1997

Cultural identity and diversity in deaf education

Ila Parasnis

Cultural identity and diversity in deaf education
Ila Parasnis
American Annals of the Deaf; Apr 1997; 142, 2; Research Library
pg. 72

Cultural Identity and Diversity in Deaf Education

Ila Parasnis

Guest Editor, Reference Issue

The article begins with a discussion of the sociocultural model of a deaf child as a member of a bilingual minority and examines its implications for deaf education. A case is made for recognizing ethnic diversity within the deaf community in designing and implementing educational programs and policies that strengthen the self-identities of deaf children. Several issues related to the accommodation of the diversity of deaf learners are discussed illustrating how such accommodation would enhance their educational experiences. The use of technology, its potential to accommodate diverse deaf learners, and its influence on the deaf community are also discussed.

Parasnis is an associate professor in the department of Applied Language and Cognition Research at the National Technical Institute for the Deaf, Rochester Institute of Technology, Rochester, NY. Her primary research interests are in visual cognition, bilingualism-biculturalism, and deaf education.

The perspective that deaf people[1] should be regarded primarily as a cultural and language minority group rather than as individuals with an audiological disability is gathering support among educators, linguists, and researchers involved in deaf education. There has been a small revolutionary shift in deaf education away from the medical model of deaf people as disabled to the sociocultural model of deaf people as a minority group with its own language and culture (e.g., Johnson, Lidell, & Erting, 1989). Several books have been published discussing the sociocultural context in which deaf people live and its relevance for deaf education (e.g., Lane 1992; Lane, Hoffmeister, & Bahan, 1995; Lucas, 1995; Padden &

Humphries; 1988, Wilcox, 1989) including a recent book (Parasnis, 1996a) that provides an in-depth examination of the concept of deaf people as a bilingual, bicultural minority group in the United States and its implications for understanding their psychosocial and educational experiences. In general, there is a growing interest in the field of deaf education in treating deaf children as bilingual, bicultural minority children and in strengthening their self-identities through articulation of their membership in the deaf community. However, there is no clear consensus on what functional roles the deaf community and American Sign Language (ASL) can play in the psychosocial development of deaf children or how relevant these

[1] In this article the capitalized form "Deaf" is used to refer to those deaf people who share a language (ASL in this case) and cultural values that are distinct from hearing society, and the lowercase form "deaf" is used to refer to the audiological condition of deafness, or to the community (see Padden, 1980). Furthermore, like the term "deaf community," the term "deaf people" is used with a lowercase *d* when referring to deaf people to include Deaf members as well as those members of the deaf community who may not use ASL fluently but may still have culturally and linguistically diverse experiences. The term "deaf education," rather than the term "education of the deaf and hard of hearing" is used throughout for brevity.

are to deaf education. The heterogeneity of the deaf community, the diversity of the educational and social experiences of deaf children, and differing philosophical perspectives on which language to use in teaching deaf children are some of the factors that have contributed to the dissent among educators. Perhaps there is no one representative concept of a deaf child that can be developed to satisfy everyone's concerns. But then again, there may be no fundamental need to do so in these increasingly pluralistic times.

The crucial question is not whether all deaf children can be viewed as bilingual, bicultural minority children, but whether many can be viewed as such, and whether this construct has any explanatory power that is different from the construct of a deaf child as a disabled child. For example, the construct of a deaf child as a disabled child does not adequately explain the strong bonds of community that many deaf people develop as they interact among themselves, nor does it explain the pride they have in their language (ASL) and their preference for using it in their social interactions. If we consider bilingualism as "the regular use of two or more languages" (Grosjean, 1982: p. 1) and biculturalism as "coexistence and/or combination of two distinct cultures" (Grosjean, 1982; p. 157), it becomes clear that the experiences of many deaf people, in addition to those born of deaf parents, are quite similar to those of other bilingual minority groups in America.

Whether Deaf culture is a distinct culture (Padden & Humphries, 1988, Lane, et al., 1995) or a subculture of an ethnic minority community (Johnson & Erting, 1993), whether deaf people as a rule develop an identity that is by necessity bicultural since they must interact with the hearing world (Padden, 1996), whether they see themselves as having a hyphenated identity like other minority members of American society (Parasnis, 1996b), and whether they go through the same stages of identity development as have been postulated for other minority members of American society (Sue & Sue, 1990) are issues that need to be carefully studied. Analysis of these issues will promote an understanding of the characteristics of deaf people as a bilingual, bicultural minority group and how these characteristics overlap with the characteristics of other minority groups in America.

Often the sociocultural model of deafness is contrasted sharply with the medical model and the debate centers around the question of whether hearing status should be considered an innate physical characteristic exhibiting variation, such as race or skin color, or whether deafness should be viewed as a disability. However, as Lane, et al. (1995, p. 417) have pointed out "taking part actively in disability movements is not inconsistent with being a linguistic and cultural minority." As I have noted before (Parasnis, 1996b), this debate creates an unnecessary and artificial dichotomy because issues of medical management or social support services are made to appear orthogonal to issues of minority status and minority rights. Deaf people may need to utilize adaptive equipment and special services such as hearing aids, FM systems, and ASL interpreters that allow them to overcome barriers to spoken communication used by the majority of the society. However, this does not mean they do not have a legitimate right to also be considered a culturally and linguistically diverse minority group. Alternative means are often used to overcome communication barriers with other minority groups, such as providing interpreters for non-English speakers, without their sociocultural identity being questioned.

The fact that deaf people have preserved a culture and a language is in itself remarkable. As Hakuta (1986) has noted, research by Lieberson, Dalto, and Johnston (1975) that compared the rate of loss of language diversity in 35 nations including the United States showed that there was a general tendency toward monolingualism, but in no other country did the rate of decline approach the rapidity of that in the United States. Hakuta (1986, p. 167) observes, "...it would take 350 years for the average nation to experience the same amount of loss as that witnessed in just one generation in the United States." Despite this general societal pressure to use English, ASL has continued to flourish in the deaf community and with the current acceptance of it as a language in its own right, many more deaf and hearing people are learning, studying, and creating literature in ASL. Schein and Stewart (1995) have estimated that the number of people in the United States who sign has more than doubled from 446,500 in 1980 to 1,015,000 by 1990 and this number is expected to grow. The importance of teaching a visual spatial language that is fully accessible to a deaf child is being recognized in deaf education to the point where the majority of schools for the deaf are using some form of a sign language in the classroom. Some schools have recently adopted a bilingual, bicultural program of education (Strong, 1995). These developments in deaf education show an increased recognition and validation of the diverse identities of deaf children.

Elsewhere, I have discussed the advantages of viewing deaf children from a sociocultural perspective and how it enables us to shift the focus from deficiencies to group differences in order to allow identification and accommodation of the psychosocial and language related needs of deaf children that are not adequately accommodated by the present educational system (Parasnis, 1996b). However, the deaf community is not homogeneous; it consists of many ethnic minority groups and its diversity must be taken into account in any discussion of the development of Deaf identity. Although the diversity of the deaf community has been acknowledged by many writers (Delgado, 1984; Humphries, 1993; Lane et al., 1995) an analysis of how this diversity should be accommodated and validated in an educational program for deaf children and youth is far from complete.

Diversity

Although much is said and written about the idea of accommodating and respecting diversity, racism continues to exist in American society as it does in the rest of the world. Despite important strides made during and since the civil rights movement, it is a common experience for many people of color within our society to encounter some form of racism in their educational and social environments. The degree to which they are aware of racism and influenced by it in their education and career may vary greatly depending on many factors such as the individual's intellectual and social skills, socioeconomic status, family background, and their own perspective on racism (Steele, 1990). However, the inherent power imbalance and overt or covert societal pressures often make it impossible for a minority group member to ignore the perceptions of the majority in developing self-identity and self-esteem (see Scheurich, 1993). Often there is very little acknowledgment or validation of a minority group member's psychosocial experiences in traditional educational environments or in the design and implementation of curricula. Academics and practitioners in education, including deaf education, have become increasingly aware of the need to adopt an antiracist, multicultural approach to educating and counseling children as the percentage of minority children continues to increase (e.g., Christensen & Delgado, 1993; Cummins, 1988; Jankowski, 1995; Scheurich, 1993; Skutnaab-Kangas & Cummins, 1988; Stone, 1996; Sue & Sue, 1990). Schildroth and Hotto (1995) have reported that from 1974 to 1994 the percentage of deaf and hard of hearing minority children and youth has increased from 24% to 40%. The recent 1995-1996 Gallaudet Research Institute's Annual Survey of Deaf and Hard of Hearing Children and Youth has shown that this number has risen to 43.5% (Gallaudet Research Institute, 1997).

It is not easy to adopt an antiracist, multicultural approach to education because it requires rethinking existing curricula and language policies. Furthermore, the cultural, linguistic, and socioeconomic diversity among minority children is great and must be recognized in designing and implementing educational programs. How to implement such an approach is therefore a complicated issue.

Diversity among Minority Groups

In designing programs and policies specifically aimed to improve minority education generalizations across different racial/ethnic groups can inadvertently promote institutional racism for some. Ogbu (1978, 1990), for example, distinguishes between "involuntary" and "voluntary" minority groups in America, considering involuntary minority groups as those brought to the United States through slavery, conquest, or colonization, and voluntary minority groups as those who emigrated to the United States seeking better socioeconomic opportunities or greater political freedom. He argues that each group's response to the assimilation of the language and culture of the majority would be fundamentally different and therefore differentially influence a child's educational progress. Thus, comparing a Black child and an Asian child on their literacy achievement, even if they were both at the same level of English proficiency at the start of their schooling, would not be appropriate.

Furthermore, within the same racial/ethnic category label, much diversity exists so that an educational program that serves the needs of an "Asian" child, in fact, would need to take into account the needs of many culturally and linguistically diverse ethnic minority groups that are collectively put together under that umbrella term. For example, Asian children with Limited English Proficiency (LEP) have sometimes been placed in bilingual remedial programs based on their racial classification—ignoring the fact that they come from different countries and speak different languages or dialects at home (see Baron, 1990; pp. 194-195). This defeats the purpose of such remedial programs that are supposed to be conducted in the child's native language.

For those minority children who are in deaf education programs, there is the added issue of learning a sign language in school that may be different from the sign language used in their community or at home. The use of a sign language other than ASL is not necessarily restricted to recently emigrated families. As Aramburo (1993) has noted, a variation of ASL is used in the Black deaf community in interacting among themselves. Thus, traditional testing in English or in ASL may not be completely accurate in measuring minority children's linguistic and cognitive skills due to their cultural and language diversity. To properly evaluate the abilities of a minority deaf child, professionals must pay attention to that child's spoken language/dialect at home, the sign language used at home, and the child's knowledge of English and ASL. The family's level of acculturation should also be taken into account (e.g., Yacobacci-Tam, 1987). Practically, the financial and personnel resources needed for such an evaluation are not readily available to the schools. Thus, designing and implementing a program that takes into account the diversity of deaf children in developing English literacy and academic competency continues to be a challenge.

Nevertheless, this challenge must be met because minority deaf children as a group do not fare well in existing educational programs. For example, Allen (1994) has estimated that approximately 80% of the Black and Hispanic deaf school leavers at the end of the 1992-1993 school year would not be able to meet the criteria for fourth-grade reading achievement, while 52% of the White deaf school leavers would. Cohen, Fischgrund, and Redding (1990) have commented that depressed achievement is an expected outcome when minority children's needs and backgrounds are as poorly understood as they are in the present educational programs. Despite the concerns raised by several educators (see Delgado 1981, 1984), a systematic

philosophical and practical plan of action has not been developed to address the issue of underachievement of minority deaf children in the current educational system compared to their White deaf peers. Several initiatives are obviously needed to enhance the educational experience of the minority deaf children and their academic achievement.

Minority Role Models

One often mentioned strategy is to increase the number of minority teachers so that all children can benefit from having diverse positive role models to emulate. For minority children having minority role models can especially strengthen their self-identities. However, in a survey of 6,043 professionals in 349 deaf education programs Andrews and Jordan (1993) found that the number of minority teachers and professionals in deaf education was quite low, about 10.4%, and of those minority professionals only 11.7% were deaf. Whether these low numbers reflect a continued resistance to change or the lack of a large pool of qualified minority candidates is not clear. However, an institutional commitment to change is clearly needed.

In this context, it should be pointed out that the number of deaf role models continues to be low. Andrew and Jordan (1993) reported that only 15.6% of educators of the deaf were themselves deaf. Lane (1992) has discussed at length the politics of the dominance of hearing professionals in the field of deaf education and its negative effects on the educational and social lives of deaf people. Accordingly, Lane et al. (1995) have argued for an increased effort by deaf and hearing people to understand and affirm the role of Deaf culture and ASL in the lives of deaf people. However, unless this effort is backed by a significant change in educational policies and programs, it will remain a grass roots effort marginal to the institutional business of educating deaf children and young adults.

Diversity and the Learning Process

Perhaps, one approach to bringing about this change is to examine how to accommodate and respect the diversity of deaf learners within the context of accommodating and respecting the individual differences among all learners. Shifting the focus from disability to diversity when considering deaf learners might bring about a change in perspective that would enhance the educational experiences of all deaf learners and would not be inconsistent with the general goal of the sociopolitical movement to consider deaf people as a bilingual, bicultural minority group in America.

Accommodating Diversity in the Classroom

Accommodating diversity in the classroom is good educational practice because it is consistent with the goals of a democratic society to make education accessible to all members of the society. A common characteristic of a good teacher is that he or she is intuitively attuned to different ways of learning and actively seeks ways to tap into each child's learning style. As Anderson (1996) has suggested, when the educational process is modified to accommodate the minority members of society, it often leads to recognition and accommodation of individual differences in learning and to an enhancement of the educational experiences for all.

The need to accommodate a deaf learner's reliance on the visual modality can be viewed as an asset and not a liability since many hearing learners will also benefit from teaching that effectively utilizes the visual medium in the classroom. Similarly, a teacher's increased attention to the clarity of the spoken message and of the verbal text in providing well organized lecture notes not only makes the information more accessible and comprehensible to a deaf learner, who usually has limited English skills, but also benefits many hearing learners. When sign language is used by an interpreter or a teacher in the classroom, it can be viewed as an asset since it promotes all learners' awareness

of the cultural and linguistic diversity of their deaf peers. Thus, it can be argued that such accommodations will generally lead to enhanced educational experiences for all learners.

Diversity and the Learning Communities Model

There is a growing movement in education to replace the traditional concept of guru to disciple transmission of knowledge with the concept of learning communities (see Gabelnick, MacGregor, Mathews, & Smith, 1990). Some institutions have successfully used a learning communities model on their campuses and have reported an increased rate in retention and course completion as a result (Angelo, 1996). The concept of learning communities considers both students and teachers as learners on a continuum and recognizes that learning occurs across different course contents and across different groups. Participatory learning in which students learn in small groups and share the learning task is a part of this concept. This conceptualization allows the sharing of the learning experience and accommodating and strengthening different learning styles. Thus, the learning communities model of education intrinsically respects the diversity of learners and should be considered seriously by institutes involved in the higher education of deaf students.

Diversity and the Use of Technology

The use of technology in education also holds a tremendous potential for accommodating the diversity of deaf learners. The use of technology by deaf people in general has been increasing steadily as captioning decoders, multimedia presentations, fax services, TTY availability, and computer networks have expanded the access of deaf people to information and have given them an unprecedented opportunity to network among themselves and with hearing people.

The recent information explosion on the Internet and the World Wide Web and the demand for access to the information superhighway are now having a

significant impact on how knowledge is shared and how education is imparted around the world. Although it is true that the information flowing through electronic media is usually not independently checked for its accuracy or validity, rich and diverse information data banks do exist on the Web from reliable and reputable sources. The availability of this technology has changed the intellectual and social interaction opportunities for individuals and server networks are working at capacity to accommodate the demand of users around the world (Cerf, 1996). On several college campuses, use of the Internet has become an integral part of the coursework and this has been reported to enhance student learning (e.g., Sandell, Stewart, & Stewart, 1996).

Secretary of Education Riley (1997), in his fourth annual State of American Education address called the Internet "the blackboard of the future" and has noted that 65% of schools are linked to the Internet but only 14% of classrooms are connected so far. He indicated that in the spring of 1997 the Federal Communications Commission is scheduled to pass an education rate that will cut access charges to the Internet in half for the vast majority of the schools and provide almost free use of the Internet for the nation's poorest schools.

Schools for deaf and hard of hearing students are not yet extensively connected on the Internet, however, a recent survey of 546 schools serving deaf and hard of hearing students showed that 96% had access to at least one computer for instruction (Harkins, Loeterman, Lam, & Korres, 1996). For professionals involved in deaf education, the use of electronic media is advantageous for many reasons. First, it allows presentation of educational materials to a deaf learner that are easily accessible anytime and anywhere the learner has access to the Internet, thus allowing deaf learners to access information and learn at their own individual paces. Second, it permits much information to be presented in a visual medium with increasingly enhanced multimedia

capabilities for the presentation of video, animation, and graphical representations. This may benefit deaf learners who rely primarily on visual presentation of the information and may have more flexible visual attentional strategies to process information than hearing people do (e.g., Parasnis & Samar, 1985). Finally, it allows networking among deaf learners as well as professionals around the nation and the world, which can be beneficial in expanding their educational and social experiences.

It is well known that having professional networking and mentoring opportunities is important for career advancement. However, there are many barriers that exist for those who are from nontraditional groups of learners when they learn in traditional educational settings. Cyberspace is an electronically connected global learning community where the sharing of information can occur freely across academic disciplines and where professional networking and mentoring can occur without immediate reference to an individual's social stratum, gender, national, or racial origin, or other individual characteristics (see Stephenson, 1995; pp. 14-16). Cyberspace is where a deaf learner can interact on more equal grounds with others and where this active participation could lead in turn to enhanced learning (e.g., Coombs, 1989).

Thus, the use of electronic media is highly suited to accommodate the diversity of deaf learners. Furthermore, it has the added advantage of reaching a larger pool of deaf learners that may not be able to attend a college campus for a variety of reasons. Educators need to seriously consider the possibility of offering a variety of distance learning courses, live teleconferences, and on-line tutorials as a regular part of the educational program for deaf school children, college students, and working adults.

Use of Technology and the Deaf Community

Although it is evident from the above discussion that the use of technology will generally benefit the educational

and social experience of deaf people, it raises some interesting issues regarding its influence on the deaf community.

As Stephenson (1995) has noted, a medium of communication or any technology is not merely a tool but recreates and modifies culture. Stephenson (1995) conducted an ethnologically-based case study using quantitative and qualitative measures in which she analyzed the communication dynamics on DEAF-L, a listserve on the Internet that provides an electronic forum for the discussion of questions, topics, and concerns of importance to the deaf community. Participant observation and document analysis of collected transcripts of all communication on DEAF-L over a 20-day period revealed that DEAF-L participants enjoyed a profound attachment to their virtual community and to each other. Furthermore, this computer mediated communication (CMC) was rich in verbal cues and strategies that enhanced clarity, encouraged participation, and promoted active engagement in discussion and debate. CMC offered a new opportunity for discourse among the members of the deaf community and strengthened their feeling of community membership.

Although these findings appear promising, how the use of the Internet and other technologies will influence the deaf community and thereby its culture is not clear at present since these technologies are relatively new. The availability of TTY, captioning, fax, and now the Internet, have made it possible to easily contact other deaf people across the nation and the world and have strengthened interactions among deaf people. At the same time it could be argued that these technologies have reduced the critical importance of Deaf clubs in the social interactions of deaf people. As Padden (1996) has noted, the role of Deaf clubs in deaf people's lives is diminished now compared to the past when Deaf clubs were the primary place for keeping the culture of the community alive and thriving. ASL has been a preferred language in these clubs and its use and knowledge have been consid-

ered crucial for the transmission of Deaf culture. Will ASL continue to be the preferred language of the deaf community if its community members start to rely more heavily on the various electronic technologies to interact with each other? The language of use with these technologies is English at present, although technically it is possible to transmit information in ASL. Perhaps, the use of English may become significantly more important than before to maintain this within-community cultural contact and thus, being fluent in English will become an increasingly important priority for the deaf community. What impact will this have on the deaf community?

It is quite possible that the impact will be minimal. Deaf people may continue to function as a language minority group that has learned to code switch and negotiate two or more languages in daily life like many other communities in the world that use two or more languages in their daily lives (see Grosjean, 1996). For example, India is a multicultural and multilingual society in which the average school child grows up learning more than two languages and often has more than one group identity without sacrificing his or her national identity (Pattanayak, 1988). In fact, the educational system in India for the past 50 years has adopted a three-language formula that involves teaching school children their regional language, the national language (Hindi), and English as their world language. Deaf children in India are not required to learn three languages. However, Parasnis, Samar, and Mandke (1996) found in their study that half of their sample of 36 deaf adults in India did know two or more spoken languages. Perhaps, the deaf community as a bilingual, bicultural community in America will follow the same pattern of using English as *one* of the languages for communication. In that case, increased reliance on English for telecommunication will not per se substantially alter the fabric of Deaf culture, except for an increased emphasis on acquiring fluency in English sufficient to maintain electronic contact with others.

Furthermore, it remains to be seen how pervasive the use of the Internet will be for the deaf community and whether all of its own subgroups will have equal and easy Internet access. Although in itself, the Internet holds the promise of a broad-based access to information, a survey of the Internet users has shown that the average user is white, English-speaking, male, and from an upper-middle class background (Cerf, 1996). This finding is not surprising since at present 60% of the Internet's host computers are located in the U.S. (Oudet, 1997). Whether these demographics will change as the Internet becomes more accessible to everyone will depend partly on how the electronic medium is utilized by each society around the world, and partly on the languages available for communication on the Internet (Oudet, 1997). It is possible that a new elitism could be introduced that will be based on the available resources to interact on the Internet and the facility of users with the English language. This, in turn, may further preclude the participation of some societies and of traditionally excluded subgroups within a society. How this new form of communication will influence the use of English and ASL in the deaf community thus remains an open question for future study.

Scope and Outline
of This Issue

I invited several experienced deaf and hearing professionals in the field of deaf education to join me in writing for this issue. The primary goal of this issue is to provide a discussion of some of the theoretical and practical issues related to the cultural identity and diversity of deaf learners. These issues require much more in-depth consideration than we are able to provide in this issue given space constraints. Many important issues have been necessarily omitted, including issues related to the distinction between deaf and hard of hearing children, between individuals deaf from birth and those deafened later in life, and between

deaf native ASL signers, and those who learned ASL late, or who rely on spoken communication. These characteristics distinguish many subgroups within the deaf community and have important implications for customizing the educational process to promote effective learning and identity development in deaf children. It is clear that various subgroups within the deaf community must be considered separately in the future to develop an accurate picture of the heterogeneous nature of the deaf community and to appreciate the individual differences among deaf learners.

In this issue, Oscar P. Cohen discusses how institutional racism needs to be countered so that all deaf children, including children of color, can develop healthy self-concepts and receive optimal educational opportunities. Reginald L. Redding focuses on the issue of minority role models and their importance in the education of deaf children and provides some suggestions on how to increase and retain the number of minority professionals in deaf education. Cheryl Wu and Nancy Grant discuss how to provide services to Asian American subgroup of the deaf community. Collectively, these three articles raise some thought provoking issues related to accommodating diversity in deaf education and underscore the need to recognize and serve the ethnically diverse groups that exist within the deaf community.

Thomas K. Holcomb discusses the several categories and stages of development in establishing a Deaf bicultural identity and argues that exposure to the deaf community and ASL are crucial factors in forming such an identity. Dorothy M. Wilkins and Karen Christie focus on the experiences of deaf women on a college campus, documenting gender differences that can influence the formation of self-identity. Patricia Mudgett-DeCaro and T. Alan Hurwitz discuss how a teacher training program can incorporate an in-depth examination of issues surrounding the development of self-identity in deaf children. Collectively, these three articles provide a

77

thoughtful analysis of how psychosocial experiences influence identity development in deaf learners and how educators can recognize and influence this process.

Bonnie Meath-Lang discusses how the concept of learning communities can be successfully applied to the education of deaf college students. Christine Monikowski presents an educator's perspective on using the Internet to teach college level courses. E. William Clymer and Barbara G. McKee provide the details of different types of technologies currently being used by deaf schools around the country and specifically discuss the use of the Internet for educational purposes. Collectively these articles provide insights and practical information on how to accommodate the diversity of deaf learners by applying a framework of learning communities and by using technology creatively and effectively to provide access to education.

Conclusion

How to provide an optimal educational environment in which a deaf child can thrive is an on-going concern of professionals involved in deaf education. Acknowledging the cultural identity and diversity of deaf children and the complexity of their psychosocial experiences is the first step toward developing educational programs that meet the needs of individual deaf learners and help them realize their full potential. Using the sociocultural model of a deaf child as a bilingual, bicultural minority child in designing and implementing educational programs and policies has its strengths and limitations. The strengths are that it provides a rationale for integrating and promoting Deaf culture and ASL in educational programs in order to strengthen the group identity of deaf children, it permits the application of knowledge gained from research on the psychosocial and language development of bilingual minority children, and it validates the diversity of deaf learners in general. The primary limitations of this model are that it is not applicable to

all deaf children and adults and that it tends to gloss over the limited language access of many deaf children that makes their language development fundamentally different from other bilingual minority children who have full access to the language used at home. No model captures the full diversity of the group it labels. Nonetheless, the model of a deaf child as a bilingual minority child growing up in America opens up a much needed venue to examine the experiences of deaf children in the educational setting and to discuss educational approaches that take into consideration their culturally and linguistically diverse status. It is my hope that taken together our articles will inspire some fresh insights, new thinking, and innovative approaches to deaf education.

References

Allen, T. (1994). Who are the deaf and hard-of-hearing students leaving school and entering postsecondary education? Paper submitted to Pelavin Research Institute as part of the project, A comprehensive evaluation of the postsecondary educational opportunities for students who are deaf and hard-of-hearing funded by the U. S. Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services.

Anderson, J. (1996, October). Merging teaching effectiveness, learning outcomes, and curricular changes with the diverse student needs of the 21st century. Keynote address presented at the Professional and Organizational Development Network in Higher Education (POD), Salt Lake City, Utah.

Andrews, J., & Jordan, D. (1993). Minority and minority deaf professionals: How many and where are they? American Annals of the Deaf, 138, 388-396.

Angelo, T. (1996, October). Developing learning communities: Seven promising shifts and seven powerful levers. Paper presented at the Professional and Organizational Development Network in Higher Education (POD), Salt Lake City, Utah.

Aramburo, A. (1989). The black deaf community. In C. Lucas (Ed.), The sociolinguistics of the deaf community (pp. 103-119). New York: Academic Press.

Baron, D. (1990). The English-only question: An official language for Americans? New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Cerf, V. (1996, October). Vint Cerf: Father of the Internet. NTID Special Speaker Series, National Technical Institute for the Deaf, Rochester, NY.

Christensen, K., & Delgado, G. (Eds.). (1993). Multicultural issues in deafness. White Plains, NY: Longman.

Cohen, O., Fischgrund, J., & Redding, R. (1990). Deaf children from ethnic, linguistic, and racial minority backgrounds: An overview. American Annals of the Deaf, 135, 67-73.

Coombs, N. (1989). Using CMC to overcome physical disabilities. In R. Mason, & A. Kaye

(Eds.), Mindweave: Communication, computers, and distance education (pp. 22-39). Oxford, U. K.: Pergammon Press.

Cummins, J. (1988). From multicultural to anti-racist education: An analysis of programs and policies in Ontario. In T. Skutnabb-Kangas, & J. Cummins (Eds.), Minority education: From shame to struggle (pp. 127-160). Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters.

Delgado, G. (1981). Hearing-impaired children from non-native language homes. American Annals of the Deaf, 126, 118-121.

Delgado, G. (Ed.). (1984). The Hispanic deaf: The issues and challenges for bilingual special education. Washington, DC: Gallaudet University Press.

Gabelnick, F., MacGregor, J., Mathews, R. S., & Smith, B. L. (1990). Learning communities: Creating connections among students, faculty, and disciplines. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Gallaudet Research Institute. (1997). Annual survey of deaf and hard of hearing children and youth, 1995-1996 school year. Unpublished tabulations.

Grosjean, F. (1982). Life with two languages: An introduction to bilingualism. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Grosjean, F. (1996). Living with two languages and two cultures. In I. Parasnis (Ed.), Cultural and language diversity and the deaf experience (pp. 20-37). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Hakuta, K. (1986). Mirror of language: The debate on bilingualism. New York: Basic Books, Inc.

Harkins, J., Loeterman, M., Lam, K., & Korres, E. (1996). Instructional technology in schools educating deaf and hard of hearing children: A national survey. American Annals of the Deaf, 141, 59-65.

Humphries, T. (1993). Deaf culture and cultures. In K. Christensen & G. Delgado (Eds.), Multicultural issues in deafness (pp. 3-16). White Plains, NY: Longman.

Jankowski, K. (1995). Empowerment from within: the deaf social movement providing a framework for a multicultural society. In C. Lucas (Ed.), Sociolinguistics in deaf communities (pp. 307-329). Washington, DC: Gallaudet University Press.

Johnson, R., & Erting, C. (1989). Ethnicity and socialization in a classroom for deaf children. In C. Lucas (Ed.), The sociolinguistics of the deaf community (pp. 41-84). New York: Academic Press.

Johnson, R., Lidell, S., & Erting, C. (1989). Unlocking the curriculum: Principles for achieving access in deaf education. Gallaudet Research Institute Working Paper 89(3). Washington, DC: Gallaudet University Press.

Lane, H. (1992). The mask of benevolence: Disabling the deaf community. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Lane, H., Hoffmeister, R., & Bahan, B. (1996). A journey into the Deaf-World. San Diego, CA: DawnSignPress.

Lieberson, S., Dalto, G., & Johnston, M. (1975). The course of mother-tongue diversity in nations. American Journal of Sociology, 81, 34-61.

Lucas, C. (Ed.). (1995). Sociolinguistics in deaf communities. Washington, DC: Gallaudet University Press.

Oghu, J. (1978). Minority education and caste. New York: Academic Press.

Oghu, J. (1990). Racial stratification and education. In G. E. Thomas (Ed.), U.S. race relations in the 1980s and 1990s: Challenges and alternatives (pp. 3-34). New York: Hemisphere.

Oudet, B. (1997, March). Multilingualism on the Internet. Scientific American, 276, 77-78.

Padden, C. (1980). The deaf community and the culture of deaf people. In C. Baker and R. Battison (Eds.). *Sign language and the deaf community: Essays in honor of William C. Stokoe* (pp. 89-103). Silver Spring, MD: National Association of the Deaf.

Padden, C. (1996). From the cultural to the bicultural: The modern deaf community. In I. Parasnis (Ed.), *Cultural and language diversity and the deaf experience* (pp. 79-98). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Padden C., & Humphries, T. (1988). *Deaf in America: Voices from a culture.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Parasnis, I. (Ed.). (1996a). *Cultural and language diversity and the deaf experience.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Parasnis, I. (1996b). On interpreting the deaf experience within the context of cultural and language diversity. In I. Parasnis (Ed.), *Cultural and language diversity and the deaf experience* (pp. 3-19). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Parasnis, I., & Samar, V. (1985). Parafoveal attention in congenitally deaf and hearing young adults. *Brain and Cognition, 4.* 313-327.

Parasnis, I., Samar, V., & Mandke, K. (1996). Deaf adults' attitudes toward career choices for deaf and hearing people in India. *American Annals of the Deaf, 141.* 333-339.

Pattanayak, D. P. (1988). Monolingual myopia and the petals of the Indian lotus: Do many languages divide or unite a nation? In T. Skutnabb-Kangas and J. Cummins (Eds.), *Minority education: From shame to struggle* (pp. 379-389). Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters.

Riley, J. (1997, February). *Putting standards of excellence into action.* The fourth annual State of American Education Address presented at

The Carter Center, Atlanta, GA.

Sandell, K., Stewart, R., & Stewart, C. (1996). Computer-mediated communication in the classroom: models for enhancing student learning. In L. Richlin (Ed.), *To improve the academy,* 15 (pp. 59-74). Stillwater, OK: New Forums Press.

Schein, J., & Stewart, D. (1995). *Language in motion: Exploring the nature of sign.* Washington, DC: Gallaudet Press.

Scheurich, J. (1993). Toward a white discourse on white racism. *Educational Researcher, 22(8),* 5-10.

Schildroth, A., & Hotto, S. (1995). Race and ethnic background in the annual survey of deaf and hard of hearing children and youth. *American Annals of the Deaf, 140.* 96-99.

Skutnabb-Kangas, T., & Cummins, J. (Eds.). (1988). *Minority education: From shame to struggle.* Philadephia: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Steele, S. (1990). *The content of our character: A new vision of race in America.* New York: St. Martins Press.

Stephenson, C. (1996). *In a place where there are only words: An examination of deaf issues in an electronic medium.* Unpublished Masters thesis, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, Toronto, Canada.

Stone, J. (1996). Minority empowerment and the education of deaf people. In I. Parasnis (Ed.), *Cultural and language diversity and the deaf experience* (pp. 171-180). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Strong, M. (1995). A review of bilingual/bicultural programs for deaf children in North America. *American Annals of the Deaf, 140.* 84-94.

Sue, D., & Sue, D. (1990) *Counseling the culturally different: Theory and practice* (2nd Ed.). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Wilcox, S. (Ed.). (1989). *American deaf culture: An anthology.* Burtonsville, MD: Linstok Press.

Yacobacci-Tam, P. (1987). Interacting with the culturally different family. *The Volta Review, 89(5),* 46-58.

Author Note

Correspondence regarding this article should be sent to Ila Parasnis, Department of Applied Language and Cognition Research, National Technical Institute for the Deaf, Rochester Institute of Technology, 52 Lomb Memorial Drive, Rochester, New York 14623. E-mail: IMPNCR@rit.edu.