JADARA

Volume 7 | Number 4 Article 9

October 2019

Book Reviews

none none
none

Follow this and additional works at: https://repository.wcsu.edu/jadara

Recommended Citation

none, n. (2019). Book Reviews. *JADARA, 7*(4). Retrieved from https://repository.wcsu.edu/jadara/vol7/iss4/9

BOOK REVIEWS

SEEING ESSENTIAL ENGLISH/MANUAL. David Anthony (Ed.). Anaheim Union High School District, Anaheim, California: 1971. 543 pages. $5.70

Seeing Essential English/Manual is a book in two looseleaf volumes containing an explanation, a grammar and a collection of several thousand signs for English words and morphemes. It is more than a book; it is more than 540 pages long; and it is more than open-ended. Blank pages in several places will be replaced by additions to be mailed to the buyer. Purchasers are sent a monthly newsletter which includes corrections and additions.

S.E.E. is also a strategy for teaching the English language to deaf children and youth. It tries to get them inside the language as a native speaker is inside, and it tries to help them get the language inside themselves.

S.E.E. is also a group of people and a movement. As a group it contains both deaf persons and hearing, both teachers and interpreters. As a movement it comprises those schools and classes for the deaf which use its strategy, its vocabulary of signs, and its philosophy of language learning.

Besides all this S.E.E. is a language, a planned language. S.E.E. is therefore more than a book, a strategy, a group, a movement, and a language—it is an idea.

It deserves a full scale review on each of these six counts, but that is hardly possible here. No authoritative evaluation of the strategy can be made now either. That will have to wait some years, until experience in using the strategy to teach by has tested it. One reaction to the whole S.E.E. idea is that of Arthur O. Washburn. In his Foreword to the Manual he states his own, an experienced teacher's, opinion: "This manual is undoubtedly the most exciting, impressive, and important guide for the teaching of English to deaf children that I have ever reviewed. I wish that I had had this manual in hand many years ago."

The editor of the manual and the originator of the idea is David A. Anthony, a deaf son of deaf parents. In addition to explaining S.E.E. he has in the first 200 pages written a remarkable essay on deafness and language and much else. As a writer he should be compared with masters of a nearly impossible art, that of writing with excellence in an acquired, a second language. Laurent Clerc is such a one. Born deaf a few years before the 18th century began, Clerc was ten when Sicard opened a school in Marseilles and began teaching him with L'Epee's "methodical signs". Clerc accompanied Sicard when that great teacher succeeded his master as head of the Paris Institute. Clerc was 21 when he accompanied T.H. Gallaudet to America. His first language was Sign, his second French. English came after Latin and others. Nevertheless, in the early volumes of the *American Annals of the Deaf* there is not another writer who can match Clerc for English style.

David Anthony has a style too. It is marked with his wit and self-deprecating humor, with charm and magnanimity. With it all he covers most of the topics familiar to those interested in the deaf and their education. Every item in the 140-item bibliography is therefor use. His subject is language, his concern is the deaf child, his

interest is in ways that this child can learn the English language, and yet his appeal is to the literate reader.

The book and the strategy have the virtues of the originator. His own skill in writing a language that he has never heard is strong support for his method. His style attests that he would teach *language,* not strait-jacketed language. Some of the faults are his as well. He switches too quickly from Basic English, the origin of S.E.E. to the unlimited vocabulary of English. Basic English is a useful way of communicating with just 850 words and a workable but unbeautiful grammar. It can be used to acquire a fuller English, and with its words in signs Anthony used it to get communication from deaf pupils who had never before communicated. But the vocabulary of S.E.E. signs makes possible not only the whole Latin-derived learned vocabulary of English, including *vintner,* but also the old native adverbs *hither, thither, whither, hence,* and *thence* and *whence.* A user can sign "It is snowing"—the signs are given on pp. 138, 188, 280, and 106 (for———ING). He can also read and sign in S.E.E. Fitzgerald's Rubaiyat:

> I often wonder what the Vintners buy
> One half so precious as the Goods they sell. LXXI
>
> What, without asking, hither hurried whence?
> And, without asking, whither hurried hence! XXX

The switch from simple to literary language need not be a fault. The wise teacher using S.E.E. will see that pupils gain confidence as well as competence before taking great leaps forward. With caution then the fault becomes a virtue. The S.E.E. strategy holds out the whole language as prize, not a limited, scaled-down English for deaf children.

In the title the second word is *Essential.* If it is taken to mean, as it often does, 'stripped-down', 'basic', then the manual provides much too much vocabulary and grammar. *Essential English* can mean also 'the essence of the English language'. In that case what is inessential? What can be removed? All the grammar, all the words, all the ways of forming and inflecting and modifying and deriving words are essential because they are part of the system. For complete English the manual may be not too long but too short.

The first word in the title was originally *Signing.* The substitution of *Seeing,* as Anthony explains, was a concession to the destructive effect of the oralist-manualist controversy. On that controversy he takes a realistic stance—". . . deaf children *will* sign" (p. 13); he reviews the research—". . . early manual communication will not, does not, and cannot[1] impede or impair acquisition of language and expression of speech . . . manual communication will, does, and can enhance educational achievement, social maturity, and personality development as well as language and speech" (following citation of studies by Quigley & Frisina; Stevenson; Montgomery; Birch & Stuckless; and Meadow, p. 11); and he shows concern for speech—"The correct application of S.E.E. signs in speech training/therapy should enhance the rhythm and quality of a deaf child's speech" (p. 29). He treats the problems of lipreading and speech production by the prelingually deaf child from inside deafness. He can view them with humor and yet with the realization of how much the deaf need these skills despite the problems. Anthony knows both how useful it is to understand that "variety" is what someone speaking has said and how easy it is to take the speaker's facial clues for *fried egg.*[2] He is all for lipreading and speech, and he believes they are

more easily learned by the deaf child who has competence in the English language.

As an idea S.E.E. lost ground when *signing* was changed to *seeing*. As a strategy S.E.E. may have emphasized signing more for teaching in its early stages. Natural signs must have been much in use to ask and answer questions. But the English language and Sign seem to have melded into a third language, S.E.E., with rules of its own.

In Sign (=ASL, =Ameslan) there is a sign which means 'true', 'real', 'sure', and the like. Also in Sign there is no copula. Like many other languages Sign expresses its users meanings without a verb-link between a noun and a quality. Thus in Sign a meaning like 'his car is yellow' is expressed by the signs HIS[3] CAR YELLOW.

English has such a link of course, but the English copula has eight forms: *am, are, be, been, being, is, was* and *were*. When Sign and spoken English are used at the same time (=Simultaneous Communication, =Total Communication) some communicators use the sign meaning 'true' to stand for any and all forms of *be*. Others simply say the word and make no sign. Still others fingerspell the form of *be* as they say it. In the teaching from which the idea of Signing Essential English arose Anthony chose the first way, but he writes, "the kids demanded changes, and so we devised the manual alphabet A hand for AM, and I hand for IS, the R hand for ARE, and the B hand for BE, all with the same movement from the lips out and down. The more advanced students soon insisted on having definite signs for such verb endings as −ING and −ED." (p. 26)

This is the germ of S.E.E. It is not Sign, for Sign uses no copula and adds no endings to verb signs. Time is signalled by other means in Sign. It is not English, for English words are both sounds—Cued Speech gives a good representation of them—and letter sequences—fingerspelling gives an exact but painstaking representation of them. If it is not Sign nor English, what then is S.E.E.?

It is a new device to express English developed on an old pattern. It closely resembles in principle the methodical sign language developed by L'Epee and Sicard. Like that it uses a natural sign language as source, taking from it a sign to represent a simple word/concept. Like that too, it supplies signs for function words (*a, an, the, be* in English; *le, la, etre,* etc. in French). But S.E.E. differs from the French methodical sign language in having a sign for each root and for each suffix, prefix and infix.

The difference needs explanation. L'Epee writes that he observed Parisian deaf-mutes in sign-talk flipping the hand over the shoulder to indicate some past event. He adapted this to French grammar by letting one flip represent simple past, two flips the perfect tense, and three the pluperfect. If this were translated directly into English, one would sign *saw* as PAST SEE; one would sign both *have seen* and *has seen* as PAST PAST SEE; and *had seen* as PAST PAST PAST SEE. The French system combined lexical signs like SEE with signs for grammatical signals like PAST. Clerc or any other pupil in the French school seeing these signs would know which of the French forms he had memorized to use in writing French. The S.E.E. idea differs in giving each particle of a verb phrase its particular sign. A user of S.E.E. signs *saw* as SEE + −ED, *have seen* as HAVE + SEE + −EN, *has seen* as HAVE + −S + SEE + −EN, and *had seen* as HAVE + −ED + SEE + −EN.

The irregularities of English verb inflection are not handled automatically in S.E.E. Notes in the sign entries remind the teacher and pupil that the proper spelling

BOOK REVIEWS

must be learned—just as the French pupil working from general grammatical signals had to memorize French verb paradigms. If either teacher or pupil using S.E.E. places too much reliance on the signs as exact, consistent, and complete representation of English, disappointment may result. Anthony recognizes this and gives warnings, but it is worth reiterating. He also recognizes that the ideal situation for teaching and learning English through S.E.E. would be the disappearance of Sign without a trace, because the pupil who uses one sign for 'play' in *played with us* and a different one for 'play' in *I have a a part in the play* will be put off by finding PLAY in S.E.E. is a homonym too and has both meanings. In the same way *have* in *have eaten* and *have* in *have money* as two quite different signs in Sign may alert the pupil to the difference between the English auxiliary and the true verb that means 'to possess'. But again for the pupil who knows Sign, the same S.E.E. sign must repeat the ambiguity of the English homonym. He must discard, in class time anyway, his 'have' (='finish') sign; and in some sense he must tear down his competence in Sign as he builds up his competence in English. This is one kind of bilingualism. There is also another kind which allows a person to use Sign in situations calling for Sign and to use English (Signed, S.E.E., fingerspelled, or speechread and spoken) in situations calling for English. The wise teacher will choose the latter kind of bilingualism. Requiring English to replace Sign completely among deaf persons is unrealistic. Besides, untold harm can be done by too strictly adopting the former kind of bilingualism. That amounts to saying with every word and action: "You use Sign: you are worthless; you must use English: only then can you be good for something." Happily Anthony and associates never are guilty of any such implication.

S.E.E. itself is a methodical way of using clear manual symbols to teach English language competence. It does not perfectly represent idiomatic or literary English, but it is as complete and consistent a strategy as has appeared since 1776 when L'Epee published the first account of his method. It has the unique merit of being from the learner's side—the originator is a teacher but is himself deaf as are many in the S.E.E. group. It has the further advantages, not often found in system builders and makers of educational methods, of the originator's urbanity, humor, and humility. It deserves even wider adoption than it is now enjoying.

As with any system, method, or strategy much will depend on how it is used. It cannot by itself teach language. It does not automatically confer competence in English on a deaf pupil. It will not ensure proper English usage. No system devised can do that. The teacher who is attracted to S.E.E. should be on guard against expecting miracles. Its ingenious treatment of articles and tense endings may distract attention from those places where English and S.E.E. do not match so well. The teacher who is told to use S.E.E. because it is school policy to do so must also be on guard. *It is much better than many other strategies or methods that might have been chosen;* and an uncommitted, noncommital, indifferent teacher will make failures out of any method and material ever invented.

Besides care in using S.E.E. the teacher should have good language sense; that is the teacher should recognize that S.E.E. is a bridge. It is a bridge between two solid but widely separated natural prominences, Sign and English. As a bridge—despite the enthusiasm of its advocates—it is not a one-way passage from the "weeds" in the land of Sign to the "flowers" in the land of English. English is a language; Sign is a language. S.E.E. can be a first-class way for moving between them. It is not a place to stay. Even if the 50 or 60 thousand deaf children and youth now in school learned and used S.E.E. signs, they would still have to learn the words as spellings, meanings,

appearances, and sounds. They would still have to get off the bridge made by S.E.E. onto solid English ground. The other end of the bridge is worth looking at too.

In the beginning of S.E.E. lies much of its strength. Basic English like Sign can be used to communicate. Both are languages. With communication established more can be learned. One place where S.E.E. is being seriously considered for use is the classroom of non-communicators, often "oral failures", pupils who with three or four years of the best in auditory and speech therapy are still out of touch. One way to be sure S.E.E. helps them is to find out how much Sign they know. If among them they know even a few dozen signs, they can communicate readily with a teacher who knows Sign and who will let them crawl for a time in Sign before walking upright with S.E.E. If they know little or no Sign, or if the teacher has no competence in Sign, another approach is more promising. Let the teacher take a few words from among the Basic English 100 operations, 200 pictured things, 100 qualities. Let the teacher then learn the S.E.E. signs for the selected words—as Basic words without inflections and all those other distractions of the whole English system. After all, hearing toddlers' first English is quite free of endings, articles, and the rest, and they learn adult language eventually. Let the teacher teach these signs and start communicating. Once a start is made, other Basic concepts will be learned quickly as S.E.E. signs, because they fit the communication system as a piece fits a hole in a jigsaw puzzle. There is no need to rush into the whole grammatical system of English, or that part of it presented in S.E.E. The longer the time that can be spent in genuine communication, using the 850 words of Basic English or the open-ended vocabulary of Sign, the larger the stock of ideas the pupils will have and the greater the motivation to learn how to put them into English. This is a positive approach to bilingualism, letting the child handle a lot of experience and reality and mental operation in a language familiar to him. After that he will be ready to tackle an interesting new language.

It seems likely that teaching the first S.E.E. classes, David Anthony may have let the pupils go too fast, but who can blame him? They had been incommunicado for years. The bright boy who invented "better sign" for *glass* deserved the approval his teacher gave him. His one sign connected the manual G for spelling—at the eye for one kind of glasses, down across the face for window 'glass', and on the palm of the other hand for drinking 'glass'—with the English word in all its three uses. So was invented one of the first signs of S.E.E. But it seems likely too that a pupil as bright as that should be ready to learn facts of language life at the same time he is playing games with language—facts like these: many things that differ are given the same word as name; many things alike or identical are given different word names. Looking at the episode another way, a pupil actively excited about the illogicality of language is well on the way to accepting it and so to gaining competence. He is also ready for a demonstration that illogicalities in one language say English, can be beautifully clear in another, i.e. Sign.

Much of the unfortunate misunderstanding deaf pupils have of written English and many of the odd mistakes they make in writing it come from an environment of people who say or pretend that only English is language and who tell the direct lie that Sign is not language.

The S.E.E./Manual honestly presents English as a different language from Sign. It presents its vocabulary in "Topical Theme Units", grouping words in one area of meaning. The signs for them are usually related in formation. This semantic

38

arrangement makes sense for lesson and course planning, and an alphabetical index to the list is supplied at the end of Volume 1.

The notation used, CAPS and numerals for hands and small letters for palm and finger direction, is simple and clear. It also sets off invented signs from those borrowed or adapted from Sign. The former are usually small movements like J or Z in fingerspelling, the latter have a *tab,* i.e. a place like chin or chest or arm where the sign is localized. For the latter the notation is supplemented with directions:

BRAIN

XLU: Tap temple twice with [bent] index fingertip BRAINS, BRAINING, BRAINED, i.e. "knocked out"

BRAINLESS/LY, BRAINY   (p. 300)

The entry reproduced here shows another important feature of the S.E.E. idea. Suffix signs make the one sign BRAIN into six other English words. With approximately 3,000 different words/signs listed and perhaps an average of five derived and inflected words per lexical entry, the user has in the two volumes a potential vocabulary in the 15,000 to 20,000 range.

The part of the first volume which deals with grammar and syntax reflects the good sense and flexiblity of the originator. Excellent sources are used for school grammar (e.g. Roberts) and for usage (e.g. Fowler). There are a few minor errors. The pronunciation of *the* before a consonant should be *th UH* or the like, not *thE* as given on p. 81. An item in the exercise on page 95 seems to be a mixture of two items: "A/An (WRITER/AUTHOR) is one who fixes lights." In the same exercise "FOOT-BALLER" is one of the many traces found throughout of a British, rather than an American, provenance of Anthony's style. These spice the already lively style for a seasoned reader but many raise difficulties for a less catholic teacher or for a very observant deaf pupil reading the manual.

One last wish and hope: The whole remarkable idea, strategy, movement, language that is S.E.E. came about only because of its originator's complete competence in at least five languages, British Sign, American Sign, British English (colloquial), American English (colloquial), and Literary English. He tends to under-estimate the importance of his competence in Sign, but that competence and skill in instant switching, i.e. of translation among all of these language systems, gives S.E.E. its solidity and its brilliance. So, let every user of the book and the strategy, whether buying S.E.E. wholesale or merely sampling from it, strive for a like facility in Sign *and* in English.

William C. Stokoe, Jr.
Director, Linguistics
Research Laboratory
Gallaudet College

[1]A more cautious view is that it need not.

[2]Variety and fried egg are alike to a lipreader. Make the mirror test.

[3]The sign used also mean 'her'; ASL does not distinguish, but S.E.E. does.

BOOK REVIEWS

SOUND AND SIGN: CHILDHOOD DEAFNESS AND MENTAL HEALTH. Hilde S. Schlesinger and Kathryn P. Meadow. University of California Press: 1972. 256 pages. $10.00

Dr.'s Schlesinger and Meadows have examined several factors which appear to affect the deaf individual from birth to adulthood. This book is based upon the developmental approach to the study and subsequent treatment of deafness. Throughout the entire presentation, they recognize that there are many factors in the individual child's sociological environment which contribute to personality outcome. These various factors are examined and special emphasis is placed upon the effect which communication has upon the personality development and the individual's ability to function in later life. It is the authors' thesis that a person, in order to understand and work with a deaf individual, must understand the events which occurred during the developmental years and how those events are influencing the individual's current behavior. One of the first chapters is used to lay a theoretical base, which is used throughout the book to examine the child's development and how that development has either been hindered or accelerated by deafness and other factors. This appears to be a logical presentation in that, anytime one examines a human development process, some theoretical framework must be adopted, which can be used to explain both normal development and development which is considered to be other than normal. These authors have chosen to use the Erikson model of development, and its eight critical phases of: (1) basic trust, versus mistrust; (2) autonomy versus shame and doubt; (3) initiative versus guilt; (4) industry versus inferiority; (5) identity versus identity diffusion; (6) intimacy versus isolation; (7) generativity versus stagnation; and (8) integrity versus despair. Each of these critical phases are discussed and the impact of deafness on each of the phases is pointed out. In this instance, the content is well handled, but the coverage is somewhat limited. It may have been more helpful and beneficial to have had more elaboration within each of the areas. These developmental stages provide a base for much of what is covered in the remainder of the book.

Two chapters are devoted to an examination of manual communication and language acquisition in deaf children. These two chapters are again tied to the theoretical developmental base and it is indicated that the child's manipulation of the environment may be delayed if communication systems are not established. It follows that if the child's ability to manipulate the environment is delayed, other areas of development may also be delayed or thwarted. The authors also hypothesize that the use of a manual communication system or some other system of communicating may considerably reduce the frustration which is inherent in the child-mother relationship. It appears that this frustration becomes less and less as the age at which the communication system is installed becomes less and less. In other words, the earlier the communication system is established, the less mother-child frustration we find in the family structure. Language development is treated by using four children who were studied intensely, and then indicating how their language developed and what kind of progress they made from the beginning to the termination of the project in which the authors were involved. Various examples of sentences, sentence structure and word meanings are given and an attempt is made to show how each child progressed from one stage to the next. This type of presentation is somewhat difficult to understand. It is hard to follow from one point to the next what is being done for the child and how the changes are being made to occur, if in fact changes do occur. This particular section appears to be one of the weakest in the book and it is felt that it could have been handled in a manner which would have given a better description of language acquisition in deaf children.

40

BOOK REVIEWS

Two chapters are devoted to developmental process in deaf children. These two chapters cover the developmental process in preschool deaf children, and the developmental aspects of deafness in the school years. Research is reported which has come from the authors' experience at the Langley-Porter Neuropsychiatric Institute in San Francisco. This particular section of the book is well handled and the developmental process is tied very closely to the Eriksonian model of childhood development. Again emphasis is placed upon the strength of the communication system between the child and the other individuals within his environment. The research which is reported has the same problems which much of the research with the deaf has always contained, which is that the sample size is somewhat small. This is easily understood, since the framework in which the authors were operating was in a restricted area and, also, that there were not that many deaf children and their parents available for study. The authors do report that the behavior of mothers of deaf children appears to differ radically from that of mothers of hearing children. This difference appears in several areas. Among them appears to be the fact that deaf children have a great deal of difficulty attracting the attention of those around them, that the mother herself may have some adverse reaction to the continuing frustration of impaired communication with the child and thirdly, and one of the most important areas, that the mother may be reacting to the training information which she received from experts in the handling and socialization of her child. The authors also examine the child's ability to relate to others and to get along within the school setting. The research reported here, again, has a small sample size but several conclusions were reached. Among them, are that the lag in reading achievement levels between normally hearing and deaf children was from 2.2 to 3.2 years, that the deaf in a day school setting appear to have a depressed self-image and that as the student's ability to communicate with others around him decreased, his ability to understand and accept both himself and his deafness also appeared to decrease.

Three chapters are devoted to deafness and mental health. The problem of mental health in the deaf population is looked at in relation to a residential school, provision of mental health services for the deaf and the preventative aspects of community psychiatry. The authors report that the deaf population when compared with the normally hearing population, has almost five times as many severely disturbed individuals as does the hearing group. They also report that over 2½ times as many deaf as hearing students were identified as mildly disturbed. These results are somewhat different than has been reported in previous research. Once the individual's need of the service was identified, procedures which were followed at the Porter-Langley Clinic are reported in some depth. Clinical case loads are described and the various factors which may affect the adjustment of the individual are discussed. These included the occupational distribution of parents, etiology, age-onset of deafness, sex, marital status of parents, etc. Therapeutic procedures are discussed and the effect that the therapeutic process had upon individual clients is presented with a variety of case histories given to point out changes which either did or did not occur. Discussion is also presented concerning the major types of problems treated. In each case, the breakdown in the developmental phases and the case history was used to show where the breakdown in development may have occurred. The authors conclude that therapists with specific training and experience in working with deafness probably have an advantage over those without that additional expertise. It was also pointed out that in order to do the most effective job, the staff themselves had to have sufficient time to undertake more direct service and that specialized training for consultation with other mental health professionals was needed. A series of consultations with other professionals in a variety of settings are described. These consultations took place in a

41

state school for the deaf, a city school system, a school for deaf-blind children, and in other professional settings.

Finally, the authors present a model program for community psychiatry, which should be used for services to a deaf population. The eight components of a model program are discussed in some detail and the ways to establish the program are discussed. It is unfortunate that the authors did not have enough time or space to delve more deeply into the establishment of this model program, since it appears to be one of the highlights of the book. The model program is built upon service to clients and methods to correct problems which have been outlined and discussed in previous chapters. This particular chapter even though short, is well handled and is well worth reading by all professionals in the field of deafness.

It is suggested that this book is worth reading by all professional people working with deaf individuals. There is a wealth of information in it for teachers who are working with preschool or young deaf children and there is equal content for the professional person working with the adult deaf. The developmental structure which has been set up by these authors, is one which should be considered by individuals working in the area of deafness. Even though the Erikson model may not be the professional's choice, the conclusions which were drawn can be applied to other developmental models. The conclusions which were drawn can also be used to explain much of the behavior which a professional individual is seeing in either his clients or in the individuals with whom he is working.

<div style="text-align: right">

Richard E. Walker
Oregon College of Education

</div>

SPEECHREADING PRINCIPLES AND METHODS. Kenneth W. Berger. National Educational Press, Baltimore, Maryland: 1972. 233 pages. Price $8.50

Doctor Berger has written an interesting book on speechreading. As the title implies, the book deals with principles and methods; it does not give the reader the typical lessons so often put forth in cookbook fashion. The book has nine chapters and an adequate bibliography.

The author starts the text with a delightful chapter on the history of communication of the deaf. It contains some brief historical facts that should add to students' understanding of the problem of deafness. The second chapter is entitled "Oral and Manual Communication"; owing to its content, it could have been entitled "Oral vs. Manual Communication." Although it is obvious that the author is of the oral school, he should be complimented on his attempt at objectivity. Even so, if one is attempting to find support for the manual or more popular combined approach, one would do well to look elsewhere. The author's harsh treatment of some authors who support the manual approach leaves this reviewer with the impression that those criticized were at least as objective as the author. Chapter 3, however, which deals with receptive speech by vision, is a return to some degree of objectivity. Berger points out that as the hearing loss becomes greater the dependence on vision becomes greater, and he concludes with an excellent discussion of the role played by the various sensory modalities. This chapter is followed by one that gives an excellent understanding of the

visual recognition of the phonetic elements of speech; it includes some of the reasons why visual and phonetic elements are often confused.

Chapters 5, 6, and 7 deal with the many complex factors that influence the speechreader, the speaker, and the environment. Included are discussions on individual differences in speechreaders and their environment; individual characteristics such as visual acuity, attention span, and intelligence; characteristics important in the speechreading situation; and obvious effects of the environment upon the speech-reader's ability to perceive the visual stimulus. Chapter 8, which deals with tests of speechreading, covers the two main types of speechreading tests: face-to-face tests and filmed tests. Berger then discusses the merits of the two test procedures. He points out that "... a standard test of speechreading is not presently available and is greatly needed." The final chapter, like the first, is an excellent review of the historical development of methods used in teaching speechreading. The author also mentions many supplementary materials such as training films, journal articles, television educational media, and he then presents some general guidelines for those who are concerned with the process of lipreading.

The bibliography contains 412 references; however, it must have cost the author a great deal of imagination to include some of these in a book on speechreading.

I believe that this book will be a great asset to those who are struggling with courses that apparently must be taught in the area of lipreading. This book may have an added attraction of calling to the attention of those using it some areas of much needed research. I am impressed with the book to the extent that I shall purchase a copy.

Darrell E. Rose
Mayo Clinic and Mayo Foundation

SPEECHREADING: PRINCIPLES AND METHODS. Kenneth L. Berger. National Education Press, Baltimore, Maryland: 1972. 233 pages. $8.50.

More than thirty years ago when I was a student in college, I was frequently placed in the front row so that I could speechread the lecturers. At best I could get a word here and there, sometimes a phrase, and on infrequent occasions even a complete sentence. Naively, I assumed that the words I missed were subject to the same principles as those I understood, and I lived on the hope that with diligent application I would gradually comprehend an increasing number of sentence elements to the point where I could comprehend the entire lecture. Maybe I was deficient in visual acuity, or possibly I had some defect in my cerebral processes, or perhaps I simply didn't try hard enough. Regardless of the cause, speechreading for me has been a tantalizing mistress who never fulfilled the promises she held out to me.

I interject this personal experience into this book review because I see a parallel between my own experience and the literature on speechreading. In the over-all picture, there is a bit of credibility here and there, but more than a hundred years of effort has accomplished little in the development of this singular means of communication. Despite a brave effort to make a science of teaching speechreading, it remains an elusive art in which success correlates poorly with the amount and quality of effort expended in the pursuit of it.

43

BOOK REVIEWS

The target readers for this book apparently are those people in teacher preparation programs who teach prospective teachers and audiologists about speech-reading. For this rather limited number of professionals the book could be a very useful teaching tool. However, for the teachers who are concerned with the problem of improving communication skills of a hearing impaired population, those who deal directly with this segment of the handicapped, the book offers very little assistance.

The comparatively small volume (nine chapters, 200 pages) is a comprehensive and exhaustive effort to summarize what has been written on the subject of speechreading. The bibliography of 412 books and articles attests to an extensive library search. If one were to question the relevance of the first two chapters, dealing with the history of the education of the deaf and a rehash of the oral-manual controversy, the book becomes a very skimpy basis for a course in speechreading.

The book is strongest in those areas where Berger deals with phonetic and accoustical principles of speech. The author also seems to be authoritative when discussing the clinical tools for the diagnosis of speechreading skills. Berger also attains considerable depth when discussing the variables that affect speechreading skills. He has, it should be pointed out, possibly been more active in speechreading research during the past five years than anyone else in the field.

Dr. Berger's heart, however, is apparently not set on winning friends within the adult deaf community. In spite of an exhaustive search for knowledge, Berger has had insufficient contact with the adult deaf community to understand and present the perspective of the people who use speechreading as a communication tool. As a result, he is as unfair to those adult deaf who support oralism as he is toward those who are pro-manual. Both, to borrow a phrase, get short shrift in the book.

In his introduction Dr. Berger points out the inadequacy of both quality and quantity of scholarly work in speechreading. Many of the research reports among the bibliographical items reveal vastly contradictory results. Similarly, much of the data reported is statistically questionable and often outdated. However, the only research that Dr. Berger questions or challenges is that supportive of manual communication. It makes one wonder just how successful the author was in his goal of objectivity.

It is interesting to note that of the 412 bibliographical notes, 132 were reported in the years since 1963. Some of the older articles go back to the nineteenth century. The topic of speechreading apparently attained a height of popularity during the 1940's. It appears that the major output during the past ten years has been from graduate students in institutions of higher learning, rather than from practicing professionals. The lack of contributions from practitioners of speechreading instruction is attested to by the fact that speechreading methodology described in the final chapter was mostly developed during the first quarter of the century (1912-1931). The major effort in recent years has been with the employment of film and television technology for teaching speechreading.

The book will be useful to a relatively small number of people. As a summary of literature in this limited field it should be a necessary addition to teacher preparation libraries. However, in all candor, it is a shallow and superficial volume on what is basically a shallow and superficial body of knowledge.

George Propp
Northwestern University