

Keyword Signing: Evidence of impact (from Budiyanto and Sheehy, in preparation)

KWS approaches have been used to support children with severe learning difficulties in several countries, often with individual manual signs adopted from those of the respective country's Deaf community. For example using British Sign Language (Walker, 1987), Irish Sign Language (Lámh, 2008) or adapted as in the Flemish *Spreken Met Ondersteuning van Gebaren* (SMOG) approach (Vandereet, Maes, Lembrechts, & Zink, 2011).

KWS is learned relatively easily and several factors have been associated with this (Kristien Meuris, Maes, & Zink, 2014): Signs' multimodality may enhance their comprehension (Sigafos & Drasgow, 2001); signs are produced more slowly than speech, and can be physically modelled and shaped for children (Bryen, Goldman, & Quinlisk-Gill, 1988), they require no technologies (Mirenda, 2003) and can be based in typical everyday interactions (e.g with regard to turn-taking and eye contact) (Clibbens, 2001). Learning KWS is reported to be enjoyable, so children may be motivated to learn and use it (Mandel & Livingston, 1993), including children without learning difficulties (Mistry & Barnes, 2012). There is extensive evidence that KWS improves the communication and language development of children with severe learning difficulties, including those without spoken language (Doherty-Sneddon, 2008; Dunst & Hamby, 2011; Snell et al., 2010; Tan, Trembath, & Bloomberg, 2014). It can also enhance children's expressive language development (Rudd, Grove, & Pring, 2007), stimulate speech development (Millar, Light, & Schlosser, 2006; R. Schlosser & Wendt, 2008) and make communication easier for others to understand, for example by making speech (where it exists) more intelligible to others (Meuris, Maes, Meyer, & Zink, 2014). By reducing communicative frustration for some children it can reduce problematic behaviours (Doherty-Sneddon, 2008). Furthermore research suggests that the positive effects of KWS are greater than using either a sign alone or a purely oral approach (Schlosser & Sigafos, 2006).

Children use KWS in different ways. For some children it is a limited part of their communication repertoire, for others it is a developmental phase in which their language development is facilitated and for others it becomes their main means of communication (Vandereet et al., 2011). Within inclusive classrooms there will also be children who do not themselves 'need' KWS, but use it to communicate with their peers. Developing the communication skills of all members of a class has positive outcomes for those who experience communication barriers (Roulstone & Lindsay, 2012) and KWS has been perceived by teachers as a tool to support inclusive classrooms (Sheehy & Duffy, 2009).

References.

- Bryen D.N., Goldman, A. S., & Quinlisk-Gill, S. (1988). Sign language with students with severe/profound retardation: How effective is it? *Education and Training in Mental Retard.*, 23, 129–137.
- Clibbens, J. (2001). Signing and lexical development in children with Down syndrome. *Down's Syndrome. Down's Syndrome: Research and Practice*, 7, 101–105.
- Doherty-Sneddon, G. (2008). The great baby signing debate. *The Psychologist*, 21(6), 300–304.
- Dunst, C. J., & Hamby, D. W. (2011). Influences of Sign and Oral Language Production of Young Children with Disabilities. *CELL Reviews*, 4(4), 1–20.
- Lámh. (2008). *A manual sign system for people with intellectual disabilities and communication needs in Ireland*. Retrieved December 11, 2012, from <http://www.lamh.org/>
- Mandel, L. A., & Livingston, P. (1993). The effect of signing key words for demonstrating work instructions to students with learning. *Journal of Rehabilitation*, 59(2), 43–48.
- Meuris, K., Maes, B., Meyer, A. De, & Zink, I. (2014). Manual signing in adults with intellectual disabilities: influence of sign characteristics on functional sign vocabulary. *Journal of Speech, Language, and ...*, 57(June), 990–1011. doi:10.1044/2014
- Meuris, K., Maes, B., & Zink, I. (2014). Key Word Signing Usage in Residential and Day Care Programs for Adults With Intellectual Disability. *Journal of Policy and Practice in Intellectual Disabilities*, 11(4), 255–267. doi:10.1111/jppi.12093
- Millar, D. C., Light, J. C., & Schlosser, R. W. (2006). The impact of augmentative and alternative communication intervention on the speech production of individuals with developmental disabilities: A research review. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, 49(2), 248–264.
- Mirenda, P. (2003). Toward Functional Augmentative and Alternative Communication for Students With Autism: Manual Signs, Graphic Symbols, and Voice Output Communication Aids. *Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools*, 34(3), 203–216.
- Mistry, M., & Barnes, D. (2012). The use of Makaton for supporting talk, through play, for pupils who have English as an Additional Language (EAL) in the Foundation Stage. *Education 3-13*, (August 2015), 1–14. doi:10.1080/03004279.2011.631560
- Roulstone, S., & Lindsay, G. (2012). The perspectives of children and young people who have speech, language and communication needs, and their parents. Retrieved from <https://dfe.gov.uk/publications/eOrderingDownload/DFE-RR247-BCRP7.pdf>
- Rudd, H., Grove, N., & Pring, T. (2007). Teaching productive sign modifications to children with intellectual disabilities. *Augmentative and Alternative Communication*, 23(2), 154–63. doi:10.1080/07434610601124867

- Schlosser, R. W., & Sigafoos, J. (2006). Augmentative and alternative communication interventions for persons with developmental disabilities: Narrative review of comparative single-subject experimental studies. *Research in Developmental Disabilities, 27*, 1–29.
- Schlosser, R., & Wendt, O. (2008). Effects of augmentative and alternative communication intervention on speech production in children with autism: A systematic review. *American Journal of Speech- Language Pathology, 17*, 212–230.
- Sheehy, K., & Duffy, H. (2009). Attitudes to Makaton in the ages of integration and inclusion. *International Journal of Special Education, 24*(2), 91–102. Retrieved from http://oro.open.ac.uk/19897/2/SheehyDuffy_Makaton_112009_No_2.doc
- Snell, M. E., Brady, N., McLean, L., Ogletree, B. T., Siegel, E., Sylvester, L., ... Sevcik, R. (2010). Twenty years of communication intervention research with individuals who have severe intellectual and developmental disabilities. *American Journal on Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities, 115*(5), 364–80. doi:10.1352/1944-7558-115-5.364
- Tan, X. Y., Trembath, D., Bloomberg, K. (2014). Acquisition and generalization of key word signing by three children with autism. *Developmental Neurorehabilitation, 17*(2), 125–136. doi:10.3109/17518423.2013.863236
- Vandereet, J., Maes, B., Lembrechts, D., & Zink, I. (2011). Expressive vocabulary acquisition in children with intellectual disability: speech or manual signs? *Journal of Intellectual & Developmental Disability, 36*(2), 91–104. doi:10.1080/13668250.2011.572547
- Walker, M. (1987). *The Makaton Vocabulary: Uses and Effectiveness*. Retrieved from <http://www.makaton.org/research/walker87.htm>