work on the identified difficulties that the children have with either signed or written English. Efforts to improve their English will give the SSD children more opportunities later in life. Furthermore, Phua Su Yin (2003) suggests that remedies to overcome the difficulty of learning English and to improve literacy levels often include a bilingual approach, where Deaf children are allowed to develop their native sign language alongside SEE 2. This approach in the classrooms has much support elsewhere (Petitto *et al.*, 2001; Prinz *et al.*, 1996; Hall, 1995).

According to Phua Su Yin (2003), there are different programmes and approaches to Deaf education including the Auditory-Verbal Approach, the Bilingual Approach, Cued Speech, the Oral Approach and Total Communication. Several of these programmes are available to Deaf children in Singapore, however Phua Su Yin's research focused on the language of children using Total Communication. The following is a summary of the different approaches to language learning as listed by Phua Su Yin.

3.5.1 Auditory-Verbal Approach

One of the approaches to managing hearing-impairment in the US is the Auditory-Verbal Approach, where children utilise their hearing potential by using powerful hearing aids or cochlear implants to learn to talk through listening. Estabrooks (1996) sums up the goal of Auditory-Verbal practice for hearing-impaired children as the opportunity to grow up in a regular learning and living environment that allows hearing-impaired children to become independent, participating and contributing

citizens in mainstream society. The Auditory-Verbal therapist and the parent(s) work together to help the child develop auditory, speech, language, cognitive and communication skills, such that the hearing-impaired child will subsequently participate in mainstream society and attend a regular school.

Very few schools in South Africa, such as Eduplex School, use the Auditory-Verbal Approach. Eduplex High School is an inclusive, private and mainstream school that caters for the HOH and completely deaf learners. The Deaf learners are mixed with hearing learners during teaching and learning. Teaching and learning takes place in specialised classrooms to cater for the Deaf learners. This school does not offer SASL HL. Learners write their examinations as in any other mainstream school. However, Deaf learners and hard-of hearing learners are granted concessions/ accommodations, such as extra time, separate venues and rephrasing of questions in the question paper during examinations.

3.5.2   Bilingual Approach

Phua Su Yin (2003) maintains that a key issue in literacy development for the Deaf, especially in the US, is bilingual education. In response to a growing body of research evidencing that learning two languages is not detrimental to the development of one particular language, global advocacy efforts are increasingly emphasising bilingual education for Deaf children (Phua Su Yin, 2003). For instance, Petitto *et al.*, 2001 show in their videotaped study of three children learning Langues des Signes Quebecoise and French and another three learning English and French, that both groups of children attain their early linguistic milestones in the languages at the same time.

Research on Deaf children's education and literacy often examines the role of a native sign language, such as ASL, and its relation to the children's mastery of the English language (Prinz *et al.*, 1996; Rinne, 1996; Everhart and Marschark, 1988). Many have suggested that a bilingual-bicultural education, such as the use of both English and ASL in pedagogy, will help Deaf children in school. In this approach, the goal is the mastery of both English through an English-based sign system (such as SEE) and ASL. For example, Prinz, Strong, Kuntz, Vincent, Friedman, Moyers and Helman (1996) tested the hypothesis that competence in ASL facilitates the acquisition of English literacy. Their sample of six girls and three boys was measured in their ASL proficiency, English literacy and cognitive abilities. They found preliminary evidence in support of a significant correlation between broad reading and writing achievement and fluency in ASL, with those who are proficient in ASL achieving high levels of literacy in tests.

Prinz and Strong (1998) also conducted a larger study to investigate the relationship between ASL and English literacy skills among 155 students at a residential school for the Deaf in California. An ASL test battery and an English literacy test battery were administered. The results showed a significant relationship between English literacy skill and ASL proficiency. The researcher's interpretation was that ASL skill may be a

predictor of English literacy performance, with the suggestion that more research on bilingual-bicultural programmes for Deaf children is needed since existing models of bilingual instruction (developed for hearing populations) are not suitable for the Deaf. Advocates of a bilingual education approach, Nover, Christensen and Cheng (1998), believe that bilingual education empowers students with a more active role in their own literacy development making them independently engaged learners.

The school of thought advocating for bilingual Deaf education is not limited to the use of ASL and English. Hall (1995) suggests that a bilingual instruction model would benefit Deaf children in Jamaica. In Hall's (1995) study, 12 deaf children completed tasks in writing, reading and sign language. They were found to have the ability to express complex ideas in sign language which they had difficulty expressing in writing. It was suggested that there was a diglossic language situation that resulted in the children's limited facility with English and that there was a need for a non-traditional approach in the teaching of the written language.

3.5.3   Cued Speech

Cued Speech, a method used to supplement speech-reading, uses handshapes that are phonemically-based to show the exact pronunciation of words in connected speech. Williams-Scott and Kipila (1996) describe it as a system that allows the child to 'see-hear' every spoken syllable that a hearing person hears very precisely. This system was developed to help make reading lips clearer as many English words look alike when spoken.

3.5.4   Oral Approach

The Oral Approach is not a single method but rather a group of methods that places emphasis on the different aspects of the communication process (Gatty, 1996). These methods collectively emphasise that hearing-impaired children should only use spoken language in face-to-face communication. Emphasis is also placed on the child's use of residual hearing as an important factor in how well the child understands and produces spoken language. Audiological management is, hence, an important consideration in this approach.

Parents of children with hearing impairments in Singapore who want an Oral Approach for their children have the option of enrolling them in the Canossian School for the Hearing Impaired (CSHI). The Directory of Services for the Disabled states that students at CSHI are taught using the Natural Auditory-Oral philosophy, which emphasises the use of audition. Children do not use sign language, unlike the children at SSD, the only other school for Deaf children in Singapore.

There are also hearing-impaired children in mainstream schools. These children access the school curriculum mainly through auditory input – using their residual hearing from hearing aids or cochlear implants. Some of the children may receive therapy for

language development through services such as CSHI's programme or the Listen and Talk Programme at the Singapore General Hospital. The Listen and Talk Programme uses the Auditory-Verbal Approach which helps children access speech and language primarily through auditory input. It aims to integrate children into mainstream schools so that their hearing peers can be good language models.

3.5.5 Total Communication

Bodner-Johnson (1996) describes Total Communication as a communication philosophy where signs, speech, gestures, speech-reading, amplification and/or finger-spelling may be used to provide linguistic input to Deaf children. Children taught using this approach are allowed to express themselves in the mode of their choice. The philosophy of Total Communication assumes that different children benefit from using different modalities in various situations. Thus, one description of Total Communication could be the simultaneous use of speech and signs to represent English. In this instance, manual systems used with Total Communication in the past include invented systems such as Signed English, SEE, Seeing Essential English and Linguistics of Visual English, amongst others. Another description could be the choice of sign or speech and the use of speech-reading and residual hearing for communication purposes.

Kuntze (1998) argues that an undercurrent of change is beginning to take shape in Deaf education. Research on bilingual education has shifted Deaf education towards a combination of ASL and English to help children access the curriculum better. Nover, Christensen and Cheng (1998) noted that in the US, many educators of the Deaf are turning to ASL for a linguistic foundation that would enhance the learning of English as a second language.

The present SSD was established in 1963 and offers classes from pre-school to primary six and is the only Deaf school that employs the Total Communication approach in Singapore. The School is managed by the Ministry of Education (which oversees all public education in Singapore) and, thus, follows the local mainstream education system. Speech therapy, audiological services and counselling are also provided at the school. Teachers at SSD utilise all potentially available resources of linguistic communication which may include sign, speech and amplification through the use of hearing aids in the classroom.

A 'no-voice' teaching method is used to reinforce the learning experience at the SSD. Participants learn through classroom instruction and role-play, as well as storytelling and handouts (SADeaf, 2008-2017). The same method of teaching applies to teaching and learning for SASL. Educators and learners are not permitted to use voice in the classroom so as to avoid the possible confusion of SASL and the spoken language, and to foster the development of expressive skills in students. All in-class teacher communication should be conducted in SASL. However, the teacher should not

demand that the learners express themselves in SASL until they have had ample, meaningful receptive exposure to the language.

3.6   Instructional Support to Deaf Education in Singapore

Regarding the literacy issues of Deaf children, Phua Su Yin (2003) states that, in Singapore, English is the main medium of instruction in schools. Key subjects, such as Mathematics and Science, are taught in English and examinations are taken in English. It is also the official language used in commerce and administration. English plays an important role in cross-cultural communication between the different ethnic groups in Singapore. Without a good grasp of English, opportunities for the Deaf population will remain limited (Phua Su Yin, 2003:25).

3.6.1   SEE 2 and Sign Language

SEE 2 is used as the language of instruction in class (Phua Su Yin, 2003). SEE 2 is a manually coded English sign system, meant to represent formal English language, with one sign for each morpheme. According to Gustason and Zawolkow (1993), SEE 2 was originally developed to help Deaf students improve their grasp of English. It was hoped that children exposed to English in a gestural mode would master the structure of the language better if complete sentences and formal syntax were signed.

Unlike SEE 2, sign languages do not always share the vocabulary and syntax of the equivalent local spoken language. Sign language is a visual gestural language that is based on the use of the hands, eyes, face, mouth and body. It may include the use of a manual alphabet. Deaf people all over the world are said to have their own native sign language (World Federation of the Deaf, 1993). However, since SEE 2 is essentially the English language coded in signs (SEE 2 merely substitutes signs for words in full English sentences), it is a version of English and not a sign language in its own right. At present, there is no official documentation of a native sign language in Singapore.

3.6.2   SEE 2 in Singapore Education

The use of SEE 2 in Singapore is complicated because not everyone understands or uses SSE. Deaf children who do not come from English-speaking homes are likely to struggle with SEE 2 as their parents are not able to communicate with them in this language. Not only are they deprived socially, they are like the children in Padden and Humphries' (1988) observation of Deaf children in the US lacking the adult models for learning a natural language. DTAs, like those used in South Africa, are not provided in the SSD. School should be a place for children to learn and develop intellectually, yet most of the SSD children have not mastered the medium of instruction, English.

3.7 International Approaches to Assessment in Sign Language

Internationally, the main skills that are assessed in Deaf education are receptive and expressive skills.

3.7.1 Assessment in Singapore

With regard to assessing Deaf children's language in Singapore, Phua Su Yin (2003) argues that assessing the language and literacy abilities of Deaf children provides educators and parents of Deaf children with more information to help promote these skills. Testing of the subject is carried out in the four major components of syntax, semantics, pragmatics and phonology. There are two ways of assessing Deaf children's language. The first includes predominantly standardised tests for language (usually administered by speech-language specialists) and the second includes informal sampling of language (conducted mostly by educators). Schirmer (2001) notes that the advantage of the former is the ease of administration and consistency of use, while the latter offers the best opportunity to understand the Deaf child's use of language within a natural setting and provides a better link to remediation strategies.

3.7.2 Assessment in Scotland

According to the Scottish Qualifications Authority (SQA) (2008; 2011 and 2016), when a candidate who uses sign is being assessed, the subject teacher and the educator of the Deaf will need to work closely together. Thus, the team assessment model is also encouraged in Scotland. For oral evidence, SQA (2008; 2011 and 2016) notes that the sign communicator (educator of the Deaf) provides the 'voice' for the learner's signed presentation to allow the subject teacher to access the content. SQA (2008; 2011 and 2016) also states that if a candidate who uses sign wishes to write their responses to an assessment they should be allowed to do so and it should be assessed in the same way as any other assessment. If a candidate who uses sign wishes to sign their responses to an assessment, then this should be filmed and a transcription produced for the assessor to mark (both the film and the transcription should be kept for verification purposes) (SQA, 2008; 2011 and 2016).

3.7.3 Research on Sign Language Assessment in the UK

In the UK most research on assessment has taken place in Bristol (Herman, 1998). Jansma (1994) evaluated the suitability of traditional methods for eliciting features of British Sign Language (BSL). The merits of three different tasks in producing morphosyntactically rich samples of children's BSL were investigated. The three assessment tasks were set up as follows:

- Children were asked to either retell a story after seeing a Deaf adult tell it in BSL
- Retell a cartoon story after viewing it, or

- Describe a story told in a picture

The results indicated that of the three tasks, the picture description task was least effective in producing verb modification. Many of the targeted verbs were not elicited at all or produced in unmodified forms. In addition, in retelling the story children referred directly to the picture, incorporating reference points to parts of it in their narrative, rather than setting up arbitrary locations in space, which is an important part of BSL grammar. The cartoon task provided most opportunities to apply grammatical mechanisms in BSL, suggesting that it was the story content here rather than the elicitation method itself, which was significant. The results suggest that materials used to elicit samples of BSL need to be carefully selected in order to produce a representative sample on which to base the assessment of children's BSL skills.

3.7.4   BSL Assessment Battery

The BSL assessment battery (Herman, 1998) developed at City University is the result of collaboration between three individuals: a speech and language therapist (a specialist within the field of deafness), an expert in BSL and sign linguistics, and a deaf researcher with considerable experience of working with Deaf children. It is designed to assess aspects of morphology and syntax in children aged three to eleven years and consider both receptive and expressive skills. Assessors are qualified and experienced in Deaf education and at least one must be a Deaf person.

The assessment battery includes the following assessment tasks:
- Picture naming task which identifies signs which vary from those used in the test
- The picture naming task is followed by a receptive assessment which has a video presentation format
    - Children watch Deaf adult signing instructions to them on video and respond by selecting the most appropriate picture from a choice of three or four in a picture booklet
    - The video format was designed to eliminate variation in presenting test items which emerged in the pre-pilot stages where a live presentation was used
    - In certain circumstances, the tester may present items live, e.g., when it is felt that vocabulary differences will interfere with the child's performance or when the child is unable to cope with responding to the video
    - The receptive test consists of 40 items, organized in order of difficulty, which assess children's knowledge of a range of BSL structures, e.g. negation, number/distribution, verb morphology and noun/verb distinction
    - Test time varies from 12 minutes for children able to work through the test without stopping the tape to 20 minutes for children who require more time to respond

- o Scoring is possible at two levels: pass/fail analysis which yields raw score (eventually to be converted to a standard score) and an error analysis which allows the tester to look in more detail at the pattern of response.

- Samples of signing are elicited in two subsequent tests
  - o Certain BSL structures are elicited using similar pictures to those of receptive test
  - o Initially the order of the test was varied but a problem arose in that use of this expressive test before the receptive test led to a great variation in the type of responses produced by the children
  - o By completing the receptive test first, children have a better idea of what is expected of them and the range of responses is constrained to those being targeted

- The final part of the assessment battery is a story recall task
  - o The child views a short video clip of three minutes duration involving two Deaf children acting out a story sequence, and then retells the story to a Deaf adult
  - o The particular story was selected because of its repetitive story-line which has a correspondingly light load on memory and its effectiveness in eliciting aspects of BSL grammar which relate to story-telling (e.g. role shift) and which extend across sections of discourse (e.g. setting up locations in space for use with verb morphology)
  - o A few questions are then asked to look at the child's ability to respond to selected 'wh-' questions
  - o Both expressive tests are video-recorded for later analysis

The BSL assessment battery has elements that are found in SASL assessment.

3.7.5   The BSL Receptive Skills Test

Developed in 1999 by Herman, Holmes and Woll this test is designed for children aged three to eleven years and focuses on selected aspects of morphology and syntax of BSL (pilot study conducted in the United Kingdom (UK) – Haug, Herman and Woll, 2015). The test consists of a vocabulary check and video-based receptive skills assessment consisting of 40 items, ordered by level of difficulty. In this assessment, the children see a signed stimulus and are then asked to select the right answer among the four multiple-choice answers that are provided as colour drawings in a booklet. The BSL Receptive Skills Test is presented to participants using DVD.

Due to regional variations in signs in the UK (a worldwide challenge), assessments normally contain two or more versions of the same task. For the BSL Receptive Skills Test, there is a version for the north of the UK and another for the south. Regional variations are also taken into account in assessment in South Africa. A glossary

explaining concepts in the test is added to the test question paper to account for provincial variations in concepts.

3.7.6 The Test of American Sign Language (TASL)

TASL has been developed within the framework of a larger cooperative research project investigating the relationship between ASL and English literacy skills (Prinz *et al.*, 1995; Strong and Prinz, 1997, 2000). TASL allows an in-depth investigation of specific linguistic structures and, thus, does not provide a screening mechanism for Deaf children. At the time of writing, TASL had been reported to have been used with 155 Deaf students aged 8 –15 years.

TASL consists of two production and four comprehension measures, administered individually:

a)   Production measures
    i.   Classifier Production Test: a short cartoon movie is shown to the test takers. The cartoon is then presented again in 10 segments. Participants are asked to sign each segment in ASL. The videotapes of their signed responses are scored for the presence of different size, shape and movement markers in the classifiers.
    ii.   Sign Narrative: pictures from a children's book (*Good dog Carl*; Day, 1996) without text are given to the participants with the task to tell a story using the pictures. Their signed versions of the story are videotaped and scored for the use of specific ASL grammar and narrative structures using a checklist.

b)   Comprehension measures
    i.   Story Comprehension: an ASL narrative presented by a native signer is shown on video. While watching the video, the participants are asked questions about the content. Their responses are videotaped.
    ii.   Classifier Comprehension Test: pictures of objects with a variety of visual features are shown to the participants. Next, they see a Deaf person describing each object in four different ways. Following these descriptions, participants are asked to select, from different video still frames in their text booklet, the description that best matches the picture stimulus.

3.7.7 Assessment Instrument for Netherlands Sign Language

In the Netherlands, the SLN was developed as a standardised language test for Deaf children in primary education. The Instrument tests both receptive and expressive skills (Hermans, Knoors, and Verhoeven, 2010) and can be considered as an instrument for in-depth investigation across different domains of language. The target group for this test is Deaf children aged four to twelve years old.

The SLN Assessment Instrument consists of nine different computerised tests that focus on receptive and expressive SLN skills across different domains, i.e. phonology, morpho-syntax and narrative skills. Not every test is expected to be appropriate for every age group, for example the receptive and phonology tests were only developed for the children 4 to 8 years old since it was expected that children older than 8 years have already mastered the phonological system of SLN (Hermans *et al.*, 2010). All expressive tasks are scored live by the test administrator, in order to keep avoid time-consuming analysis after the testing (Hermans *et al.*, 2010).

The final test version of the SLN assessment instrument contains the following tasks:

- *Receptive phonology task* (Video 1): In this task, two signs were shown one after the other on a computer screen. The signs were produced by two deaf native signers. Children were asked to decide whether or not the signs had the same meaning (press the green button with the mouse) or a different meaning (press the red button). A certain number of the signs are minimal pairs in SLN, and are different (predominantly) in respect to one phonological parameter: either the mouthing pattern, the handshape, or the movement. The rationale behind the task was that if children had not yet acquired this phonological parameter, they would have difficulties in discriminating these minimal pairs. The receptive phonology task consisted of 36 items.
- *Expressive phonology task:* The children's expressive phonological skills were assessed in an imitation task. In this task, a sign was presented on a computer screen. Children were instructed to repeat the sign. The test-administrator judged the correctness of one parameter of the sign produced by the child (e.g., handshape, movement, oral component). The test materials also included an information sheet for test the administrator on which the possible correct responses for each sign were depicted.
- *Receptive vocabulary task* (Video 2)*:* In the receptive vocabulary task, a sign was presented on the computer screen followed by four pictures. Children were asked to select the picture that matched the meaning of the sign, by using the computer's mouse. This test consisted of 61 items in total. One of the major problems in developing a sign language vocabulary test concerns the iconicity of signs (e.g., Jansma *et al.,* 1997; White and Tischler, 1999). The problem is that children who encounter a sign which they have not yet acquired may exploit the iconic features of the sign to correctly guess its meaning, and select the appropriate picture. The authors of this test used two strategies to reduce this problem: (1) distractors were added (pictures) that did not match the meaning of the target sign, but which resembled the shape of the target sign and (2) the picture that matched the target sign in meaning was drawn from such a perspective that its shapes no longer resembled the iconic features of the sign (Hermans *et al.*, 2010).
- *Narrative comprehension and production skills task:* The narrative comprehension and production skills of the children were assessed in two tasks. In the narrative comprehension task a story was presented in SLN. After each

story, four questions were presented in SLN on the screen, and children were instructed to answer these questions. Some of these questions referred to information mentioned in the stories. The test-administrator scored whether or not the children had correctly answered each question. The narrative comprehension task consisted of five stories and 20 questions. The average length of the stories was 53 seconds (range 39 – 83). In the narrative production task, a story was depicted on the screen. Children were instructed to watch the story. Then the depicted story disappeared from the screen, and children were asked to retell the story in SLN. The retelling of the story was scored live.

3.7.8   SASL Assessment

SASL learners are assessed continuously through term tests, mid-year and final examinations. SASL is also assessed in institutions of higher learning such as the University of the Witwatersrand, University of the Free State and Stellenbosch University.

The SASL assessment at the University of Free State involves:

- *A video camera is used to record the students' expressive skills (from the script) that the assessors mark as they would mark written scripts*
- *Receptive skills are assessed by the learners observing (listening with their eyes) and writing in spoken language what they perceive or understood the signed stimuli meant. This is marked in a traditional way*

At school learners are also video-recorded during the assessment of their expressive skills and this is done in Paper 3 – Recording. The learners' receptive skills are assessed under Visual Reading and Viewing learning outcome and this is done in Paper 2 – Literature.

Akach and Naude (no date) suggest that it could also be of value to develop a system to involve members of the Deaf community in the assessment of students during the training of the sign language students and sign language interpreters as they have first-hand experience of the language.

3.7.9   Challenges with Assessment in Deaf Education

Although some standardised tests have been developed, Mann and Marshall (2010) argue that the following will remain challenges in sign language assessment: the overall scarcity of available, standardised sign language tests, and limited time and resources available for sign language test development.

A study by Herman (in press) in relation to BSL indicates that speech and language therapists, teachers of the Deaf and a small portion of other Deaf and hearing professionals and parents are being involved in the assessment of the Deaf children's signing skills (Herman, 1998). However, much additional training is felt to be needed

to fulfil the role of assessor adequately. This encompasses high level training in BSL, knowledge of sign linguistics and language development in BSL, transcription skills and elicitation techniques (Herman, 1998). Similarities can be drawn between the British and the South African one in terms of training needs for assessment.

One of the schools visited for this study had two DTAs qualified in SASL education (SASL NQF Level 5). The literature indicates that trained Deaf adults have a role to play in the assessment process. However, few such individuals exist (Herman, 1998). Herman (1998) states that most hearing professionals working with Deaf children lack sufficient fluency in sign language, and few have knowledge of sign linguistics or sign language acquisition. He goes on to note that increasingly Deaf professionals have these skills but lack the experience in assessment which speech and language therapists possess. Research (Strong, 1988) also highlights the extent to which Deaf children are sensitive to the language skills of their interlocutor to the extent that modifications are made towards spoken language syntax where the listener is hearing with non-native signing skills. This emphasises further the need to involve Deaf people in the assessment of the sign language (Herman, 1998).

Sign language is widely used by both hearing and Deaf people. It is taught in numerous primary, secondary and post-secondary academic programmes as a second language, especially in the US. It is possible for the South African hearing learners to take SASL as FAL. One of the challenges indicated by the literature, including for Deaf children in South Africa, is the delay in first language (sign language) acquisition by Deaf learners born to hearing parents. This is also the case in South Africa. A large percentage of Deaf learners come from hearing families. These learners do not have full access to a sign language until after they have passed the most critical early ages of language acquisition. Acquiring a language for this special population is often a great challenge.

CHAPTER FOUR: METHODS

4.1   Introduction

This chapter discusses the research methods that were used in this research report. The focus was on the following research methods: instruments, data collection, target and accessible population, sample, and limitations.

4.2   Research Design

The SASL Project is largely located within the qualitative research paradigm and applies a case study approach involving the DBE (Item Development Unit), seven SASL schools for the Deaf selected from Gauteng Province and the University of the Witwatersrand.

A case study constitutes an important and useful means for gathering data in qualitative research. It is a technique the researcher uses to observe the characteristics of an individual unit, for example a school (as in this study), child or a community (Manion, 1990). Kahn (1989) maintains that a case study is a way of organising social data for viewing the social reality. The case studies for the research focused on seven schools for the Deaf from Gauteng Province.

4.3   Research Instruments and Data Collection

Data collection involved the following:

Literature review (including of the SASL HL CAPS) focusing on assessment processes and procedures for SASL as well as the quality assurance of the assessment of sign language by other countries.

Instrument construction took place on the following basis: teaching, learning assessment and quality assurance of assessments, that is, pre- and post-assessment moderation. Structured interviews that investigated the following aspects were constructed: teaching of SASL Home Language, activities that are part of the learners' signing skills, assessment of learners' signing skills, monitoring of the implementation of the annual assessment plan and quality assessment, internal moderation of assessments and the expertise required for teaching and assessing SASL Home language. Over and above, semi-structured interviews were conducted with certain individuals.

Key informant interviews took place to obtain detailed information relating to formal assessments, marking of scripts, moderation and verification of SBA, moderation of question papers, and verification of marking, monitoring and evaluation of the state of examination readiness, examination writing and marking. Face-to-face, one-on-

one and in-person interviews were conducted with the DBE (Item Development Unit) specialists and officials, experts from schools for the Deaf as well as experts from the University of the Witwatersrand. Interviews were also held with the SASL HL curriculum developers from the DBE.

Review of public documentation and audio-visual materials. For the latter, ethical considerations required that permission for use was granted before use. All the Gauteng Province schools that were visited gave permission for photos and videos to be taken.

Observation of teaching and assessment practices with the seven Deaf schools included in the study. During observation, the researcher's role remained one of an impartial, non-participatory observer.

The Umalusi Qualifications, Curriculum and Certification (QCC) Senior Manager, Executive Management and other experts in the field checked the validity and the reliability of the research instruments.

4.4   Targeted and Accessible Population

Muyangwa and Imenda (2006) defines a target population as the group of subjects to whom the findings of a given study can be generalised. In this study, thus, all schools offering SASL HL in South Africa constitute the target population. These schools form a natural grouping per province and per phase in respect of this research topic. In terms of the accessible population, this consisted of all schools offering SASL HL in Gauteng Province.

4.5   Research Sample

Non-probability sampling specifically known as convenience sampling was used to select schools. Convenience sampling "takes people or other units that are readily available for selection" (Leedy and Ormrod, 2005:206). This method was used to limit travel and any other associated and ad hoc costs that might be incurred. The most convenient sample for the research project were schools offering SASL HL in Gauteng Province. All seven schools for the Deaf in the Province participated.

CHAPTER FIVE: RESEARCH RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

5.1 Introduction

This chapter discusses the major results from data collected during fieldwork. The focus in this chapter is on the following aspects: teacher qualifications, teaching and learning, assessment and monitoring, internal and external moderation, sources of expertise, management of mark lists, teachers' training recommendations for SASL Home Language moderators, accommodations or concessions and challenges. Participants were teachers and principals from seven schools for the Deaf in Gauteng Province, the DBE and the Gauteng DOE Head Office, and academics from the University of the Witwatersrand.

5.2 Results and Discussion of Findings

Seven schools for the Deaf were visited in Gauteng Province. Of these, two had Grade 9 as the highest grade, two Grade 10 and three had Grade 11. One of the schools has a Grade 10 bridging class. In 2018, Gauteng Province will have two schools with learners writing SASL HL examinations at exit level (Grade 12). Two schools offer Grade 12 over two years because of slow pace in learning. One of these schools will write SASL Home Language in 2019 and another will write SASL Home language in 2020 since its learners started SASL Home Language in Grade 10 in 2017.

5.2.1 Teacher Qualifications

It is clear that regarding teacher qualifications expertise in relation to SASL qualifications is lacking. This is a worldwide challenge. Referring to ASL, Newell (1995:27) comments "Certification is another indicator of involvement in the profession. The percentage of certified to non-certified teachers remains low". Kanda and Fleischer (1988:193) suggest that the answer to the question, "What makes one qualified to teach ASL?" includes the following:

Linguistic and cultural competence undergirded by interaction with members of the Deaf community and accompanied by proper attitudinal characteristics are prerequisites. In addition, an ASL teacher should be educated, demonstrating knowledge and application of educational and pedagogical principles along with formal study of the language being taught. Sign language teachers should be able to integrate second language teaching theory and methodology in their classrooms. They should be engaged in activities leading to personal and professional growth and development.

The above statement provides some valuable guidelines for selecting sign language teachers. Referring to ASL, Reagan (2002), further provides the following characteristics of a sign language teacher:

The individual, first and foremost, must be a fluent user of ASL, and must be able to demonstrate a high level of contact with and integration in the Deaf community. He or she must also have some degree of formal training in ASL; native speakers may well become outstanding teachers, but formal study of the language is nonetheless necessary, especially in a case such as ASL where the linguistic norms of the language are not always clear-cut. Pedagogical training also plays a key part here; mere knowing a language well does not always translate into effective second language teaching.

Luckner (1991) argues that the issue of teacher's sign language skills is fundamental to the failure to educate Deaf children. Lane, Hoffmeister and Bahan (1996); Vernon and Daigle (1994); Woodward and Allen (1987) maintain that the poor quality of discourse in Deaf classrooms is because the overwhelming majority of teachers do not possess the ASL (or any other relevant sign language) competence needed to instruct Deaf children effectively. Yet hearing teachers, most of whom are not fluent ASL users, continue to dominate the educational process (Simms and Thumann, 2007). This preponderance of teachers lacking in ASL fluency limits the visual-spatial benefits that develop in natural language to minimise the transmission of information visually.

Simms and Thumann (2007) note that one reason for the inadequacy of teachers' ASL skills is that many in American society find it difficult to see Deaf people as members of a linguistic minority. For teachers, this translates into large numbers being unaware of the linguistic differences between ASL and English-based sign systems. In addition, the privileging of English over ASL causes many teachers to change ASL from a rich, fully formed language to a manually coded version of English. For this reason, in South Africa SASL HL is strictly promoted over Signed English or any other spoken language. In other countries, like Singapore, they have SEE. This dilutes the purity and the linguistics of sign language. To overcome these risks of dilution, it is important that teacher preparation programmes adequately instil sign language proficiency (fluency) in their students. The DBE provides ongoing workshops and training for SASL teachers as does the University of the Witwatersrand.

5.2.2 Teaching and Learning

Teachers commented that many newly admitted learners arrive at school with no language. Learners use gestures at home and acquire language only later at school. This observation is in agreement with the literature on SASL. Morgan, Glaser and Magongwa (2016:20) argue that "for most Deaf learners SASL is not used at home due to the reluctance of family members to acknowledge and use SASL; it is the language that the Deaf learners acquire from other Deaf learners and adults at school". It has also been observed that CODAs are more proficient with SASL HL as compared with learners that are born to hearing parents.

The implementation of SASL HL needs teachers with both teaching and SASL skills, however the literature indicates that "there is a lack of qualified Deaf teachers to teach SASL as a result of barriers to tertiary education and teacher training for Deaf South Africans" (Morgan, Glaser and Magongwa, 2016:20). In the absence of a qualified Deaf teacher, the Curriculum Management Team (appointed by the Minister of Basic Education in 2010) proposed a bilingual-bicultural team teaching model following Akach (2010) in which a hearing teacher is paired with a DTA. In this model, the DTAs have expertise in SASL and the qualified hearing teachers in teaching methodologies, classroom practice and the English-based curriculum (Morgan, Glaser and Magongwa, 2016).

The schools observed in this study are using the team teaching model from FP to FET Phase. The DTAs are employed as teaching assistants and as teachers, but they also serve as role models for the promotion of SASL. Morgan, Glaser and Magongwa (2016) maintain that it is important to provide proficient, deaf SASL role models to Deaf learners. For cultural reasons, it also imperative that no hearing teachers teach SASL alone. Furthermore, Morgan, Glaser and Magongwa (2016) argue that the reality on the ground is that most hearing teachers are not native sign language users and do not have the linguistic proficiency to teach SASL HL on their own. The DTA are often proficient and fluent sign language users and are able to position signs, use facial expressions and formulate sentences clearly and to high standards.

All the schools that were visited follow the SASL HL CAPS curriculum which has four learning outcomes: Observing and Signing, Visual Reading and Viewing, Recording, and Language Structure. The findings show that SASL HL is the LOLT in all the schools that were observed. In some schools, teaching and learning takes place through PowerPoint presentations. Teaching and learning focuses on the SASL Parameters including: reading, viewing, comparing, phonological awareness and the structure of the language syntax.

The teaching philosophy for SASL HL is based on three key principles outlined by Akach, Aarons and Matabane (2007b):

- Students learn the language best when the language is presented in context
- Students retain the language best when activities are meaningful and experiential
- Students develop comprehension skills more quickly than expressive skills

Akach, Aarons and Matabane (2007b) further argue that lessons must be designed to be presented in SASL, avoiding the use of voice, written English or glosses, and teachers are encouraged to always sign slightly beyond what they think is the students' expressive ability. Reagan (2002) states that voicing, or using spoken language at the same time that one signs, or even simply mouthing the words of the spoken language, takes place as a mandatory feature of manual sign codes and is generally an option in contact sign languages. Reagan (2002) further maintains that

for a variety of reasons, including differences in word order, it is not possible to use a natural sign language in conjunction with spoken language. Thus, voicing and the use of sign language are generally mutually exclusive activities.

With regard to the nature of the lexical items, Reagan (1986) maintains that individual signs can be either conceptual or word-based in nature. In natural sign languages and contact sign languages, signs are generally conceptual in nature. That is, a given sign will correspond to a specific concept in another language. Depending on the usage and context, the ASL sign CONTROL, for instance, can be translated into English as "control," "manage," administer," "govern," "operate'" "regulate'" or even "manipulate." On the other hand, there are instances in which the spoken language uses a single word to express a number of different concepts. In such situations, one finds that conceptually-based signs in natural language may be more precise than the spoken language allows. In ASL, for example, the English word "run" requires different signs for each of the following contexts:

- Run in race
- Run for Congress
- A run in a stocking
- To run a business
- Running water
- A running engine
- A runny nose

In other words, if one is trying to manually encode English, all of the different signs for "run" will be collapsed into a single sign. Similarly, if English requires separate words for "control", "govern" and so on, then the manual sign code must find a way to represent each of these terms as a separate lexical item (Baker and Padden, 1978). Word Order, presence or Absence of Inflectional Markers

In SASL HL, the sentence is glossed, meaning it is written in capital letters or block letters to indicate that the sentence is signed. The order in which lexical items occur in a natural sign language differs from word order in a spoken language, just as word order varies among different spoken languages. SASL HL does not follow the normal English grammatical order rather the subject, object, verb (SOV). For example,

- English HL: "I am going to town."
- SASL HL: "ME TOWN GO." – SOV order and the sentence is glossed.

- English HL: "The boy talks to the girl."
- SASL HL: "BOY GIRL TALK-TO."

- English HL: "The girl talks to the boy."
- SASL HL: "GIRL BOY TALK-TO."

- English HL: "I like pizza but I don't like cheese."
- SASL HL: "ME PIZZA LIKE BUT CHEESE DON'T LIKE."

- English HL: "Do you like pizza or hamburgers?"
- SASL HL: "YOU PIZZA LIKE OR HAMBURGERS?"

- English HL: "I like pizza and hamburgers."
- SASL HL: "ME PIZZA HAMBURGER LIKE."

- English HL: "I like pizza because it is delicious."
- SASL HL: "ME PIZZA LIKE WHY? DELICIOUS."

(South African Sign Language Training Manual, 2017:23)

Regarding inflectional markers, Reagan (2002) states that manual codes designed to represent English will contain inflectional markers for such morphological items as *-ing, -s* (plural), *-'s* (possessive), *-ed*, and so on. Further grammatical irregularities in spoken language will be maintained in the manual sign code, as in the use of distinct, initialised signs for *"am," "is,"* and *"are."* Such inflectional markers are absent in natural sign languages altogether, and are only rarely used in contact sign languages.

For hearing children, the third-person singular *–s*, plural *–s*, past tense *–ed* and progressive *–ing* are considered the most important among the morphological errors, according to James (1998). Shaughnessy (1977) observed that all learners of English learn *–s* more successfully when it is syllabic, and thus, more salient. James (1998) noted that this is phonological in cause but grammatical in effect. Shaughnessy (1977) also found that the plural *–s* is often omitted when preceded by quantifiers and other numerals.

Mogford (1988) found that Deaf children use mostly content words (like nouns and verbs) and fewer function words (such as conjunctions, auxiliaries, prepositions and pronouns). These function words, which are not often used, are less familiar to them and hence the children are more prone to committing errors when using them. Quigley and King (1982) found that Deaf children have particular difficulties with the morphology of English, especially verb and noun inflections. Citing the work of Taylor (1969), where the written productions of Deaf children up to 16 years of age were examined, morphemes were noted to be difficult for children even at this advanced age.

Schools use DVDs from SLED for language structure. Learners watch and observe a signed story from the video and thereafter relate the story through signing whilst being videoed. One of the schools indicated that teachers use textbooks borrowed from English HL. There are no SASL HL textbooks. Reagan (2002) maintains, in reference to ASL, that it is important to emphasise that the teaching of ASL requires carefully designed texts and materials intended for the teaching of ASL. Whatever textbook is chosen, the curriculum of the ASL course should reflect four broad areas: grammatical

features of ASL, the lexicon of ASL, practice with ASL conversational skills and cultural awareness (Cokely and Baker-Shenk, 1980). The same requirement applies for SASL HL.

5.2.3 Assessment and Monitoring

The finding show that the learners' signing skills are assessed through Recording, Observing and Signing, and Visual Reading and Viewing. All assessments are recorded and rubrics are used for marking. No pen and paper were used during the assessment of SASL HL. One of the schools observed used a hard copy question paper and learners signed the answers. This situation is not ideal for SASL HL assessments. Preferably, learners should have access to laptops with webcams and all questions should be signed and recorded using the laptops. In all of the schools observed, SASL HL assessment takes place in a SASL laboratory and both the qualified hearing teacher and DTA are present.

Teachers stated that SBA portfolios are kept electronically using memory sticks and on computer hard drives by the teachers. The memory sticks are retained by the school for security reasons. The teachers' files are kept as hard copies (memo) and digital copies of question papers. The learners' files are kept as hard copies marked answer sheets and digital copy of answers.

Haug *et al.* (2016) provides some useful commentary regarding SBA portfolios including:

- They note the merits of creating a language portfolio for each child to include reports, observations and scores from assessments collected over time as well as language background
- They also recommend creating a scoring grid to assess language competency and fluency that can be used cross-linguistically (i.e. for sign and spoken languages) and this should link up to learning outcomes

Haug et al (2016) also give some useful advice on the involvement of children in the assessments/ giving feedback:

a. Older children can be involved in understanding the results of their assessments
b. They can be involved in discussions about new targets for them to achieve and how they can achieve those new targets
c. It would be excellent for them to see their own progress over time and reflect on their own language skills

Haug, et al, (2016) posit that there should be several learning outcomes from assessing the child. They further assert that schools may aim to assess both academic achievement and language proficiency (the two aren't necessarily the same). Assessing academic achievement covers curriculum-related aspects, which may not

be appropriate for all Deaf children. Assessing language proficiency tests level of language fluency and it should be possible to see individual progress over time. In the same notion, Reagan (2008) states that sign language can be used effectively to teach both academic content and literary skills in the spoken language, and finally, for Deaf children as for all children.

5.2.4   Internal and External Moderation

During the school visits, it was found that schools were using their own pre- and post-moderation tools which differed from school to school. It was only at the national SASL teacher training conducted by the DBE in 2017 that teachers were given pre- and post-assessment moderation tools to use during moderation. Some schools have SATs that are responsible for the quality assurance of the internal assessment and moderation. In some schools, teachers teaching senior classes/grades moderate question papers for teachers teaching junior classes/grades.

Information provided by one of the national examiners for SASL HL indicates that internal moderation at school level is usually done by the HOD or another SASL teacher. The requirement is that the moderator should have SASL HL proficiency and knowledgeable about phase-specific content. The tools for internal moderations (SASL pre- and post-assessment moderation) were circulated to SASL HL teachers nationwide to use during moderation.

Regarding national or provincial external moderation, the examiner indicated that there is a challenge regarding the appointment of national external moderators by the DBE. There are no provincial or national SASL HL Subject Advisors so the DBE is using the spoken language subject advisors in the interim. South Africa only has three SASL HL Provincial Officials (KwaZulu-Natal, Western Cape and Gauteng Provinces).

The SASL HL CAPS document indicates that moderation should be implemented at school, provincial and national levels (DBE, 2014b, 2014c and 2014d). The document further states that comprehensive and appropriate moderation practices must be in place for the quality assurance of all subject assessments and this should be done at least once per term. Moderation should ensure that all assessments are valid, fair, reliable and sufficient (DBE, 2014b, 2014c and 2014d). Furthermore, the CAPS clearly stipulates the following (DBE, 2014b, 2014c and 2014d):

> Moderators at school level must give quality comments based on the requirements above to ensure that the assessment practice at school is enhanced. Moderation cannot simply be a monitoring exercise to check that the number of tasks has been done or that a memorandum has been applied correctly. In SASL it means that the moderator will give good comments, among other things, on the levels of questioning in comprehension testing; the frequency of extended recording; the quality of assessment instruments and the developmental opportunities afforded

and the teacher's engagement with learners' recorded work as evidence of performance.

The moderation of Observing and Signing is the same as the moderation of orals in other spoken HLs. However, the moderation practice in schools is at odds with the Policy Statement as it is not happening at provincial and national levels. Likewise, checklist and tick-box (yes or no) instruments are used for school level moderation even though the SASL HL CAPS (DBE, 2014b and 2014c) clearly states "moderation cannot simply be a monitoring exercise to check that the number of tasks has been done or that a memorandum has been applied correctly". The external moderation procedure exists to ensure that students from different schools and provinces receive comparable grades for comparable work and that the same standards apply from year to year.

Regarding pre-assessment moderation of the assessment tasks, Haug *et al.* (2016:4) provide the following guidelines:

Determine that the test's technical and user documentation provides sufficient information to enable evaluation of the following:

a.   *Coverage and representativeness of test content, representative norm groups, difficulty level of content, etc.*
b.   *Accuracy of measurement and reliability demonstrated with respect to relevant populations*
c.   *Validity (demonstrated with respect to relevant populations) and relevance for the required use*
d.   *Freedom from systematic bias in relation to the intended test taker groups*
e.   *Practicality, including time required, costs, and resource needs*
f.   *Avoid judging a test solely on the basis of face value, test-user testimonials, or advice from those with a vested commercial interest*

(Adapted from Haug *et al*, 2016:4)

The SASL HL CAPS document states that moderation should ensure that all assessments are valid, fair, reliable and sufficient. The task must measure the level of achievement of specific skills. Moderation cannot simply be a monitoring exercise to check that the number of tasks has been done or that a memorandum has been applied correctly. When assessed against these criteria, the pre-assessment moderation tool circulated by the DBE needs some improvement to make it fit for purpose as a monitoring tool. Furthermore, the pre-assessment moderation tool does not use the cognitive levels for a language. These cognitive levels are a combination of the 1956 version of the Bloom Taxonomy and the 2001 version of the revised Bloom Taxonomy. According to the

SASL HL CAPS document, the required cognitive levels are Literal, Reorganisation, Inference, Evaluation and Appreciation.

Moderators at school level must give quality comments based on the requirements above to ensure that the assessment practice at school is enhanced. Moderation cannot simply be a monitoring exercise to check that the number of tasks has been done or that a memorandum has been applied correctly. In SASL HL, this means that the moderator will comment on the levels of questioning in comprehension testing; the frequency of extended recording; the quality of assessment instruments and the developmental opportunities afforded and the teacher's engagement with learners' recorded work as evidence of performance (DBE, 2014c:55).

5.2.5   Sources of Expertise

Data from the schools relating to sources of expertise to moderate the assessment tasks indicate that Deaf schools from the Gauteng Province draw their expertise from the University of the Witwatersrand and SLED. The University of the Witwatersrand and the University of the Free State are the only two universities in the country currently offering SASL training to teachers (Reagan, 2008).

In terms of expertise for internal moderation, the HODs, and in some schools the principals, do pre- and post-assessment moderation of the SBAs. Teachers also moderate each other's work. However, the lack of qualified SASL HL teachers means this expertise is spread very thinly. Some schools draw additional expertise from teachers for other subjects such as English HL; however such teachers can only moderate the written form of the assessment since they are neither fluent in sign language nor sign language experts. Some schools have teachers that are qualified in special needs education or inclusive education but with no specialisation in Deaf education or in SASL. One school had three qualified DTAs, two with SASL NQF Level 5 and one had a BEd Honours in Deaf Education and SASL NQF level 6. Some schools rely on DTAs as native and fluent signers to do the moderation of the SBA tasks. Teachers in one of the schools visited confessed that they were unsure if they are moderating the assessment tasks correctly and would value some guidance in this regard.

5.2.6   Management of Mark Lists

HODs and principals moderate mark sheets and check if marks are correctly entered into the mark lists. Teachers stated that marks are weighted and captured into the mark lists. Schools use the SA-SAMS or administration system to capture marks for SASL HL assessments and assist teachers to follow assessment guidelines provided in the SASL CAPS. In some schools, mark lists are checked during the class visits.

5.2.7 Recommendations for Training of SASL Home Language Moderators

It has been mentioned elsewhere in this report that expertise in SASL HL is lacking. In this regard, teachers also indicated the need to train SASL HL moderators at school level with the following training areas identified:

- PGCE qualification with the University of Witwatersrand
- Competency in sign language
- Signing skills level five qualification
- Knowledge of SASL
- Didactics of teaching SASL HL
- Experience in teaching sign language
- Interpreting skills
- More training in SASL HL literature e.g. poetry is needed for teachers
- Intensive knowledge of SASL CAPS curriculum and knowledge of SBA requirements
- Know SASL as HL and different dialects that are used
- Knowledge of SASL linguistics and should have attended moderation courses
- Fluency in SASL HL
- Ongoing workshops, training and networking with teachers from other schools in Gauteng Province

The above list is a summary of the training requirements for moderators as proposed by teachers working hands-on with SASL HL teaching.

Gauteng Department of Education's views on assessment

An interview with the Gauteng DOE officials responsible for inclusive education in the Province was held as part of this research. The Gauteng DOE Head Office officials interviewed conceded that, with the exception of the subject teachers, the Department lacks SASL expertise. They promote networking amongst the teachers as a means of mitigating this. Regarding the form of training required by SASL HL moderators, they indicated that moderators need training on the principles of moderation, understanding the purpose and the process of moderation, and need to understand the nature of SASL HL.

The Department also made the following recommendations for Umalusi:

- Umaluisi should draw the SASL experts from Universities, provinces and/or schools for external moderation of the assessment/examination question papers at exit point or Grade 12 level
- A panel of moderators is encouraged for SASL HL moderation
- The provincial SASL HL project coordinators should be part of the panel because of their expertise in the language

- Umalusi will also need consultants who are experts in SASL to do the monitoring of the state of readiness as well as the writing and the marking phases

Department of Basic Education's views on assessment

A meeting with the DBE was organised with the aim of establishing a common understanding in regard to the management and assessment of SASL HL. The following is a summary of what transpired from the meeting with national SASL HL examiners and DBE officials. They indicated that the estimated number of centres for SASL HL examinations in 2018 will be 24. Some schools have introduced a Grade 10 bridging class for SASL HL. These schools will write SASL HL for matric in 2019. It was also indicated that provinces do not have SASL HL subject advisors. The DOE, likewise, also does not have subject advisors or subject experts for SASL HL. Hence, no physical monitoring is currently happening. The current recommendation is to get SASL HL subject advisors to assist with the SASL HL basics and to support teaching and learning.

In terms of the consideration of different dialects in question paper setting, the examiners are developing a glossary for each question paper for SASL HL to cater for different variations. The glossary explains concepts in the question paper, however every candidate should understand standardised signing for assessment purposes. In addition, the examination panel consists of persons from all nine provinces for purposes of standardisation of SASL HL question papers. It was also noted that when setting question papers, examiners require the assistance of a Deaf person for the signing of questions, with the exception of CODA examiners who may not require this.

University of the Witwatersrand's views on assessment

A discussion on SASL took place with two officials from the University of the Witwatersrand. The meeting promoted the idea of using academics with a linguistic understanding of SASL as examiners and moderators and to take the lead in setting a national standard.

The shortage of SASL qualified Deaf people was raised during the discussion. High levels of variation in SASL HL were also noted as a challenge. In this regard, there should be a study on variations to establish the most commonly used signs in South Africa. According to Akach and Morgan (1999), there is no detailed linguistic analysis of variations, which gives rise to the misperception that there are many different sign languages in South Africa as a result of variation at the lexical level. Akach and Naude (not dated) states that it has been observed that variation in vocabulary does not prevent coherent communication among the Deaf. Akach and Naude further maintain that Deaf people all over the country watch the same signers on television shows, which will also contribute to the standardisation of SASL across regions and ethnic groups.

Other important points raised included: the need to focus on developing Comprehension and Narration skills in SASL as well as poetry teaching skills in educators. The interview participants affirmed the team teaching model as a solution for Deaf education in South Africa.

5.3   Accommodations or Concessions

Government Gazette, No. 37652, 16 May 2014, indicates that, depending on the severity of the barrier experienced, the following accommodations or concessions can be made available at the discretion of the Provincial Assessment Committee: adaptation of questions, additional time, computer, oral examination, reader, rest breaks, scribe, separate venue, sign language interpreter, spelling, and video/DVD recorder/webcam. However, not all these accommodations/concessions apply to SASL HL candidates. The following are the approved accommodations for SASL HL candidates:

- Extra time – 30 minutes
- Sign language Interpreter

Other accommodations may apply for other subjects (Geography, Life Sciences, etc.) such as adaptation of questions, use of video, DVD recorder and webcam.

Regarding the matter of extra time, SQA (2008; 2011 and 2016) maintains that it is important that teachers, assessors and invigilators understand the candidates' or learners' needs. Appropriate evidence can be gathered from class work and from class assessments to help the teacher or the assessor to determine how much extra time will be needed in assessment, and where appropriate, eventually for prelims and the external examination (SQA, 2008; 2011 and 2016). The following points should be remembered when considering extra time (SQA, 2008; 2011 and 2016):

- Give candidates sufficient time to complete their assessments and, where they wish, to review their signed assessment responses
- Allow yourself (invigilator or technical expert) extra time for the technical requirements involved when candidates review their signed assessment responses (this time does not count towards the time allowed for the assessment concerned)

However, in regard to candidate fatigue SQA (2008; 2011 and 2016) maintains that assessments that last for more than three hours can cause tiredness and may ultimately disadvantage the candidate.

5.4   Challenges

Some of the challenges raised by the participating schools for the Deaf include: skills shortages, lack of support from education districts, diversity in classes, learners with little or no language on admission, etc. Teachers also indicated that having one service provider (SLED) in the country is not enough.

The Chief Examiner shared the following envisaged challenges for SASL HL during the information-sharing meeting at Umalusi:

- Technical Readiness
  - Teacher training/technical person
  - Compatibility issue – question papers
  - PowerPoint question papers may not work for some laptops – IT challenge
  - Storage – memory sticks, CD (video clips)
- Environmental Readiness
  - Layout of the examination rooms
  - Lighting
  - There should be no direct light from outside through the window
  - Reduction of distractors
- Human Resources
  - No provincial/national subject advisors for SASL HL

Regarding the school-based internal moderation, the Chief Examiner stated that this is usually done by HODs or other SASL HL teachers. She mentioned that schools do have pre- and post-internal moderation tools and that there are no SASL provincial/national moderators or subject advisors. The interim measure to date has been to use the spoken language subject advisors.

The Chief Examiner also indicated that the guidelines for Practical Assessment Tasks for SASL HL are the same as those for English HL. Guidelines for SBA are available. Teacher's file should be a hard copy with memoranda and the teacher should also have a digital copy that contains his/her SBA work. The learner's file should be a hard copy with marked answer sheets. The learner should also have a digital copy of the answers.

CHAPTER SIX: RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1   Introduction

This report presents the areas of good practice, areas of concern and recommendations for best practice. The aim of the research was to establish a common understanding regarding the assessment and the quality assurance of assessment of SASL HL, and to provide guidance to Umalusi about its role in the quality assurance of the SASL Home Language SBAs and examinations at exit level (Grade 12). The scope of the SASL HL Project included, amongst other things, how Deaf learners are assessed and what kind of resources and materials are required for this assessment. The scope of the research further included visiting schools for Deaf learners and visiting the Gauteng Department of Education.

6.2   Areas of Good Practice

Good practices were recognised in almost all schools for the Deaf. The following are highlighted.

- All schools for the Deaf that were observed follow CAPS for SASL Home Language;
- They promote bilingualism;
- They use SASL HL as LOLT from Grade R to Grade 12 and English as LOL from Grade 4 to Grade 12 as recommended by the CAPS policy;
- The entire classroom communication is in SASL Home Language. Teachers do not use voice in the classroom and this helps to avoid the possible confusion of SASL and the spoken language;
- Learners are also not permitted to use voice in the classroom. This restriction fosters the development of expressive skills in the learners;
- The majority of the learners have laptops with webcam;
- Team teaching model has been adopted and all schools have DTAs;
- Teachers use text-based approach to teaching and learning;
- Some schools had all teachers qualified to teach SASL Home Language;
- Some schools have qualified Deaf professionals (qualified to teach SASL);
- Some schools have qualified DTAs (have a qualification in SASL teaching);
- Internal moderation of assessment if done by HoDs, subject heads and/or peer educators; and
- The Witwatersrand University supports teachers (training and workshops) and SLED support schools with resources such as DVDs; and
- The teacher should bring in the DTA functions as a role model in team teaching.

6.3   Areas of Concern

Some concerns have yet to be addressed especially the concerns that relate to assessment and quality assurance of assessment. The following are highlighted:

- Teacher preparation for SASL Home Language teaching is an area that needs special attention. In schools for the Deaf that were observed, the highest qualification teachers have is an honours degree and the lowest qualification is Post Graduate Certificate in Education (PGCE) SASL. The highest qualification for the DTAs is an honours degree and the lowest is Grade 9 (Standard 7);
- One of the schools had almost all teachers not qualified to teach SASL Home Language including DTAs;
- Teaching, learning and assessment resources have to be improved. The SASL laboratories/examination rooms needs some improvements in some schools;
- SASL Home Language subject advisors have to be appointed. Provincial and national moderation of SBA should take place as recommended by SASL Home Language CAPS policy.

6.4   Recommendations

The research focused mainly on the assessment and the quality of assurance of assessment of SASL HL at school, provincial and national levels. However, the research findings indicate that currently no quality assurance of the assessment tasks is taking place at provincial and national levels. The research also focused on the type of resources and materials needed for SASL HL assessments. The research findings revealed that SASL HL is taught in specialised classrooms and assessed in laboratories with private spaces or cubicle for each candidate. The section that follows provides recommendations for the improvement of the management of SASL HL assessments and the quality assurance thereof.

The findings of the study have been presented and discussed in previous chapters. The recommendations that follow are drawn from engaging with the findings of this research and the challenges that were raised by the SASL HL teachers. This study makes the following recommendations:

Internal moderation

- SASL HL like other languages uses Barret's Taxonomy and not Bloom's Taxonomy, however, a combination of the two taxonomies is recommended.

External moderation

- For the delivery of the SASL Home Language curriculum, the DBE also encourages a team-teaching model. A panel or team of external moderators is

encouraged for SASL HL moderation. Each panel or team should comprise one Deaf SASL academic and two qualified SASL hearing professionals.

Training (Umalusi staff)

- It is recommended that Umalusi should give staff members basic training in SASL, especially those that will be dealing with question paper moderation, monitoring and evaluation as well as management of assessments in SASL HL.

Expertise

- The SASL HL CAPS is currently (in 2016 – 2017) not fully implemented in regard to moderation of the assessment tasks. The Policy Statement notes that moderation should be implemented at school, provincial and national levels. It further states that the provincial subject advisor should moderate a sample of the Grade 10 and 11 tests and examinations during school visits to verify the standard of the tasks and internal moderation. However, the DOE indicated that there are no provincial and national subject advisors for SASL HL. Schools for the Deaf also indicated that they do not get support from the district office of education because there is no expertise in the field, other than the SASL HL teachers.
- It is recommended that the DBE must appoint SASL HL provincial subject advisors since there are relatively few schools for the Deaf in South Africa and subject advisors are required by the SASL HL CAPS for IP, SP and FET Phase to moderate samples of tests and examinations to verify the standard of the tasks and internal moderation from 2018 going forward.
- The SASL HL teachers should all be qualified in SASL HL and/or in Deaf education. Both the literature reviewed and comments from the teachers and DBE officials interviewed emphasise that assessors and moderators should be qualified, experienced, know the linguistics of the subject and also involve qualified Deaf SASL specialists.
- In addition, the SASL teachers should be trained in SASL literature on an ongoing basis. Both the literature and DOE officials raised the need for teacher training in SASL literature.

Teacher development

- Regarding teaching and learning, the literature indicates that "there is a lack of qualified Deaf teachers to teach SASL as a result of barriers to tertiary education and teacher training for Deaf South Africans" (Morgan, Glaser and Magongwa, 2016:20). SASL teacher development should be prioritised and should include training in literature and the teaching of poetry, drama and short stories.

Assessment and question paper moderation

- The following expertise should be involved during test development or examination question paper setting: native signers (could be qualified Deaf academics or qualified CODAs) and qualified, hearing SASL professionals.
- Teaching, learning and assessment should help learners develop the following skills: comprehension, narrative, receptive and expressive skills. To achieve this, teachers should use text-based approach more frequently during teaching and learning with the use of DVDs and other resources.
- Discrepancies in the different assessment methods for SASL HL should be addressed. It is recommended that these be aligned to make use of only sign language with questions presented via laptops and answers recorded on laptops with webcams. No paper and pen should be used. This should be the practice from the FP to the FET Phase.

Marking

- The SASL markers should be fluent signers and should include Deaf persons.
- Marking should be done at national level because the number of candidates will always be very small as there are only a few schools for the Deaf in the country.

Technical

- The DBE should ensure that resources, such as the SASL laboratory, are technologically flawless and ready for the first Grade 12 SASL HL examination in 2018. Since SASL is a visual gestural language, this recommendation has significant implications for assessment. The lack of resources to accommodate this in some schools has been raised as a challenge.
- Each school should have a technical person to deal with any technological challenges that may arise while the SASL examinations are in progress.
- The DBE must appoint technical experts to deal with the editing of question papers that are developed in PowerPoint.

SASL FAL

- The curriculum for SASL FAL should be developed and be introduced in the mainstream schools so that hearing people can also communicate with Deaf people.

6.5   Conclusion

The introduction of the SASL Home Language goes some way towards addressing the injustices of the past in Deaf education. The literature study has revealed that after the 1880 Milan Congress the oralism approach was exclusively used in Deaf

80

education. This was an attempt to eradicate Sign Language; however, Deaf people did not stop signing to one another.   The SASL Home Language is cementing Sign Language as a language of instruction in Deaf education. The team-teaching model and other approaches such as the text-based approach, bilingualism as indicated by the SASL Home Language CAPS policy were found to be of a good standard and in line with international practice. However, teacher qualifications remain a challenge for Deaf education in South Africa (and worldwide), although some schools do have qualified SASL Deaf professionals (teachers) and also qualified DTAs. Teaching, learning and assessment resources is another challenge that need to be addressed. For assessment, some schools use question papers (hard copies) and others use signed questions in the learners' laptops with webcams. The former practice is not encouraged. With enough resources, Deaf learners should learn to respond to or answer signed questions.

REFERENCES

Aarons, D. and Akach, P. 2002a. *South African Sign Language: One language or many?* In: R. Mesthrie (ed.), Language in South Africa, 127-147, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Aarons, D. and Akach, P. 2002b. Inclusive and Deaf child in South African education. *Perspective in Education 20(1):153-170.*

Akach, P. 2010. Application of South African Sign Language (SASL) in a Bilingual-Bicultural Approach in Education of the Deaf. PhD. Dissertation submitted to the University of the Free State.

Akach, P., Aarons, D. and Matabane, E. 2007a. *Signing Naturally.* Student Manual and Workbook Level 1. South African Sign Language. A Communicative Approach. University of the Free State, Bloemfontein.

Akach, P., Aarons, D. and Matabane, E. 2007b. *Signing Naturally.* Teachers Curriculum Guide Level 1. South African Sign Language. A Communicative Approach. University of the Free State, Bloemfontein.

Akach, P., Aarons, D. and Matabane, E. 2007c. *Signing Naturally.* Student Videotext Level 1. South African Sign Language. A Communicative Approach. University of the Free State, Bloemfontein.

Antia, S. 2014. "Deaf and Hard-of-Hearing Students in the Mainstream." *Raising and Educating Deaf Children.* N.p., 23 Oct. 2013. Web. 31 July 2014.

Antia, S. 2017. "Deaf and Hard-of-Hearing Students in the Mainstream. Oxford University Press.

Bachman, L. 2005. Building and supporting a case for test use. *Language assessment quarterly, 2(1), 1-34.*

Baker-Shenk, C. and Cokely, D. 1980. American Sign Language. Teacher 's resource text on grammar and culture. Washington DC:Gallaudet University Press.

Bornstein, H. (ed). 1990. *Manual communication: Implications for education.* Washington: Gallaudet University Press.

Blamey, P. J. 2003. Development of spoken language by deaf children. In M. Marschark and P. E. Spencer (Eds.), *Oxford handbook of deaf studies, language, and education* (pp. 232-246). New York: Oxford University Press.

Bloch, B. and Trager, G. L. 1942. *Outline of linguistic analysis*. Special publications of the Linguistic Society of America. Baltimore: Linguistic Society of America.

Bochner, J.H., Samar V.J., Garrison, W.M., Searls, J.M., Hauser, P.C. and Sanders, C.A. 2015. Validity of the American Sign Language. *Language Testing, Vol. 33, 4: pp. 473-495.*

Callier, V. 1995. *Promoting academic success for ESL students*. Understanding second language acquisition for school. Union NJ: New Jersey Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages - Bilingual Educators.

Callis, L.L. 2017. Can mainstream schools meet the diverse needs of students? Sign Language Interpreter, Community educator, Advocate. From 3 generations of Deaf family. The Huffington Post.

Chomsky, N. 1957. <u>*Syntactic Structures*</u>, The Hague/Paris: Mouton, <u>*ISBN*</u> <u>*978-3-11-021832-9*</u>

Cokely, D. and Banker-Shenk, C. 1980. American Sign Language: A teacher's resource text on curriculum, methods, and evaluation. Washington DC: Clere Books.

Cripps, J. and Small, A. Not dated. To mainstream or not to Mainstream your Deaf Child.

Cummins, J. 1979. *Linguisitic intredependednce and the educational development of bilingual children.* Los Angeles: National Dissemination and assessment centre, California State University.

Davies, A., Brown, A., Elder, C., Lumley, T., and McNamara, T. 1999. Dictionary of language testing. In M. Milanovic (Series Ed*.), Studies in language testing (Vol. 7)* Cambridge University Press.

Deaf Federation of South Africa (DeafSA), 1996. *South African Sign Language.* Curriculum for level 1, 2, 3. Johannesburg.

Department of Basic Education (DBE). 2014a. South African Sign Language Home language, National Curriculum Statement, Curriculum and Assessment Policy Statement for Foundation Phase (Grades R-3). South Africa

Department of Basic Education (DBE). 2014b. South African Sign Language Home language, National Curriculum Statement, Curriculum and Assessment Policy Statement for Intermediate Phase (Grades 4-6). South Africa

Department of Basic Education (DBE). 2014c. South African Sign Language Home language, National Curriculum Statement, Curriculum and Assessment Policy Statement for Senior Phase (Grades 7-9). South Africa

Department of Basic Education (DBE). 2014d. South African Sign Language Home language, National Curriculum Statement, Curriculum and Assessment Policy Statement for Further Education and Training Phase (Grades 10-12). South Africa

Department of Basic Education (DBE). 2017. South African Sign Language training manual. Senior Phase, Grade 11 and Grade 12.

Enns, C.J. and Herman, R. C. 2011. Adapting the Assessing British Sign Language Development: Receptive Skills Test Into American Sign Language. University of Manitoba. City University, London.

Ergin, M. 1990. Retrieved from abs.kafkas.edu.tr/upload/37/LANGUAGE

General and Further Education and Training Quality Assurance (GENFETQA) Act No. 58 of 2001 (as amended in 2008).
Government Gazette, No. 37652, 16 May 2014. *Department of Basic Education 2014*

Goy, P. 2017. *Building bridges with sign language*. Singapore talking. The Straits Times.

Gustason, G. and Zawolkow, E. 1993. *Signing Exact English*. Modern Signs Press. USA.

Hall, Kira (1995). Lip Service on the Fantasy Lines. In Kira Hall and Mary Bucholtz, eds., *Gender Articulated: Language and the Socially Constructed Self*. New York: Routledge. 183-216. (Reprinted 1998 in Deborah Cameron, ed., *The Feminist Critique of Language*, 2nd edition. New York: Routledge. 321-342).

Halliday, M.A.K. 2003. "On the 'architecture' of human language". In *On Language and Linguistics*. Vol. 3 in *The Collected Works*. London and New York: Equinox.

Haug, T. 2008. Review of sign language assessment instruments. In A. Baker and B. Woll, eds. *Sign language acquisition. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, pp. 51-85.*

Haug, T. 2010. Approaching Sign Language Test Construction: Adaptation of the German Sign Language Receptive Skills Test. *Journal of Deaf Stud Deaf Education.* University of Applied Sciences of Special Needs Education Zurich (HH).

Haug, T. 2011. *Adapting and evaluation of a German Sign Language test*. A computer-Based receptive skills test for Deaf children ages 4-8 years old. Hamburg University press. Carl von Ossietzky, Germany.

Haug, T. 2011. Approaching Sign Language Test Construction: Adaptation of the German Sign Language Receptive Skills Test. *Journal of Deaf Stud Deaf Educ (2011) 16 (3): 343-361.* University of Applied Sciences of Special Needs Education Zurich (HH).

Haug, T., Mann, W. 2007. Adapting tests of sign language assessment for other sign languages - a review of linguistic, cultural, and psychometric problems. Oxford University Press. Hamburg University and City University, London.

Haug, T., Mann, W. 2008. Adapting tests of sign language assessment for other sign languages - a review of linguistic, cultural, and psychometric problems. *Journal of Deaf Studies and Education, 13, 138-147.*

Haug, T., Herman, R. and Woll, B. 2015. Constructing an online test framework, using the example of a sign language receptive skills test. *Deafness and Education International, 17, pp. 3-7.* City University London.

Haug, T., Mann, W., Boers-Visker, E., Contreras, J., Enns, C., Herman, R., and Rowley, K. 2016. *Guidelines for sign language test development, evaluation, and use.* Unpublished document, retrieved from http://www.signlang-assessment.info/.

Herman, R. 1998. The need for an assessment of Deaf children's signing skills. Deafness and Education. *Journal of the British Association of the Teachers of the Deaf, 22, 3-8.*

Herman, R. 1998. *Issues in designing an assessment of British sign language development.* International Journal of Language and Communication disorders, 1998, Vol. 33, Supplement. Department of Clinical Communication Studies, City University. Northampton Square. London EC1V OHB.

Herman, R. 1998. The need for an assessment of deaf children's signing skills. *Deafness and Education, 22, 3–8.*

Herman, R., Holmes, S., and Woll, B. 1999. *Assessing British Sign Language development: Receptive skills test.* Gloucestershire, UK: Forest Bookshop.

Hermans, D., Knoors, H. and Verhoeven, L. 2009. Assessment of sign language development: The case of Deaf children in the Netherlands. Oxford University Press.

International Baccalaureate Organization (UK) 2012. *Middle Year Programme (MYP) Language B: Sign Languages Guide.* The International Baccalaureate Organization (UK) Ltd Peterson House, Malthouse Avenue, Cardiff Gate Cardiff, Wales CF23 8GL United Kingdom.

IOL News. 2014. *SA Sign Language added to curriculum.* Western Cape, 1 December 2014, 11:02 AM / ILSE Fredericks

IOL Lifestyle. 2013. *New Curriculum for deaf pupils on the cards.* Parenting, 29 October 2013, 12:15 PM / Ntobeko Mtshali

Johnson, R., Liddell, S. and Erting, C. 1989. *Unlocking the curriculum: Principles for achieving access in deaf education* (Gallaudet Research Institute Working paper No. 89-3. Washington, DC: Gallaudet University.

Johnston, T. 2004. The assessment and achievement of proficiency in a native sign language within a sign bilingual program: The pilot Auslan receptive skills test. *Deafness and Education International, 6, 57–81. doi:10.1002/dei.168.*

Kline, P. 2000. Handbook of Psychological Testing. (2nd ed.). London: Routledge. Krashen, S.D. and Terrell, T.D. 1993. *The natural approach: Language acquisition in the classroom.* San Francisco: Alemany.

Lekoko, R.N. and Mukhopadhyay, S. 2008. Practice and preferences of sign languages in the instruction of the deaf students: some reflection on the mainstream. ResearchGate. University of Botswana.

Leppert, M. 2014. Mainstream Deaf Education. ASL University.

Levitzke-Gray, D. Auslan: Introduction – The Australian Curriculum v8.3. (Deaf advocate and Young Australian of the year 2015.

Livingston, S. 1997. *Rethinking the education of the deaf students*: Theory and practice from a teacher's perspective. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Magongwa, L. 2017. *Deaf Education in South Africa.* Project MUSE.

Mann, W. and Marshall, C. 2010. Building an assessment use argument for sign language: the BSL Nonsense Sign Repetition Test. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 13(2), pp. 243-258.*

Morgan, R., Glaser, M. and Magongwa, L. 2016. Constructing and Rolling out the New South African Sign Language (SASL) Curriculum – Reflexive Critique. Per Linguam 2016 32(2):15-29.

Marschark, M. 2002. Foundations of communication and the emergence of language in deaf children. In G. Morgan and B. Woll (Eds.), *Directions in sign language acquisition – Trends in language acquisition research (pp. 1-28).* Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Marschark, M. Morgan, G. and Woll, B. 2002. *Foundations of communication and emergence of language in Deaf children*, Directions in Sign Language – Trends in

language acquisition research, Amsterdam, The Netherlands John Benjamins Publishing Company (pp. 1-28).

McMillan, J.H. and Schumacher, S. 1993. *Research in education (third edition). A conceptual introduction;* Narper Collins College. New York. U.S.A.

Mitchell, R., and Karchmer, M. 2004. Chasing the mythical ten percent: Parental hearing status of deaf and hard of hearing students in the United States. *Sign Language Studies, 4, 138–163. doi:10.1353/sls.2004.0005.*

Morgan, R., Glaser, M. and Magongwa, L. 2016. *Constructing and rolling out the new South African sign language (SASL) curriculum.* Per Linguam 32(2):15-29. A Journal of Language Learning - Reflexive critique.

National Education Policy Act, 1996 (Act No. 27 Of 1996). Approval of the Amendments to the Policy Document, National Policy Pertaining to the Conduct, Administration and Management of Examinations and Assessment for the National Senior Certificate

Penn, C. 1993. Signs of the times: Deaf language and culture in South Africa. *South African Journal of communication disorders 40: 11-23.*

Plaza-Pust, C., Morales-Lopez, E. 2008. Sign bilingualism: Language development, interaction, and maintenance in sign language contact situations. In C. Plaza-Pust and E Morales-Lopez (Eds.), *Sign bilingualism – Language development, interaction, and maintenance in sign language contact situations (pp. 333-380).* The Netherlands: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Prinz, P. and Strong, M. 1998. ASL proficiency and English literacy within a bilingual deaf education model of instruction. *Topics in Language Disorders, 18, 47-60.*

Prinz, P., Strong, M. and Kuntze, L. 1995. Unpublished manuscript, San Francisco State University, California Research Institute.

Reagan, T. 2002. *Teaching and learning sign language as a "Foreign" language.* Neag School of Education, University of Connecticut. Paper read at the SAALT Conference, University of Natal, Durban, July 2002.

Reagan, T. 2008. *South African Sign Language and language-in-education policy in South Africa.* Stellenbosch Papers in linguistics, Vol. 38, pp. 165-190. University of the Witwatersrand and Central Connecticut State University, Connecticut, USA.

Reynolds, D. and Titus, A. 1991. *Bilingual bicultural education: Constructing a model for change.* Paper presented at the meeting of the Convention of American Instructors of the Deaf, New Orleans, LA.

Roy, W.M.P. and Morgan, G. 2015. Adaptation of a vocabulary test from British Sign language to American Sign Language. Language testing. SAGE Journals.

Schembri, A. 2013. Explainer: What is a sign language? The conversation. Department of Language Histories and Cultures. La Trobe University.

SADeaf. 2008-2017. About Deafness. The Singapore Association for the Deaf

SADeaf. 2008-2017. Sign Language Courses. The Singapore Association for the Deaf

SADeaf. 2008-2017. Deaf Culture and Sign Language Programme. The Singapore Association for the Deaf

SADeaf. 2008-2017. Singapore Sign Language Courses. The Singapore Association for the Deaf

Scottish Qualifications Authority (SQA). 2016. Using sign in SQA assessments. Published by the Scottish Qualifications Authority. First published in March 2011 and revised in August 2016. The Optoma Building, Glasgow G2 8DQ.

Scottish Qualifications Authority (SQA). 2008, 2011, 2016. Quality assurance of assessment arrangements in Internal and external assessments: Information for schools. Published by the Scottish Qualifications Authority. First published in November 2008 and revised in August 2016. The Optoma Building, Glasgow G2 8DQ.

Scottish Qualifications Authority (SQA). 2010. Using sign in SQA exams. Published by the Scottish Qualifications Authority. The Optoma Building, Glasgow G2 8DQ.

Simms, L. and Thumann, H. 2007. *In search of a new, linguistically and culturally sensitive paradigm in deaf education.* Project MUSE, Today's Research, Tomorrow's Inspiration. American Annals of Deaf, Volume 152, Number 3, Summer, pp. 302-311. Gallaudet University Press.

Singleton, J.L., and Supalla. S. 2003. Assessing children's proficiency in natural signed languages. In M. Marschark and P. Spencer (Eds.), Oxford Handbook of Deaf Studies, language and education (pp. 289-302). New York Oxford University press.

Singleton, J.L., and Supalla, S.J. 2011. Assessing children's proficiency of natural signed languages. In M. Marschark and P. Spencer (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of deaf studies, language, and education (Vol. 1, 2nd Ed, pp. 306–321).* New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

South African Schools Act (SASA) No. 84 of 1996.

Storbeck, C., Magongwa, L. and Parkin I. 2009. *Education of the Deaf in South Africa.*

Strong, M. 1995. A review of bilingual bicultural programmes for the deaf children in North America. *American Annals of the Deaf, 140, 84-90.*

Strong, M. and Prinz, P. 1997. A study of the relationship between American Sign Language and English Literacy. *Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education, 2, 37-46.*

Stoke, W.C. 1960. Sign Language Structure: an outline of the visual communication system of the American Deaf. Studies in linguistics: Occasional Paper 8. University of Buffalo

Sutton-Spence, R. and Woll, B. 1999. The linguistic of British Sign Language: An introduction. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Sutton-Spence, R. and Kaneko, M. 2016*. Introducing Sign Language Literature: Creative and Folklore.* Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan.

The Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, 1996. Act 108 of 1996. As adopted on 8 May 1996 and amended on 11 October 1996 by the Constitutional Assembly. Pretoria: Government Printer.