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Abstract:

This study investigated the language use of deaf adult bilinguals in conversation with each other in workplace settings, and with their deaf and hearing children in home settings. The aim was to gain insight into the Auslan-English language contact outcomes that might be found in these settings, and what factors influenced these outcomes. The results indicated that the most unique use of language by deaf bilinguals was that of simultaneous use of both spoken English and Auslan, and it was this simultaneous use which facilitated the two examples of code-switching (defined as a complete change of language from Auslan to spoken English) that was found in the data. The other two contact outcomes of significance were frequent transference of English into Auslan, and the equally frequent use of fingerspelling, which has a pivotal role in filling the gap in Auslan, a language with no orthographic form. The study also revealed that Auslan (a signed language) was the language in which many issues of identity were expressed by deaf bilinguals, regardless of whether the individual was a first or second language learner of Auslan. The results confirmed that these language and identity factors did influence the language contact outcomes.
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Chapter 1 - Introduction to Thesis

Research into sign language in deaf communities is relatively recent, and one of the first examples was Stokoe’s 1960 publication, which described his early research on the structure of American Sign Language (Stokoe, 1960). Earlier studies of sign languages in the United States included those used by hearing members of indigenous communities, including those used by American Indian nations. These studies can be traced back to historical records of the 1540s. Extensive field research was carried out in the 1870s by Captain William Clark of the U.S. Army (Farnell, 1996). Studies in other parts of the world included the sign languages of Australian Aboriginals and the place of these sign languages in the Aboriginal culture. Comparison was also made between the indigenous sign languages and deaf sign languages (Kendon, 2004). From his research Stokoe demonstrated that signs used in the American deaf community could be analysed in the same way that units of spoken language could be analysed. Until then, “signs were thought of as unanalyzable wholes, with no internal structure.” (Valli & Lucas, 2000: 25). Following Stokoe’s suggestions for analysing signs, sign linguists began to research sign languages in a similar ways to research in spoken languages.

Early research into the sign languages of deaf people included considerations of the contact between a sign language and a spoken language as well as the influence of the spoken language of the wider community on the sign language of a deaf community. The underlying assumption was that the sign language was really a reduced form of the spoken language of the community (Sutton-Spence & Woll, 1999: 9; Lucas, 2001: 4). This assumption meant that linguists did not consider investigating the contact outcomes of two sign languages until many years after Stokoe’s publication. Lucas (2001) pointed out that during the early years (prior to the 1980s) she and colleagues could recall incidental examples of the outcome of contact between two sign languages, but no empirical research could be found to support their observations. (Chapter 2 has further discussion of this observation). Even after years of anecdotal evidence, no relevant empirical research was begun until the 1980s. This serves to highlight the gap between the literature on bilinguals using spoken languages and that on bilinguals using sign languages. It is now widely accepted that many deaf people are bilinguals in two or more sign languages (Schembri, 1996; Johnston, 1998; Grosjean, 2001; Lucas, 2001; Lucas, Bayley & Valli, 2003). It is also acknowledged that deaf people can be bilingual using a spoken language and a signed language throughout their daily lives (Johnston, 2002b; Kannapell, 1989; Lane & Grosjean, 1980; Lee, 1982; Lucas, 1989).

This thesis aims to contribute to the field of linguistic research in Australia in sign and spoken language contact. Empirical research into Australian Sign Language (Auslan), and Auslan/English bilingualism did not begin until the 1980s. Linguists began the first explorations during the late 1980s and the body of research has continued to grow, including examination of the linguistics of Auslan, the origin and development of Auslan, and its place
as a core value in the culture of the Australian deaf community (Hyde & Power, 1991; Johnston, 1989, 1991 & 1998; Schembri, 1996; Johnston & Schembri, 2007). Investigations were also begun into the field of interpreting and the kind of language use and decision-making of interpreters using Auslan and spoken English (Napier 2006; Ozolins, 1993; Ozolins & Bridge, 1999). Recently studies by Schembri and Johnston (2007) have been undertaken into phonological variation in Auslan (Schembri, Johnston & Goswell, 2006), variable subject pronoun presence in Auslan (Schembri & Johnston, 2007a), and sociolinguistic variation in fingerspelling use in Auslan (Schembri & Johnston, 2007b).

The present study begins with a discussion of the current Australian and international research into bilingualism, language contact outcomes (including code-switching) for two spoken languages and then the outcomes of contact between a sign language and a spoken language. It then reports on the methodology of the study, followed by the results of my research and possible implications for language planning and the future of Auslan programs.

### 1.1 Research Questions

The investigation will seek answers to the following three questions:

1. What are the language contact outcomes in Auslan/English bilingualism of deaf adults and do they include code-switching as defined in spoken language bilingualism literature?
2. What linguistic, sociolinguistic and psycholinguistic factors influence these outcomes?
3. In what ways is sign/spoken language bilingualism different from spoken language bilingualism as described in the literature?

Auslan/English bilingualism varies widely in the deaf community. Bilinguals include deaf people who have acquired Auslan as a native language, and deaf people who have learned Auslan early as a second language as well as English as a second language (in other words no natively acquired first language). Bilinguals can also include hearing people who have acquired Auslan as their first language and acquired English later although still at an early age, and hearing people who have learnt Auslan as a second language with English as their first language. These four groups can be placed on a continuum that also includes many other types of Auslan/English bilinguals. (Section 4.1 describes other sign/spoken language bilinguals as listed by Ann, 2001). The age of acquisition and the method of acquisition of Auslan and spoken English are just two factors which impact on where the bilingual would be placed on the continuum. (Chapter 4 will discuss these issues of Auslan/English bilingualism in the community in more detail).

Individual bilingualism in spoken language communities generally refers to those individuals who acquire one or more minority languages in the home, and acquire or learn additional majority languages as a second or third language after school age. In this way the term bilingualism includes multilingualism. (Romaine 1995; Weinreich, 1968). Bilingualism such as this in the deaf community is only found in a small number of people. For most deaf people
the process of becoming bilingual involves limited access to the majority spoken language in the home and wider community, and delayed learning of the minority sign language from deaf role models at pre-school or even later ages. Questions about whether a signer has acquired Auslan as a ‘native language’ or as a second language, and whether they have acquired or learned their English language when the auditory access to English was physiologically limited, become even more complex in the deaf community than in many spoken language communities. Johnston (2002b: 29) lists this issue as one which contributes to the uniqueness of signed languages, as “they are usually acquired in ways not comparable to other languages”. Romaine (1995: 22) stated that “the concept of bilingualism is a relative notion” and needs to take into account many factors, not just the number of languages an individual has access to, or the fluency with which he/she can communicate in those languages. These factors are important when considering bilingualism in the deaf community and are discussed in detail in Section 4.1.1.

For the purposes of this study, I have limited the scope to adult deaf bilinguals, excluding hearing individuals using Auslan, as well as deaf and hearing children. The venues of the data collection were home and work, namely two workplaces, and two family homes. In each workplace setting three deaf bilinguals were the participants and in each home setting two parents were the participants for the study. Although children (both deaf and hearing) were present in the family settings, their language use was outside the scope of this study, except in so far as it engendered a response from one of the parents. Chapter 5 provides a detailed explanation of the selection of the participants and the rationale behind the method of selection.

As the researcher, I represent that group of hearing people who acquired English as a first language and Auslan as a second language in adult years. I have been using Auslan with the deaf community since 1973, and I have been a qualified and accredited interpreter in Auslan and English since 1984. Deaf people usually communicate with me in Auslan although it is common knowledge that my first language was English. Being bilingual in Auslan and English, I was able to conduct the research and collect the data, communicating directly with all the participants.

The data collected includes both Auslan and spoken English, and comparisons were made with other recent research in Australia, as well as to similar international studies. Most well-known research into the linguistics of sign languages of deaf communities has occurred in the United States of America (American Sign Language - ASL), and Britain (British Sign Language - BSL). Researchers in European countries such as Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Germany, Hungary, Italy, Sweden, the Netherlands have conducted projects on the linguistics of the local sign languages (Hunger, 2006; Klatter-Folmer: 2006). Research has also been conducted on sign language in Turkey, India, Pakistan, Indonesia, Bulgaria, and New Zealand.
(Branson & Miller, 1991; McKee & McKee, 2000; Zeshan, 2002 & 2004). Studies have been conducted on Venzuelan, Argentinian, Spanish, and Catalan sign languages (Massone & Johnson, 1991; Lucas, 2001), and further on the sign languages of Taiwan, Japan, and France (Lucas, 2001).

The justification for this present study cannot be underestimated, not simply because of the lack of data corpora currently available in Australia. There is also a lack of knowledge in the wider Australian community about deaf people and their needs. In particular, there still exist many myths about the intellectual and functional skills of deaf people as well as about the language used in the deaf community. As an interpreter I have personally been asked quite recently “Do the deaf have a lesser capacity for understanding abstract concepts?” for instance, and more often “Isn’t Auslan really a shorthand form of English?” There are still those who believe that the only way for a child with deafness to succeed is to force them to use their limited capacity for hearing, and not the visual (or sign) language that is a more natural means of communication. These negative and unfounded attitudes towards Auslan, and towards the use of Auslan in educational settings for deaf students, can only be overcome by research, which acknowledges the place of Auslan in linguistic studies in Australia, and highlights the benefits of sign/spoken language bilingualism for all deaf children and adults.

This research will contribute to a better understanding of Auslan/English bilingualism and so benefit the Australian deaf community in four ways:
Firstly, it will show some of the ways deaf people use their two (or more) languages and contribute to the body of research on language contact outcomes that is growing in Australia at present.
Secondly it will reveal some of the interaction patterns between members of the deaf community and verify some of the anecdotal assertions about the use of Auslan and English by deaf people (e.g. that deaf signers use a different form of Auslan between themselves that does not include any features of English; that deaf signers always code-switch when conversing with hearing people).
Thirdly it will show how bilingualism in the deaf community could provide information for education policies in the future. Increasingly Auslan is seen as a community language and this study may contribute towards even further acceptance of Auslan in educational settings. The results will provide information that will assist interpreters working in the community, and teachers training the interpreters in appropriate language skills.
Fourthly research such as this shows us the similarities between spoken languages and sign languages and enhances the picture of human language in general.
1.2 Specific Features of the Language Contact Situation

The research in this study reveals ways in which sign/spoken language bilingualism differs from spoken language bilingualism. There are particular features of sign/spoken language bilingualism which have long been known to the deaf community and those working with the deaf community. However, as Auslan has not been recognized as a community language until very recently, many of these language features have been taken for granted. (See Chapter 4, Section 4.4 for a discussion of the Australian Language Policy of 1987). Some of these features are:

1. The sign language in any deaf community is a minority language that speakers share with other people in the deaf community, but do not necessarily share with their parents. The reality is that the majority of young deaf children do not have easy (or in many cases, any) access to the spoken language of their parents. Hearing parents are incapable (without significant intervention from professionals and technology) of passing on, in a natural way, their ‘mother tongue’. This is in contrast with bilinguals in spoken languages who share a group identity with their parents, which usually includes the language of the home. In this way immigrant languages are well maintained in many cases due to strong home use.

2. There is very little observed shift over time from the sign language of the deaf community to the spoken language of the wider community. The physiological nature of deafness means that deaf people never have full access to spoken English, despite technological interventions such as hearing-aids and cochlear implants. Intergenerational shifts among some deaf individuals to English with the increasing use of cochlear implants and advanced hearing aids, is balanced by the improved attitudes regarding Auslan as a community language, and the increased cohesion among Auslan signers. However, more importantly for this study, the influence of English can be seen in the varieties of English-like signing, or signing in order to represent English visually, which pervade the deaf community. This influence is strongly resisted by some members of the deaf community, and viewed as desirable or accepted without question by others. This creates an ambivalence towards both languages in some individuals.

3. Auslan, like all sign languages in deaf communities, and similar to some spoken languages, has no written form. Auslan signers rely on English as their written communication. This means they learn to read and write in a ‘second language’, while many signers also learn Auslan as a second language as they start their formal education at school.

4. The sign language of a deaf community is a critical feature of the identity of the community. In some minority spoken language communities, the culture of the community continues, even after the speakers have shifted to the majority language. The identity of the community is retained, even after the language has been lost. However, within the deaf community the need for communication in a sign language (providing visual communication when auditory/spoken communication is not possible) brings deaf
people together, and without this sign language the deaf community may have no reason for its existence. The relationship that deaf signers have with their sign language is a different one to the relationship speakers of spoken languages have with their languages and there are two main reasons for this. The first reason is the physiological nature of deafness blocking natural access to the spoken language, and the second is the cultural need for a common, visual language shared by all members. If the sign language was lost, it would mean the community members were no longer communicating with each other, resulting in the loss of a need for a community. These issues will be taken up in the literature survey in Chapter 2, and will provide part of the background for the research throughout the thesis.

1.3 Explanations of Terms
1.3.1 Deaf/deaf
The use of capital D in any situation for the word ‘deaf’ is not a convention which will be followed in this thesis. Woodward, in the 1970s began the convention of using the capital ‘D’ to classify the status of people who are members of the cultural Deaf community, and lower-case letter ‘d’ for those people who refer to themselves as hard of hearing or hearing-impaired. It must be noted here that sign linguists have frequently quoted Woodward as introducing this convention in his 1972 article (Woodard, 1972), but it is apparent that this reference is incorrect when one actually reads this very interesting article. The convention appears in Woodward’s papers during the 1970s, but not in this particular reference.

Padden (1980) further developed this convention by differentiating between the deaf community and a culturally Deaf person. Thus, “a deaf community has not only Deaf members, but also hearing and deaf people who are not culturally Deaf, but who interact on a daily basis with Deaf people and see themselves as working with Deaf people in various common concerns.” (Padden, 1980: 92). The culture of Deaf people, however, in Padden’s terms does not include hearing people or deaf people who do not share the culture. “Members of the Deaf culture behave as Deaf people do, use the language of Deaf people, and share the beliefs of Deaf people toward themselves and other people who are not deaf.” (Padden, 1980: 93). As Napier (2002:141) stated, “[Deaf] people are those who identify themselves as members of the Deaf community and regard themselves as culturally Deaf, whereas [deaf] people are those who do not sign and regard themselves as having a hearing impairment”.

The development of the term Deaf/deaf has not prevented confusion in its use and application. When referring to a culturally Deaf adult, with physiologically deaf children who may or may not yet be said to be part of the Deaf culture, the convention starts to become unwieldy. Children born deaf, with hearing parents, may also not yet be considered to be part of the culturally Deaf community. The convention is also redundant, as in the words of
Johnston (1998: 557), “given the reality of the sociolinguistic situation—that deaf people form linguistic communities—the usual meaning of the word does already encompass this idea”. As I agree with this position, and for the purposes of clarity, the capital D convention will not be used in this thesis. This should in no way be seen as a denial of the existence of the cultural community of deaf people in Australia. Instead the term ‘culturally deaf’ will be used to refer to an individual who identifies strongly with the deaf community, and uses Auslan as his/her preferred language, whether or not they work in the wider hearing community.

1.3.2 Other Terms
The following terms are used by participants in the data and so it was felt necessary to include some here in order to prepare the reader:

*Coda* is an acronym for Child of Deaf Adults, and is usually used to refer to the hearing children of deaf parents, but is sometimes claimed also by the deaf children of deaf parents. These children acquire the sign language of their parents or caregivers as their first language, from birth, and in Rampton’s term “inherited” it as part of their earliest development. (Rampton, 1995).

*Deafblind* is employed in this study to refer to a group of deaf people in Australia, most of whom have Usher’s Syndrome. This syndrome causes a loss of peripheral vision during early years, often leading to serious vision impairment or blindness between twenty and thirty years of age. These people were members of the deaf community until their sight loss caused them to withdraw from regular participation in community activities. By convention the name *deafblind* is not hyphenated, as it has cultural and identity significance to the individuals in this tight-knit group, just as the word *deaf* does for the deaf community. Although the name *deafblind* is also conventionally written with a capital ‘D’, this part of the convention will not be followed in this paper.

*Hearing* is the term used to refer to all those who have normal hearing, or who may have a hearing-impairment but have never experienced life as a culturally deaf person, and do not share the language and culture of the deaf community.

*Normal hearing* is a term not used by any participant in this thesis but is assumed as the base for all the following levels of deafness, some of which are used by participants in their discussions:

*Mild deafness* is a 20 to 40 decibel loss.
*Moderate deafness* is a 40 – 55 decibel loss.
*Moderate – severe deafness* is a 55 – 70db loss.
*Severe deafness* is a 70 – 90db loss
*Profound deafness* is a 90 – 120db loss.
The Australian Deaf Community refers to the community of deaf people in Australia who share the language, Auslan, and identify as being culturally deaf and members of this community.

Auslan is the acronym for Australian Sign Language, the language of the Australian deaf community.

ASL is the acronym for American Sign Language, the language used by the American deaf community.

BSL is the acronym for British Sign Language, the language of the deaf community in Britain.

ISL is the acronym for Irish Sign Language, the language of the Irish deaf community.

All of the above sign languages are distinct and separate languages, although Auslan is derived from BSL and ISL brought to Australia by deaf convicts and settlers. ASL developed from the French Sign Language taken to the U.S.A. by deaf teachers and priests from France. Chapter 3 contains a brief summary of the history of Australian Sign Language and the stages of development as it grew to become the language Auslan, as it is used today.

Native Sign Language is a term used in the literature to refer to a sign language acquired naturally by a deaf or hearing child as their first language. (The implication is that the parents or caregivers of the children are themselves deaf). The natural acquisition of a sign language as a first language can be compared to the way the spoken language of the dominant hearing community is learned with difficulty, as a second language, by a deaf child. It can also be compared to the way a deaf child in a hearing family learns the sign language of the deaf community from peers or with hearing parents who learn Auslan in a community course, and hence provide language modelling in Auslan with great difficulty.

Cued Speech is a contrived system of handshapes produced near the mouth to represent speech phonemes, and to assist in the recognition and teaching of spoken English. (See Chapter 3).

Signed English is the term used in Australia for the artificial, contrived system of signs that conveys spoken English in English syntax, word for word in a visual form.

Simultaneous use or simultaneous communication occurs when an individual signs and speaks simultaneously. It may occur with a single word, where the sign and an equivalent spoken word are produced together, or for a longer utterance, where several words and signs, in a phrase, may be produced simultaneously (Caccamise et al, 1978). The term is often used interchangably with the term ‘total communication’ which refers to signing and speaking at the same time but also includes the use of gesture, writing, and any other form of communication which the deaf child may need to draw upon to access full communication.
with his/her interlocutor (Denton, 1976). Throughout this thesis I have used the term *simultaneous use* to refer to both the process of signing and speaking simultaneously, and for the result of that process.

*Segregated schools for the deaf* are schools providing education for deaf children only, either government or private (religious) schools. Sometimes referred to as special schools for the deaf, they followed, in the past, a curriculum that focused on the perceived ‘special educational needs’ of the deaf students, rather than the curriculum used in regular, mainstream schools.

*Mainstream schools and colleges* refer to schools that educate hearing students and do not usually cater for deaf students in any way. Nowadays, certain mainstream schools and colleges (even those that are private, or have a specialist vocational philosophy) have small deaf facilities, enabling deaf students to participate in the regular classes, while being able to withdraw for specialist intervention within the facility for the deaf.

*Mouth pattern* refers to the movements of the mouth during the signed and/or spoken communication (Boyes-Braem & Sutton-Spence, 2001). If the comment in the data was produced simultaneously in both languages, the transcription in this study shows the words and signs as they were produced. However, if the utterance was only signed and not vocalised, but the signs were accompanied by a mouth movement, whether that was the English lip pattern (*mouthing*), or whether it was a conventional Auslan mouth movement (sometimes referred to as *mouth gesture*), I decided to continue to use the term *mouth pattern*. In the main, the mouth patterns were those of English word forms, even though occasionally not fully articulated. Only one instance of a non-standard mouth pattern with an Auslan sign was observed in this study, so the transcription records both kinds of mouth patterns in the same way, using English orthography. Chapter 5 discusses mouth patterns in more detail.

**1.3.3 Transcription conventions**

Chapter 5 provides a table of the transcription conventions used in this study. As stated by Zeshan (2004: 9) “Given the fact that signed languages involve dynamic movements in three-dimensional space and transmit linguistic information simultaneously via several channels (hand movements, facial expressions, head positions, body postures), adequately representing signed languages on paper has always been a major problem in signed language research”. There are many different ways of transcribing the visual nature of a sign language in a text form, and some conventions have developed, and I have sourced many texts for my method. (Johnston, 1991 & 1998; Johnston & Schembri, 2007; Lucas, Bayley & Valli, 2003; Schembri, 1996; Sutton-Spence & Woll, 1999; Valli & Lucas, 2000; Zeshan, 2004). The uniqueness of sign language is that the information conveyed in any conversation is often as much in the face and head movements of the signer as in the actual sign. This is
distinct from body language signals that often accompany spoken language communication. In sign languages, the movements of the face and head can form part of the syntactical structure of the utterance, although this is not universally accepted (Johnston & Schembri, 2007). For my purposes, in order to be able to capture the language contact outcomes between spoken English and Auslan, I needed to be able to convey to the reader all the features of the utterance whether they were in the signs, on the face, or in the speech of the participant. In order to also make it accessible to most readers, I have not followed a practice of just ‘glossing’ the signs and explaining the extra information. ‘Glossing’ in sign linguistics refers to the convention of conveying in written form the most commonly accepted meaning of a specific sign and does not always include information on morphology (which is the use of ‘glossing’ in linguistic transcriptions of spoken languages), although often it does. I have created a stave of five lines of information, so the reader can follow the whole of the message in both languages, and the bottom line of every stave is a translation of the message in English. In Chapter 5 I have provided an explanation of each line and an example of a transcribed utterance. Chapters 6, 7 and 8 discuss the language contact outcomes in the data, and include a transcription of each utterance under discussion.

1.4 Chapter Outline

Chapter 2 is a review of the literature on language contact phenomena (including code-switching) and language and identity issues. Some of the historical research is presented, and four perspectives on code-switching and other language contact outcomes are reviewed. Following the discussion of each of the linguistic, sociolinguistic, conversational and psycholinguistic perspectives on code-switching in spoken language pairs, there is a subsection presenting known research in sign/spoken language contact. Language and identity issues are presented as a basis for discussion of the reasons for some of the data obtained in this study. Language planning research is discussed briefly as it is relevant to the impact of this study on the educational and language needs of deaf students accessing education in English, through Auslan.

Chapter 3 deals with the history and demography of the Australian Deaf Community, and the Victorian Deaf Community, which is the subject of this research. The history and experiences of the Australian Deaf Community include the various communication systems used in educational settings, and the way the community language, Auslan, has developed in spite of the outside influence of the contrived sign systems as well as spoken and written English. The culture of the community, and the effect this culture can have on an individual deaf person’s identity is also discussed.

Chapter 4 describes bilingualism as it is practised in the Australian deaf community. Issues such as diglossia, language shift and language contact in the deaf community are discussed. Research into language variation within the deaf community is very recent, but what is known
empirically and anecdotally is examined. Some regional and religious differences are explained within the context of language variation. Language and identity issues in the deaf community are also explored. The final part of chapter 4 focuses on some of the language planning issues for Auslan, both status and corpus planning.

Chapter 5 describes the methods of data collection for this study and the subsequent issues, including the selection of participants, a brief profile of each participant and the method of videoing in each of four settings. A discussion of the terms used for the various language contact phenomena in this study are also explained. Transcription of the data involved several stages that are described here, including some of the hurdles that had to be overcome.

Chapter 6 contains the data results and analysis in each setting from a linguistic perspective. The discussion focuses on the variables that facilitated the language contact outcomes for the deaf bilinguals. The transcriptions for each token analysed are included, highlighting the instances of transference of English language features into Auslan and, in particular, instances of the unique feature of sign/spoken language contact, that of simultaneous production. Possible reasons for the fingerspelling in each setting are also discussed.

Chapter 7 contains the data results and analysis from a sociolinguistic perspective in each setting. This chapter discusses some of the factors influencing the simultaneous production and the occasions of subsequent switching into spoken English and highlights some of the identity issues which underlie the language use of the deaf participants. The discussion highlights the way that the language and culture of the deaf community impact on the identity of a deaf individual as expressed in the data.

Chapter 8 discusses some of the possible psycholinguistic issues that arise from this study. It was not within the scope of this study to undertake experimental research into this area of language use, but some points can be imputed from a psycholinguistic perspective on the way messages may be planned and executed by a sign/spoken language bilingual. This is an area of research that may lead to some interesting comparisons with the language use of bilinguals with two spoken languages in the event of psycholinguistic experiments in the future.

Chapter 9 concludes the thesis with the results referred back to the research questions, and their implications for further research on transference, fingerspelling and simultaneous production of a sign language and a spoken language.

The final sections of the thesis contain the Table of Transcription examples as an appendix, and the Bibliography.
Chapter 2 - Review of the Literature

This chapter will review literature on linguistic phenomena (including code-switching) resulting from contact between two or more languages including the contact between a sign language and a spoken language. In no way is this an attempt to be a treatise on language contact phenomena, but rather a brief survey of four perspectives and a selection of publications on language contact outcomes that are relevant to this study. The literature shows that some unique outcomes are the result of contact between a sign language and a spoken language, as well as outcomes that are comparable to those resulting from contact between two spoken languages, and this is relevant to the investigation for this thesis. Each of four perspectives on language contact (linguistic, conversational, sociolinguistic, and psycholinguistic) will be reviewed, and each section will include a short review of the research into sign/spoken language contact from the same four perspectives. A review of the literature on language and identity issues is included as it is relevant to the choice of language by adult deaf bilinguals.

2.1 Early studies of language contact phenomena

The many immigrants of the late 19th century from Europe continued the development of bilingualism across the American continent that had begun in previous centuries and the bilingualism that had existed in Europe for many centuries. Perhaps the first person to attempt to systematize the study of bilingualism was Haugen who began research among Norwegian immigrants to America in 1936. His earliest published works were based on the data collected from these Norwegian-English bilinguals. Haugen (1953: 7) used methodological definitions to describe bilingualism, for example, as beginning “when the speaker of one language can produce complete meaningful utterances in the other language”. He described the result of two languages existing in a community in terms of the language contact outcome it produces. “It would seem that one of the most widespread effects of bilingualism is the deposit it leaves on the languages involved.” (Haugen, 1953/1969: 4). (See chapter 4 for a discussion of the definitions of bilingualism.)

Just as English has integrated words and features of other languages, so too have other languages ‘borrowed’ and integrated words and features from English and each other. Haugen reached the conclusion that “Only by observing closely the behaviour of bilinguals, and giving them the same kind of detailed and objective study that other speakers have received can we draw valid conclusions about the theories that have been advanced to account for the many phenomena on interlingual imitation.” (Haugen, 1953: 11). Haugen highlighted, amongst other findings, the amount of borrowing which he observed in the immigrant language of the Norwegians, which he referred to as ‘loans’. He asserted that sometimes speakers themselves cannot state clearly to which language certain items should
be assigned. “We need to recognize that for certain items a linguistic overlapping is possible, such that we must assign them to more than one language at a time.” (Haugen, 1956: 40).

In the early 1950s, as Haugen was researching Norwegian-English bilingualism, Weinreich also began studying the Yiddish of immigrants to the United States, and subsequently Romansh-Swiss-German bilinguals in Switzerland. His research, which gave a more theoretical framework to this field, was published as Languages in Contact in 1953. Bright (1992: 198) attributed to Weinreich the first usage of the term ‘contact’ to describe the meeting of two languages in one community, and ‘interference’ to describe the borrowing that occurred. In addition to the revelations from his data about the motivations for bilinguals to ‘mix’ their languages, Weinreich was interested in the social motivations for different language use. He investigated factors that may give one language prestige over another. Haugen continued in a similar direction, studying the attitudes to the languages, the people using them, and judgements made by speakers and listeners. Haugen focussed particularly on integration of features from one language to the other, and the ‘switching’ between languages that he observed. Haugen concluded “Whenever language becomes a barrier to the social mobility of the individual, he is likely to feel a frustration which may turn into contempt for the language he speaks.” (Haugen, 1956: 96). This early research into language contact and the borrowing that occurred as part of contact situations, as well as observations of speakers’ attitudes to their language use, laid the groundwork for the subsequent development of the field of code-switching. The early research on bilingualism also provided the background for future research on sign/spoken language contact.

2.1.1 Sign/spoken language research
In the 1950s very little thought was given to investigating language contact situations between spoken and sign languages. Sutton-Spence & Woll (1999: 9) stated “All too often, people (including some linguists) have dismissed sign languages as not being ‘real’ languages”. Sign languages were not generally considered to be complete languages, and there were some parallels with the recognition and acceptance of pidgins and creoles in spoken language development. Ann discussed in detail the view of sign languages and spoken languages in contact that were believed to have created a pidgin (Ann, 1999: 57). Creoles and pidgins are examples of languages that have emerged in the last three hundred years, as colonization, migration and slavery have caused large numbers of languages to come into close contact. According to Sutton-Spence and Woll (1999: 12) “sign languages are [also] an example of languages that have emerged only over the last three hundred years.” Languages need a community of users, and deaf communities have only developed in the last three hundred years with the formation of large towns and centres during the industrial revolution. Some examples of eighteenth and nineteenth century scholars and their awareness of the nature of sign languages as true human languages can be found but “for a number of reasons,
however, signed language research went into decline during the early twentieth century, and many of these earlier insights were forgotten” (Johnston & Schembri, 2007:21).

As with pidgins and creoles, sign languages were not generally accepted as true languages, but rather another form of the spoken language in the wider community. In fact, some educators developed artificial signing systems in the mistaken belief that this would allow English (or the spoken language of the wider hearing community) to be visible to the deaf, and replace their “limited pantomime or gesture system.” (Sutton-Spence & Woll, 1999: 9). One of these artificial systems developed in the twentieth century was the Paget-Gorman Sign System, designed for use in classrooms with deaf children (Sutton-Spence & Woll, 1999). Reagan (2001) attributed the first artificially constructed manual sign code to be developed in the USA to a young deaf immigrant from Britain, David Anthony, in 1966. It is thought that the sign code he developed was inspired by the Paget-Gorman System, in use in Britain at that time. These developments highlight the lack of recognition, by both educators and linguists, of the native sign languages used by the deaf populations in the USA, Britain and Australia. The lack of recognition of sign languages constitutes one explanation as to why no linguists were involved in any investigation of sign languages, including language contact situations, until the 1960s.

The first studies of language contact between a sign language and a spoken language highlighted the borrowing of lexical items and some grammatical features from the spoken language into the sign language of the deaf community. (Lucas & Valli, 1992; Messing,1998; Sutton-Spence & Woll,1999; Lucas, 2001). Literature on deaf bilinguals using two sign languages is more recent. In 2001, Lucas stated that in her previous research (with colleagues in the 1990s) into what happens when two sign languages are in contact, “although we were able to think of and casually observe examples to illustrate the outcome of contact between two sign languages, our search for empirical research on lexical borrowing, code switching, foreigner talk, interference, pidgins, creoles, and mixed systems – all as a result from the contact of two sign languages – turned up practically nothing.” (Lucas, 2001: 5). Quinto-Pozos (2007: 1) noted that “the sobering truth is that we know so little about contact between sign languages.” He has edited what he describes as “the first book-length collection of various accounts of contact between sign languages, and this brings with it excitement as well as the realisation of challenges that lie ahead.”

In his Australian research, Schembri explained the kind of borrowing that he found in Auslan from ASL and BSL signs. He noted that “greater opportunities for travel have naturally resulted in sign languages borrowing from each other.” (Schembri, 1996: 111). Sutton-Spence & Woll (1999: 217) stated “for some British signers, many of their sign language loans are from American Sign Language, because ASL is a socially important sign language at the international level”. Other signs in BSL are borrowed from Irish, Danish and other European
sign languages, but the number of these borrowed signs is still small, and the majority of research has concentrated on the influence of spoken English until very recently. Schembri (1996:112) asserted that Auslan has borrowed more signs from ASL than from BSL or any other sign language. Johnston & Schembri (2007: 185) re-asserted that “The amount of borrowing from modern BSL, however, remains small compared with the number of ASL loan signs”. Schembri (1996: 112) had earlier claimed that the reason for the large number of loan signs from ASL in Auslan was due to “the size and prestige of the American deaf community and the greater availability of materials on or in ASL”. The number of ways that Auslan borrowed from English, according to Schembri (1996: 105) was “via fingerspelling, loan translations and mouth patterns” and may still exceed the number of loan signs from other sign languages.

An issue for this thesis is whether the ‘borrowing’ as described by these authors is one language contact outcome due to the influence of the spoken language on the sign language, or whether it constitutes code-switching as defined in much of the recent literature. The definitions vary and as MacSwan (1999: 55) pointed out, “It is important in research on code-switching to carefully distinguish code-switching, in which two distinct language systems interact, from language contact phenomena in which one language influences the lexicon and perhaps the grammar of another”. This issue is significant in the present study. The fact that any sign language of a deaf community is in constant contact with the majority spoken (and written) language of the wider community presents different challenges for researchers. It is difficult to categorise whether a feature of language used by an individual in the community is part of the spoken language or part of the sign language as used by some members of the deaf community. This problem also exists in other bilingual research (Clyne, 2006). This is particularly relevant to the research in this thesis, which will investigate if code-switching can be found in the data in addition to other language contact outcomes.

2.2 Current Perspectives on Language Contact Outcomes

This study will use four perspectives to consider whether the language contact outcomes obtained in the data from this study include types of code-switching as described in the literature cited in this chapter. The linguistic, conversational, sociolinguistic and psycholinguistic perspectives are the perspectives from which the data will be viewed and analysed.

2.2.1 Definitions of Code-switching

Code-switching is just one outcome of language use by bilingual speakers of both (or all) languages within the same discourse. Some scholars consider code-switching quite separately from other language contact outcomes, but others consider code-switching as part of the contact phenomena. Finding a clear definition of code-switching is difficult because there appears to be very little agreement amongst writers. Wardhaugh (1992: 103) explained,
“Most speakers command several varieties of any language they speak, and bilingualism, even multilingualism, is the norm for many people throughout the world rather than unilingualism. People, then, are usually required to select a particular code whenever they choose to speak, and they may also decide to switch from one code to another or to mix codes.”

Haugen (1956: 40) referred to switching as “the alternate use of two languages”, interference as “the overlapping of two languages” and integration as “the regular use of material from one language in another, so that there is no longer either switching or overlapping, except in a historical sense”. Gumperz (1982: 59) described code-switching as “the juxtaposition within the same speech exchange of passages of speech belonging to two different grammatical systems or sub-systems”. Auer (1998: 1) defined code-switching as “the alternating use of two or more codes within one conversational episode”. Both Gumperz and Auer used the term code-switching to refer to those instances when the switch is indexical or emblematic.

The perspective of the research determines the preference of the writer for each term. Jacobson (1998: 51) stated, “Terms such as “Codeswitching”, also hyphenated as “code-switching”, “codemixing” (or “code-mixing”), “code alternation”, language mixing”, and occasionally “codeshifting” have consistently appeared in the professional literature and scholars are rarely in mutual agreement which term to use at a given time.” In fact, as recently as the turn of the century, various scholars used different terms at times to describe the same kind of language contact outcome, and at other times to refer to a completely separate language event. These examples highlight the fact that there is little agreement amongst linguists as to the actual scope of the definition of the term “code-switching” or any of its related terms, such as code-mixing, code alternation, or borrowing, to name just a few. For the purposes of this study it also highlights the danger of simply using any of the above terms for sign language research without clarifying the perspective of the research and the model on which it is based.

There is also no agreement as to other issues, including the reason for the contact outcome, the purpose of a code-switch at a particular place in the utterance, the rules governing the code-switch, and the awareness or otherwise of the speaker about his/her use of code-switching or any other contact phenomena. Franceschini (1998: 51) summarised this dilemma when she said “linguistic research methodology and its underlying assumptions have resulted in long and sometimes tortuous discussions about what should or should not be considered code-switching vs. code-shifting, code-mixing, borrowing, transfer, insertion, transcadic markers – or whatever the concepts in use may be”. Crystal (1997: 364) described the multiplicity of perspectives in this way, “Even more complex, and not well understood, are the many cases when a bilingual talks to another bilingual with the same language background, and yet changes from one language to another in the course of the conversation – a phenomenon known variously as ‘code mixing’, ‘language switching’, or ‘code switching’.”
The crucial difference seems to be whether the language alternation that occurs in the same unit of discourse is at the sentence level, or above the level of the sentence. Scholars have referred to intrasentential code-switching when it occurred at the level of the sentence, and intersentential code-switching when it occurred at a level above the sentence. According to Clyne (2003: 72) “The term ‘code-switching’ has now become so polysemous and unclear that it is necessary to find more precise terms to map out the boundaries and interfaces.” Some have continued to use the term ‘switching’ interchangeably with ‘code-switching’, (Skiba, 1997; Sert, 2005;) or code-mixing (which included code-switching as one kind of mixing) as used by Muysken (2000). ‘Switching’ is often used to include all types of situations where a speaker changes from one language to another, within a conversation and at other times differentiated completely from code-switching. Research continues today with no general consensus regarding the rules which govern the ‘switching’. Nor is there consensus on the terms ‘switching’, ‘code-switching’ or ‘code-mixing’. In many instances they seem to be used interchangeably. (See Section 2.2.2 for a discussion of the terms as they will be used in this thesis).

One type of language contact phenomenon that is often used in contrast to code-switching and sometimes regarded as part of the same phenomenon, is ‘borrowing’. One of the first aspects that Haugen noticed amongst the Norwegian immigrant community in his early research was that the number of borrowed American English words had changed the Norwegian language that these immigrants used. Just as there is disagreement about the definition of the term code-switching, there is also disagreement about what actually constitutes a ‘borrowing’. This term is sometimes used interchangeably with code-switching (albeit by different authors) to refer to lexical or morpho-syntactic features transferred into the second language. At other times the two processes are painstakingly differentiated. Clyne (2003: 71) concluded that “There is a great deal of disagreement in recent literature as to what determines clear-cut instances of ‘borrowing’ and ‘code-switching’”. He also asserted that for many linguists, ‘borrowing’ and ‘code-switching’ form a continuum with no clear dividing line between them.

Two linguists who have gone to great lengths to explain the difference (within their own theories) between borrowing and code-switching are Myers-Scotton (1992) and Poplack (1988). Poplack, (1988) asserted that borrowed items are those that have been integrated into the second language in a way that monolingual speakers of that language do not recognize them as alien in any way. Backus (1992: 10) assumed that “borrowing is prototypically lexical in nature [ ]. Borrowings are usually content words. Functions words are borrowed only occasionally.” Examples of words ‘borrowed’ into English from French might be chic, and fait accomplis. Two further linguists who have added to this discussion from other perspectives are Backus and Clyne. Backus (1992: 10) asserted that “borrowed words have
to be pronounced, and they have to be embedded in sentences. Lexical borrowing can thus
go together with phonological, morphological and even syntactic borrowing. Clyne (2003: 71)
pointed out that “While the term ‘code-switching’ is employed for both single-word and multi-
word elements, ‘borrowing’ is limited to the former. Phonological or morphological integration
is likely in borrowing but not in ‘code-switching’. Backus (2005:307) described code-switching
as “any kind of discourse in which words originating in two different language systems are
used side-by-side.” In his definition of language change, defined as “contact induced
structural change”, Backus (2005: 308) described structural borrowing as a ‘sub-category of contact
induced change’. Thus a speaker who takes a structural pattern from the other language and
uses it in his/her base language, as a code-switch, may have been involved in the processes
of contact induced change for the base language. The question of whether this notion is
applicable to sign/spoken language contact outcomes will be discussed in more detail in
Chapter 6, in relation to the Auslan-English data.

As stated above, some linguists have considered borrowing and code-switching to form two
ends of a continuum. (Poplack,1988; Myers-Scotton,1992; Backus,1992; Clyne, 2003). As the
borrowed feature becomes progressively used by more and more of the speakers in the
community, it becomes an integrated part of the second language with significance and
standardization in the community. Clyne (2003: 72) stated that “a rigid ‘borrowing/code-
switching’ distinction would tend to accentuate the discreteness of the systems when we are
dealing with a dynamic relationship between languages that are interconnected and
constantly changing”. Clyne used the terms ‘integrated’ and ‘unintegrated’ lexical transference
to differentiate between a foreign term in language A from Language B, and a term from
language B that is integrated into Language A such that monolingual speakers do not
recognise it is a transference. This concept of integrated transference is particularly relevant
to the Auslan/English data in this study and is discussed in Chapter 6.

The current orientations to the field of study of code-switching and other language contact
phenomena assist in explaining why there have been so many ‘long and tortuous
discussions’. Attention has traditionally been focused on two aspects of code-switching, the
morpho-syntactic aspect and the discourse/pragmatic aspect. There are two other aspects of
language contact research which are particularly relevant to my research, that of the
sociolinguistic perspective, and the psycholinguistic perspective. Each of the four
perspectives focus on different levels, examining what is and is not code-switching, the
constraints on acceptability, the factors that facilitate the switching, the attitudes towards the
code-switching and other language contact outcomes, and the cognitive processes which
may be involved. The way in which I will define code-switching and other language contact
outcomes will be discussed in more detail in Chapter 5. The following sections describe the
four main perspectives on language contact research.
2.2.2 Linguistic Perspectives

The early work of Haugen, Weinreich and others in the 1950s and 1960s was sociolinguistic in nature but then began to focus on the influence of the lexicon of one language on the lexicon of the other language, and the interpenetration of grammatical systems.

Subsequently, research was conducted on “the factors that facilitated or prevented the acquisition of particular codes by some social groups and not others.” (Asher, 1994: 582).

Researchers (see below) began proposing grammatical constraints that applied across pairs of languages.

Hasselmo (1972), who conducted his research on Swedish/English bilinguals in America, found that ‘switching’ occurred in particular places in the conversation, or after certain words in an utterance. He developed a set of grammatical constraints that he believed explained this ‘switching’ used by the speakers of these two languages. Other linguists attempted to demonstrate that the constraints were universal from data observed amongst speakers of different pairs of languages. (Pfaff, 1979; Kachru, 1978; Poplack, 1980; Backus, 1992). These small data corpora from a small number of language pairs did not really provide enough information required to find truly ‘universal’ constraints, or to explain the linguistic behaviour of bilinguals in all the world languages.

Poplack, in her study of Spanish-English code-mixing in the Puerto Rican communities in 1980, found that switches occurred at sites of “co-grammaticality or equivalence” and proposed the constraint of equivalence (number 1 above). The second constraint she proposed was that of the free morpheme constraint. Poplack proposed a model of a grammar that would account for rule-governed code-switching. She suggested “A single code-switching grammar composed of the overlapping sectors of the grammars of L1 and L2.” (1980: 615).

Poplack (1980) also identified three types of code-switching: tag-switching, inter-sentential switching, and intra-sentential switching. According to Romaine (1995: 122-3) “tag-switching involves the insertion of a tag in one language into an utterance which is otherwise entirely in the other language. Inter-sentential switching involves a switch at a clause or sentence boundary, where each clause or sentence is in one language or another. Intra-sentential switching involves, arguably, the greatest risk, and may be avoided by all but the most fluent bilinguals. Here switching of different types occurs within the clause or sentence boundary.”

The main universal constraints on code-switching proposed in the literature are:
1. Structural integrity, or equivalence constraint: the syntax on either side of the code-switch must be grammatical for the language concerned. (Poplack, 1980).
2. Free-morpheme constraint: No switch can occur between a bound morpheme and a lexical form unless that lexical form is phonologically integrated into the language of the bound morpheme. (Poplack, 1980).
3. Semantic constraint: Whole prepositional phrase switches, which are infrequent, involve figurative or temporal, but not locative, switches. (Pfaff, 1979).

4. Conjunction constraint: Debate centres on whether the conjunction between the two clauses must be in the language of the first clause or the second clause in the other language.

5. Government constraint: Switching is only possible between elements not related by government (for example, V governs O, and P governs the NP in a PP). (Di Sciullo, Muysken & Singh, 1986; Halmari, 1997).

Syntacticians examined intra-sentential code-switches, and, as stated above, the search for possible universal grammatical constraints led to other scholars proposing additional theories. A unified theoretical framework was developed by Carol Myers-Scotton in the form of the Matrix Language Frame model (Myers-Scotton, 1993a). This model was developed by Myers-Scotton as an attempt at an overall theory of language contact, based on her research on Swahili-English bilingualism in eastern Africa as well as data from many other studies. She asserted that principles of code-switching which could be explained by this model could also explain other areas of language contact. Myers-Scotton defined code-switching as “the selection by bilinguals or multilinguals of forms from an embedded language (or languages) in utterances of a matrix language during the same conversation.” (Myers-Scotton, 1993a: 4).

Joshi (1984) and Klavans (1985) had preceded Myers-Scotton with their concept of the Matrix language framework. Klavans and Joshi held that the Matrix language was the language of the main verb in the utterance. Joshi’s theory was that the language from which a switch is judged to come is the matrix language and the other language in use is the embedded language.

Myers-Scotton subsequently developed her theory that the matrix language was the more activated of the two languages and could be identified by the frequency of morphemes used from that language (Myers-Scotton, 1993a). Later she defined the matrix language as the language that formed the basis of the grammar (Myers-Scotton, 2002). This redeveloped the concept from that of a matrix language to that of the language of the syntactic frame. Some linguists have found that this model provides a framework from which principles of order and system can be applied to code-switching between some pairs of languages, and have developed similar models that make predictions similar to the Matrix Language Frame. (Joshi 1984, Azuma 1993). Myers-Scotton (2002: 295) herself stated her “theoretical notion that the same principles and processes underlie all language contact phenomena”. The contact phenomena she focused on in 2002 were “codeswitching, convergence and attrition, lexical borrowing, split languages and creole development”. Myers-Scotton focussed on the grammatical structures involved, but still asserted that the principles and processes and the discussions of each “have relevance beyond contact phenomena to general linguistic theory".
(Myers-Scotton, 2002: 295). The Myers-Scotton model seems to be in a process of on-going development and as such is not used to specifically analyse the data from this study.

While both Poplack and Myers-Scotton received criticism of their proposals, many scholars held them in high esteem for their contribution to the thinking in the field. Muysken stated “Myers-Scotton has drawn together psycholinguistic, sociolinguistic, and structural perspectives on code-mixing for the first time, and thus brought its study to a deeper explanatory level.” (Muysken, 2000: 18). In his review of Myers-Scotton’s 2002 publication Contact Linguistics, Muysken commented positively on the focus on two distinct subsystems of language, designated as grammatical and lexical. “By consistently sticking to this distinction in different contact settings, further refining it within the 4M-model (sic), and embedding it in a theory of language processing, CMS introduces both precision and a more tightly constrained model than other current approaches.” (Muysken, 2005: 514). Jacobson paid special tribute to “Shana Poplack who changed the direction of codeswitching research by focusing on the theoretical side of the phenomenon. Prior to her analysis, code-switching studies were speculative in character, focused on meaning and functional goals and laid the groundwork for the realization that codeswitched communication was an orderly, rule-oriented phenomenon” (Jacobson, 1998: 52). Both Poplack and Myers-Scotton have had a profound impact on the grammatical perspective on code-switching as one type of language contact outcome.

Muysken proposed a model of code-mixing (which included code-switching as only one type of mixing), the process of which “is not unitary, but consists of three main strategies: insertion, alternation, and congruent lexicalisation.” (Muysken, 2000: 32). He categorised these processes as:

“insertion” of material (lexical items or entire constituents) from one language into a structure from the other language.

 alternation between structures from languages

 congruent lexicalisation of material from different lexical inventories into a shared grammatical structure.” (Muysken, 2000: 3). He cited Myers-Scotton’s approach as an example of the notion of insertion, in that her Matrix Language Frame model provided a framework for code-mixing of the insertional type. (Muysken, 2000: 16).

Muysken also commented on the data that Poplack gathered from her research and asserted that it correlated with his alternation perspective, and stressed “the importance of linear equivalence between the languages involved at the point of the switch”. (Muysken, 2000: 13). Clyne (1991: 160) proposed an alternative terminology for all these terms as so many different writers used them in different ways. The fact that different writers used code-switching, and switching interchangeably was not helpful for discussions.
Clyne (1967) first introduced ‘transference’ as “the process of bringing over any items, features or rules from one language to another, and for the results of this process”. This enables transference (lexical, semantic, syntactic, morphological, phonological, prosodic, graphemic and pragmatic influences of one language on the other) to be discussed under one ‘umbrella’. (Clyne,1991: 160). As stated in section 2.2.1 lexical transference can be integrated or unintegrated. This concept of transference, as one language contact outcome, will be used to examine the data from this study.

2.2.2.1 Challenging the universality of constraints
Researchers subsequently tested these supposed ‘universal’ constraints, and found that some constraints could be applicable for some pairs of languages in contact. However, Clyne (1987: 758) found in his research on Australian bilinguals, that “for the structural-integrity constraint [Poplack’s equivalence constraint] to be valid, adjustments are made to the syntax, after taking advantage of the syntactic convergence that has already taken place”. Clyne (1987) also found a small number of counter examples of the free-morpheme constraint in the Australian corpus. Previous research had also found evidence against this constraint. (Boeschoten and Verhoeven, 1985; Goke-Pariola, 1983; Nartey, 1982).

Other linguists also challenged the ‘universality’ of the constraints (Bentahila & Davies, 1983; Berk-Seligson, 1986). Clyne examined each constraint in depth and showed how it was not supported by his Australian data. None of the constraints could explain all the different contact outcomes that occurred in all the different data corpora, and each constraint could be challenged by some data from another language contact situation. Code-switching may be intentional or unintentional. Clyne (2003: 162) suggested that “the notion of facilitation may be seen as a more appropriate alternative to constraints”. Having shown from his Australian data in 1967 that the ‘universal constraints’ were not universal, but rather they formed ‘strong tendencies’ for occurrence, Clyne (2003: 84) later suggested that although some conditions did prevent code-switching, certain conditions (such as syntactic overlap and transference) actually facilitated switching. Chapter 6 examines this notion of facilitation in relation to data from the present study, and the relevance to sign/spoken language contact outcomes.

2.2.2.2 Sign/spoken language research
Some studies have looked specifically at language contact outcomes between a sign language and a spoken language from a linguistic perspective, but many studies of language contact phenomena between a spoken language and a sign language that do exist have focussed largely on sociolinguistic issues. However, despite the different focus, the results from the sign/spoken language studies have shown that some sign/spoken language contact phenomena are quite unique, and include fingerspelling and simultaneous production of both languages. Lee (1983) focused her research on the discourse of a Deaf signer and her interlocutors. She found that the two constraints proposed as universal (that of the free-
morpheme constraint and the equivalence constraint) were inconsistent with her data. (Lee, 1983: 193). See Chapter 6 for a discussion of the data from this study and the reasons for my preference for the notion of facilitation of certain language contact outcomes, rather than constraints.

It is important to note here that while many studies of language contact outcomes (including code-switching) have focussed on the contact between a signed language and a spoken language, some have also studied the contact between two visual forms of language. Hauser (2000: 43) conducted research on “the code-switching between English in a visual modality – cued American English [(hereafter cued English) – and ASL” as this had not been studied before. In other words Hauser tried to research code-switching between two languages in the same visual modality. The results of Hauser’s study found that “codeswitching between ASL and cued English follows a similar pattern found in spoken language codeswitching.” (Hauser, 2000: 44). However, Hauser concentrated mainly on sociolinguistic patterns of code-switching and did not “analyze the structural constraints of ASL and cued English to determine the possible loci for codeswitching.” (Hauser, 2000: 73).

A particular area of interest for sign/spoken language research is that of fingerspelling, or spelling on the hands using representations of the alphabet on the fingers. The use of fingerspelling in the communication patterns of deaf signers has been studied at length, attempting to define whether fingerspelling is part of the sign language, or rather just a visual representation of the orthographic form of the spoken language of the wider community. (Lucas, 2001; Mindess, 1999; Schembri, 1996; Schembri & Johnston, 2007; Stokoe, 1960; Sutton-Spence & Woll, 1999). Seminal work on fingerspelling was reported by Sutton-Spence (1994) and Sutton-Spence & Woll (1990; 1993). Their research suggested that fingerspelling may have been a form of hidden or secret communication in hearing communities before it became part of a deaf community language use Sutton-Spence (1994). The question has been whether the fingerspelling is actually a form of code-switching from the spoken language to the sign language, or some other language contact outcome. Davis (1989: 97) stated that “The salient relationship here is not between the respective phonological systems of two languages but rather between the orthographic system of one language, (English), and the phonological system of another, ASL.” In a similar way to the way lexical transference occurs between spoken languages, “a fingerspelled word can get used repeatedly and eventually become lexicalised into ASL.” (Davis, 1989: 97). Fingerspelling that has become part of the core lexicon of any sign language is widely referred to in sign linguistics as ‘lexicalised’ fingerspelling (Davis, 1989; Lucas, 1989; Johnston & Schembri, 2007; Schembri & Johnston, 2007). Lexicalised fingerspelling patterns function in the same way as signs in the sign language. Schembri & Johnston (2007: 3) claimed that “The exact nature of the relationship between fingerspelling and natural signed languages remains difficult to characterise”. Some writers have claimed that fingerspelling is actually a form of borrowing or transfer from the
spoken language to the sign language. As Schembri & Johnston (2007: 3) stated
“Fingerspelling is, however, unlike other forms of borrowing, because it is a tertiary form of
communication. It is a visual-gestural representation of writing (i.e., a secondary form) that is
in turn based on spoken language (i.e., a primary form).”

It is generally accepted by sign linguists that full fingerspelling is used for many reasons, not
only to represent the names of people and places that cannot be represented by signs.
Sutton-Spence & Woll listed seven other reasons for the use of fingerspelling in BSL:
"(a) to introduce an English word which has no sign equivalent (yet), often occurring with new technology, current
affairs, or in academic discussion.
(b) to accompany a new concept expressed in sign.
(c) to explain a regional sign that may not be well-known to a signer from another region.
(d) to produce English idioms while signing BSL.
(e) to produce euphemisms
(f) for convenience and time-saving
(g) to use as part of the core lexicon of BSL."  (Sutton-Spence & Woll, 1999: 17).

Schembri & Johnston (2007: 23) found that signers fingerspelled even when there was a sign,
for clarification, for emphasis, and also sometimes “perhaps because they prefer to use
English rather than Auslan in this particular context”. When fingerspelling is used for other
reasons, researchers have so far not reached a conclusion on its place within the sign
language. Schembri & Johnston (2007: 24) asserted that, notwithstanding the need for further
research, the results of their study “demonstrate that the use of manual alphabet in the
Australian deaf community is an important linguistically and socially conditioned variable.” The
same authors found “that variation in the use of fingerspelling in Auslan is not random but
appears to be influenced by linguistic and social factors.” (Schembri & Johnston, 2007: 16).
See Chapter 4 for a full discussion of the place of fingerspelling in Auslan, and Chapter 6 for a
discussion of fingerspelling in the data from this study.

2.2.3 Conversational Perspectives
The conversational perspective on language contact focuses on the way individuals use their
language and switch language within a conversation to shift the balance of power, or to
achieve a particular stylistic effect. Conversation analysis looks at the code-switching which
occurs that is “not dependant on a change of interlocutors, topic or situation” (Asher, 1994:
583). Auer (1998: 3) asserted that there is a gap in recent research into code-switching,
between the broader sociolinguistic perspective (referring to relationships between social and
linguistic structure), and the grammatical (referring to constraints on intra-sentential code-
switching) perspective. This gap in part is “the local processes of language negotiation and
code selection” (Auer, 1998: 3). He claimed “that there is a level of conversational structure in
bilingual speech which is sufficiently autonomous both from grammar (syntax) and from the
larger societal and ideological structures to which the languages in question and their choice
for a given episode are related". (Auer, 1998:4). Conversational analysis of any language
contact outcome therefore must include all three: the social factors underlying the change of
language or code, the stylistic and pragmatic effects, and the linguistic features of discourse
containing frequent code-switches. However, because this approach assumes a
deliberateness in the speakers’ choice of language, it is different from the grammatical or
sociolinguistic perspective in that the choice is not imposed by setting or topic, nor is it
decided simply by rules of use of either language. This assumed deliberateness in the
negotiation and choice of language may not be relevant for sign/spoken language deaf
bilinguals, as the spoken language may only be an option in its written form, not in the oral
form of communication. Thus the restriction on choice may mean the deliberate nature of the
choice is also limited.

Auer (1984) introduced the notion of ‘language negotiation sequence’ where participants in
the interaction make a series of choices on which language to use at each point in the
conversation. They negotiate the choices, and may change to the other language for reasons
related to the discourse or the participants themselves. There is an implied deliberateness in
this negotiation sequence, where participants deliberately choose the code or language to
use, and actually choose to switch at a particular point in the utterance, to realize their own
conversational interaction between the speakers, and viewed language choice as a discourse
strategy of each of the speakers. In bilingual conversations, “whatever language a participant
chooses for the organization of his/her turn, or for an utterance which is part of the turn, the
choice exerts an influence on subsequent language choices by the same or other speakers”
(Auer, 1984: 5). In fact Auer (1984: 99) proposed a “dynamic rethinking of the notion of
context”, which allowed speakers to account for all aspects in their environment, and to
determine or negotiate the context themselves, in the course of their conversation.

In research on code-switching specifically, conversational analysis has produced various
functions, (1) quotation, (2) addressee specification, (3) interjection, (4) reiteration, (5)
message qualification, and (6) personification/objectification. Messing (1998) listed six most
commonly mentioned functions as (1) strategic negotiation (of the conversational
relationship), (2) identity marker (of ethnicity or education), (3) domain marker (for a change
of domain), (4) compensation (when the speaker cannot discuss the topic in one language),
(5) accommodation (of the belief that the conversational partner cannot converse comfortably
in one language), and (6) stylistic effect (for emphasis etc). Although the names of the
functions change from writer to writer, there is broad agreement that code-switching in
conversation occurs: with a change of domain or situation; for reasons of lack of ability or
vocabulary (or perceived lack) in one language; as a strategy in the conversational
relationship between the two speakers; for reasons of emphasis or reiteration; and when a
speaker wishes to identify with a certain group or sphere, and have this recognized by the interlocutors.

The early researchers using the conversational approach sought to define sequential analysis in the interaction of the speakers (Fishman, 1971; Auer 1984). Auer (1995:123) proposed that code-alternation could be analysed just as any other contextualisation cue, including intonation, rhythm, gesture and posture. He asserted that the basic principles of code-alternation in conversation “can be stated independently of both the grammar and the macro-social context of code-alternation”. (Auer, 1995:132). Auer (1995:124) also stated that, “the situated interpretation of code-alternation as a contextualisation cue is strongly related to sequential patterns of language choice”. Auer distinguished four sequential patterns of language choice, and schematically showed these patterns with the use of 1 and 2 for each of two speakers in the interaction, and A and B for each of the two languages. One such pattern demonstrated the event where speaker 1 switched to language B at some point in the conversation, and this language was accepted by speaker 2, so that the conversation continued in language B. “Pattern 1a: A1 A2 A1 A2/ B1 B2 B1 B2”. (Auer: 1995:125). The other examples also followed a sequential pattern, and this sequential use can be compared to conversation involving a sign and a spoken language where features of both languages often co-occur in a way that is not possible with spoken languages in contact.

Some strategies from both discourse analysis and conversational analysis will be used in the data analysed from this study.

2.2.3.1 Sign/spoken language research
Sign language researchers (Lee, 1983; Tomkins, 2000; Messing, 1998) found that simultaneous communication (signing and speaking at the same time) was often the result of language contact between a sign and a spoken language, and this may challenge sequential analysis. (See Chapter 5 for a description of how the term ‘simultaneous production’ is used in this thesis). Conversation analysis of code-switching between a sign language and a spoken language may reveal information about the identity of the speakers, the effect on the interlocutor, and the need by the speaker to foreshadow specific information. Whether deaf sign/spoken language bilinguals code-switch deliberately, or whether the language contact outcome is influenced by the topic or interlocutor, will be considered in the analysis of data from this current research.

2.2.4 Sociolinguistic Perspectives
Sociolinguistic perspectives consider language contact outcomes in all situations, and how it may indicate something about the patterns of society, the preferences of individual speakers, or the particular speech event in which the interlocutors are involved. Sociolinguistic variables which influence language choice include “the location in space and time; the social event (e.g.
shopping, a religious service); characteristics of the participants, both relatively fixed (e.g. sex, age, ethnicity, or education) and situationally variable (e.g. their status and role at the time of communicating); and the channel (spoken/written). (Bright, 1992: 23). Each of the above variables are linked to the culture and history of the particular speech community.

Clyne (1991: 191) included interlocutor, role relationship, domain, topic, venue, channel of communication, type of interaction, and phatic function as “variables promoting code-switching”. Clyne described each of these variables in the Australian situation, and they will be discussed in Chapter 7 as they apply to the data from this study.

Heller (1988: 1) approached code-switching from a functionalist perspective, in which “code-switching is seen as a boundary-levelling or boundary-maintaining strategy, which contributes, as a result, to the definition of roles and role relationships at a number of levels, to the extent that interlocutors bear multiple role relationships to each other.” Heller (1988: 1) saw code-switching as one of many forms of language contact phenomena, all of which need to be understood “in the double context of the speech economy of the multilingual community and of the verbal repertoires of individual members of that community.” Heller’s focus was on language use in social interaction as a way of examining the relationship between social and linguistic processes. Later Heller discussed the relationship between language practices (including code-switching) and the politics of language. She considered “the ways in which language practices are bound up in the creation, exercise, maintenance or change of relations of power.” (Heller, 1995: 159).

Within many bilingual speech communities there is a diglossic situation, where two different language codes are used on quite separate occasions in the community. One form of the language is used for high status situations such as legal, religious and business settings, and the other used for everyday activities within the community, such as shopping, working or socialising. The L form of the language is acquired and spoken at home amongst family and friends, and the H form of the language is learned at school, and used for formal discourse. Often the L and H forms of language used constitute separate languages. The speakers in these communities switch from one code or language to the other for functional reasons, in different situations, acknowledged by the whole community. Ferguson (1959) introduced this notion of diglossic communities and his research relied on populations speaking closely related languages. Fishman (1967) studied communities using two languages that were not closely related at all and introduced the notion of bilingualism with or without diglossia, and vice versa. Other authors have more recently described bilingual communities where the different codes or forms of language used are equally valued, and the ‘switching’ which occurs is referred to as ‘metaphorical’ switching. (Wardhaugh 1992, Gumperz 1982, Romaine, 1995). According to Wardhaugh (1992: 107), “metaphorical code-switching has an affective dimension to it: you change the code as you redefine the situation – formal to
informal, official to personal, serious to humorous, and politeness to solidarity”. See Chapter 4 for a discussion of the notion of diglossia in an Auslan/English bilingual community.

2.2.4.1 Sign/spoken language research
Apart from the development of dictionaries, as stated in section 2.2.2.2, a considerable amount of research into sign language linguistics has been sociolinguistic in nature. Many writers have publications devoted to the sociolinguistics of deaf communities. (Kannapell, 1989; Lucas, 1989, 2001; Metzger, 2002; Woodward, 1972; Sutton-Spence & Woll, 1999). Past research in deaf communities has considered whether they could constitute diglossic speech communities. Stokoe (1969) proposed the idea of diglossia in the deaf community, suggesting that two very different forms of signing could be seen in formal and non-formal situations. In the Australian setting this would mean that the proposed H form (spoken or written English) would be required for use in any contact with the wider hearing community, and the proposed L form of language (Auslan) would be used within the community at social functions, at schools with friends, and in the case of deaf families, at home. Considering Ferguson’s definitions of the differences between H and L, the Auslan and English situation does not correspond to a diglossic one. Ferguson (1959) claimed that in grammatical structure, “H has grammatical categories not present in L and has an inflectional system of nouns and verbs which is much reduced or totally absent in L”. (Huebner, 1996: 32).

Ferguson’s research looked at closely related languages, but probably never considered the situation of a sign language and a spoken language in contact in the same community. In Australia, Auslan (as the possible L) does have an entirely different inflectional system of nouns and verbs, as well as very different grammatical categories. However, Ferguson (as cited in Huebner, 1996: 33) also described a diglossic situation where “the bulk of the vocabulary of H and L is shared, even with variations”. This is not the case with Auslan and English, which share none of their lexicons, and provided further evidence that the two languages are not in a diglossic situation in the deaf community. In addition sign languages are most often conveyed in a face to face manner, and acquired in a special way, unlike the H form of language in a diglossic community, where it is formally learned and used in its written form. (Johnston, 2002b).

Deuchar proposed that a diglossic situation occurred in the British deaf community between BSL as the H form and Signed English as the L form (Deuchar, 1984). Other sign linguists have suggested that BSL and ASL (to name just two) have diglossic features (Stokoe, 1969; Deuchar). However “in Ferguson’s original characterization of diglossia, it was assumed that the varieties involved belonged to ‘one language’, and that only two varieties could participate in such a relationship.” (Romaine, 1995: 35). This would preclude the situation of the British deaf community, as BSL is not the same language as the Signed English used by some. Signed English is a visual form of the spoken/written language used in the wider community.
Fishman (1967: 30) developed a figure showing the various relationships between bilingualism and diglossia, and categories of bilingualism with/without diglossia would correspond to the use of languages in any deaf community. Woodward & Markowicz (1975) discussed Fishman’s description of diglossia and stated that ‘bilingual diglossia’ as described by him better explained the language situation in a deaf community. According to Fishman (1967: 36) in some circumstances, languages and varieties formerly kept apart “come to influence each other phonetically, lexically, semantically, and even grammatically much more than before. Instead of two or more carefully separated languages each under the eye of caretaker groups of teachers, preachers and writers, several intervening varieties may obtain, differing in degree of interpenetration”. This description correlates closely with the current environment in the Australian deaf community, where each individual has a range of language varieties available that can be used depending on the language skills of his/her interlocutor. However, not all members of the deaf community have access to spoken and/or written English in a way that would allow them to be a completely diglossic community, due to the physiological barrier of their deafness. Ann (2001: 45) expressed the view that “the question of whether diglossia is a reasonable way to describe the situation [of sign languages] in several countries has been posed and, it seems, abandoned.” Zimmer (1989: 258) commented that despite there being no formal study of register variation in ASL, there are still “examples of signing that is more or less ‘formal’ (Baker and Cokely, 1980; Kettrick. 1983; Lee, 1982)”. She discussed ‘formal signing’ and ‘casual signing’ which occur in different situations or settings (Zimmer, 1989: 258). Johnston and Schembri (2007: 43) refer to the problems with the comparison of deaf communities (unique types of bilingual communities) and spoken language diglossic situations (Lee, 1982) but conclude that “despite attitudinal change since the 1980s that have begun to value Auslan more highly, English remains the language with the higher social status”.

It is apparent in the literature on sign language research that terms such as code-switching which assume a sequentiality of the languages (which of course spoken languages are) are not always relevant. Sign language researchers have tended to prefer the term ‘contact signing’ to refer to the phenomenon of co-occurring features of both languages (Lucas & Valli 1992; Kannapell, 1993; Sutton-Spence & Woll, 1999; Lucas, 2001). The term ‘contact signing’ was originated by Lucas & Valli (1992) and described what I refer to as the simultaneous use of both languages, rather than a deaf signer suddenly ceasing to sign and starting to speak, (which, in most cases, he/she is precluded from doing due to the physiological nature of the hearing loss). Lee suggested a new term, ‘simultaneous switching’ to distinguish simultaneous use of both languages from the type of switching which occurred sequentially, ‘consecutive switching’ (Lee, 1983: 192). Gumperz, Poplack and others found that code-switching from one spoken language to another occurred in a necessarily sequential order. Lucas and Valli on the other hand, found that the “phonological, morphological, syntactic, lexical and pragmatic features of two different languages are most often produced
simultaneously, [so] assigning stretches of discourse to ASL or to English seems like a fruitless exercise and also misses the point. The point is [the creation of] a third system which combines elements of both languages and may have some idiosyncratic data‖. (Lucas & Valli, 1992: 108). This concept of a third system, combining elements of both languages, is reminiscent of Poplack’s theory of “a single code-switching grammar composed of the overlapping sectors of the grammars of L1 and L2‖. (Poplack, 1980: 615). This study will examine the data obtained in the light of this theory of a third system of grammar.

2.2.5 Psycholinguistic Perspectives

Psycholinguists have long researched the way a person processes language, how it is stored, and how the lexical items were accessed. Bilinguals (and multilinguals for that matter) have provided psycholinguists with opportunities to research the organisation of the mental lexicon in two or more languages, and the various aspects of bilingual production, storage and perception. The linguist Weinreich (1953) made a distinction between compound bilingualism (one semantic system and two codes or languages), coordinate bilingualism (two semantic systems and two codes or languages), and subordinate bilingualism (the words of the weaker language are accessed through the dominant language). About the same time the psycholinguists Ervin & Osgood (1954) proposed a distinction between a coordinate bilingual (one who learned exclusively one language early in life and later learned a second language in a different context or location), and a compound bilingual (who learned two languages simultaneously from birth). Despite the fact that linguists continued to develop theories to explain how bilinguals and multilinguals access their languages, evidence to support the theories was difficult to obtain, and research has produced conflicting results. Grosjean (1998: 131) listed examples of studies that proposed a particular theory in psycholinguistics, only to have other researchers propose the opposite finding after different research. Grosjean, when interviewed in 2002 on bilingualism, stated his belief that a bilingual has linguistic knowledge that is far too complex to categorise into one of either compound, subordinate or coordinate bilingualism. “For example, at the level of the lexicon, researchers now hypothesize that within the very same bilingual, some words in the two lexicons will have a coordinate relationship, others a compound relationship and still others a subordinate relationship, especially if the languages were acquired in different cultural settings and at different times.” (Grosjean, 2002: 7). See Section 4.1.1.1 for a discussion of language acquisition by sign/spoken language bilinguals.

Green (1998) developed a model which explained how a bilingual speaker might control the two languages, by activating one language, and inhibiting the other language at the same time, but with neither one language completely deactivated at any one time. Grosjean (1998) proposed that bilinguals were in different language modes when speaking, and the mode changed according to the demands of the interaction and the interlocutor. He envisaged these modes as being on a continuum, with the complete monolingual mode on one end, and the
bilingual mode at the other end of the continuum. He defined a mode as “the state of activation of the bilingual’s languages and language processing mechanisms”. (Grosjean, 1998:136). When in the bilingual mode, bilinguals communicate with other bilinguals who share their languages, and this is the point where language mixing can occur. Grosjean stated that “Now that it is generally accepted that the bilingual is not two monolinguals in one person, but a unique speaker-hearer using one language, the other language, or both together depending on the interlocutor, situation, topic, etc., current psycholinguistic research is trying to understand the processing of language in the bilingual’s different language modes.” (Grosjean, 1995: 261).

Psycholinguistic research has traditionally focused on monolinguals, to study the “perception, comprehension, production and memorizing of language, be it spoken language, written language or sign language.” (Grosjean 1995: 260). Research on bilinguals has attempted to discover and explain what occurs during processing of two languages, and whether bilinguals keep the languages separate or do the processes occur in each language simultaneously? Research into language contact outcomes was thought to provide another opportunity to study (through the utterances used from two or more languages) the way in which bilinguals process, store or retrieve their languages. Some of the reasons for the conflicting results of the research may have to do with the lack of clarification as to which mode the bilinguals were in when the data was collected. In other words where on the language mode continuum was the bilingual positioned during the interview or recording of the conversation? If a bilingual was talking to a monolingual, few contact outcomes would be expected, and if found, the reasons would be quite different to the situation where a bilingual was talking to another bilingual with whom they were more familiar and with whom they could change languages and codes more frequently. Grosjean (1995) asserted that any experimentation needed to include controls for the language mode factor, rather than ignoring it or simply assuming that the bilinguals were on the monolingual or bilingual end of the language mode continuum.

2.2.5.1 Speech Processing Models
Various models of language production have been developed and redeveloped to account for the variability in the way that speakers plan and monitor their speech (or language production). One of the best known of these was the model proposed by Levelt (1989:9), which aimed to describe the normal spontaneous language production of monolingual adults. The features of Levelt’s original model were:
The ‘conceptualizer’, where information is gathered and ordered for expression, in accordance with situational factors, and also where specific communicative intentions are adapted to be converted into the spoken message. The output of the conceptualiser is the ‘pre-verbal message’ or package of information, and this output forms “the input to the next processing component, which will be called the Formulator.” (Levelt, 1989: 10).
The ‘formulator’, where the ‘pre-verbal message’ provided by the conceptualizer is converted into a speech plan by selecting the right words from the lexicon and by applying grammatical and phonological rules. In the first part of grammatical encoding, “a lemma will be activated when its meaning matches part of the preverbal message. This will make its syntax available.” (Levelt, 1989: 11). The second stage of the formulation is the phonological encoding, and “its function is to retrieve or build a phonetic or articulatory plan for each lemma and for the utterance as a whole.” Levelt, 1989: 12). This phonetic or articulatory plan becomes the input to the next processing component, which is the articulator.

The ‘articulator’, which converts the speech plan into actual speech.

The ‘speech comprehension system’, which provides the speaker with feedback regarding the presence of possible errors in the phonetic plan or in overt speech and which also enables the speaker to make adjustments in the ‘conceptualizer’. This speech comprehension system is part of the self-monitoring process, the components of which, Levelt asserted, are the processing components of normal language comprehension. See diagram of Levelt’s model below:
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From this model it is possible to say that in Levelt’s ‘conceptualizer’, the decision about the intention of the communication has begun long before the message has been converted to a speech plan. (Levelt 1989; Myers-Scotton & Jake 2001). It is also possible under this model for the motivation for code-switching to be at this pre-linguistic stage, despite the fact that Levelt developed the model for monolingual language processing. Levelt (1989:28) also described the model as combining “serial and parallel processing in the following way: Each fragment of information will have to be processed in stages, going from the conceiving of messages to articulation. Still, all fragments can work in parallel, albeit on different
fragments”. This has implications for the analysis of code-switching in a single utterance or a conversation, if different parts of the utterance are at different stages of conceptualization, formulation or articulation. Levelt’s model was designed as a top-down model, where each component represented the next stage in processing. Each component was independent of the other. There was feedback downwards but not from the bottom up. This model enabled psycholinguists to view the process of language choice and selection of lemmas and associated syntactic and semantic information for a monolingual, but it did not give enough information to explain the language use of bilinguals and multilinguals.

De Bot proposed an adaptation of Levelt’s model for bilingual speakers. Levelt’s model conceptualized the way processing occurred for a monolingual or a unilingual, and de Bot developed a version to “provide a good explanation of various aspects of language production” of bilinguals. (De Bot, 1992: 1). In de Bot’s adapted model, the conceptualizer is not language specific, and “communicative intentions are given form in the preverbal message, which contains information about the language in which (part of) an utterance is to be produced”. In the relevant language-specific formulator “the preverbal message is converted into a speech plan very much the same way as unilingual processing takes place in Levelt’s model”. “The different formulators submit their speech plan to an articulator which is not language specific and which stores the possible sounds and prosodic patterns of the languages”. (De Bot, 1992: 21). Levelt et al (1999) further developed the model to allow for the spread of activation between the levels, to better explain the speech production of bilinguals and multilinguals. De Bot (2004:18) extended the model further to multilinguals, based on research into lexical access for a bilingual or a multilingual. He reviewed several experimental studies which looked at the question of whether “in a lexical decision task, do we first access the lexicon from one language and then the next, or is there a parallel search through all languages, words not being organised primarily through language, but e.g. through frequency.” De Bot deduced that:

- “Access to words in the lexicon is non-selective, i.e. words from more than one language compete for activation both in production and perception
- Non-selective access does not mean that words from whatever language have an equal chance of being selected, since languages as sets can be activated and inhibited.
- Shared forms at the phonological level tend to co-activate elements from different languages.
- Level of proficiency is reflected in latencies in various experimental tasks: lower levels come with longer latencies in on-line experimentation and higher error rates in judgement tasks.”

All of the models to which De Bot referred in the development of his theory of a model for a multilingual lexicon included the concept of level of activation of languages as sets. “Languages differ in level of activation, and this level of activation will depend on amount of instruction, age of acquisition and many more variables.” (De Bot, 2004: 26)

Clyne (2003: 210) proposed further refinements to speech production modelling in order that it could provide “some further input for both the sociolinguistic and the psycholinguistic aspects of the facilitation process”. Clyne’s model (2003: 213) attempted to explain how speech production could occur for a plurilingual person, and how the planning occurred,
sometimes in parallel, in the selection of the lemmas (tagged for each language) and the lexical forms. “The language tagging gives directions not only to the formulator to select and encode appropriate system morphemes but also to the articulator to select and encode sounds.” (Clyne, 2003: 211). This suggests that if the ‘articulator’ included signs, then the signs would be selected and encoded simultaneously with words from the other system. In this way it is possible that signs and sounds would be selected and encoded in parallel, and the final ‘articulation’ would be signed and spoken simultaneously.

2.2.5.2 Sign/spoken language research

Most interestingly for the purposes of this research, the psycholinguistic perspective has led spoken language researchers to the field of sign language/spoken language bilingualism. Dufour (1997:301) reviewed the research on signed language bilingualism from a psycholinguistic perspective. He defined three types of bilingualism associated with sign language: “(a) sign-sign bilinguals: individuals who know a sign language as a first language and learn another sign language as a second language. (b) speech-sign bilinguals: individuals who primarily use a spoken language and who learn a sign language sometime in their lifetime, and (c) sign-text bilinguals: deaf individuals who acquire a sign language as a first language and, because of their deafness, can only learn the written form of the spoken language of the community they live in. I would include a fourth group sign-spoken language bilinguals who primarily use a sign language and who learn aspects of a spoken language for use in the wider hearing community. The first group of sign-sign bilinguals, Dufour stated, have very little research available at this time, although “one can assume that sign-sign bilingualism parallels spoken language bilingualism.” (Dufour, 1997: 307). It is Dufour’s third group of sign-text bilinguals, and the fourth group of sign-spoken language bilinguals, who are the subjects of this current research.

A sign language and a spoken language are completely different in the way they are produced (one on the hands in the space in front of the body, and the other from the mouth in the form of oral utterances). Dufour questioned the implications of this cross-modality bilingualism for psycholinguistic models of bilingual language representation. In addition, it is physically and mentally possible to produce some form of both languages simultaneously. Sign language researchers have reported instances of simultaneous production (rather than clear examples of sequential code-switching) occurring in their data. (Lucas 2001; Dufour 1997). Messing (1998) referred to borrowing and simultaneous communication, where the sign language and the spoken language were used at the same time, as examples of language contact occurrences between a sign language and a spoken language. She referred to the phenomenon of simultaneous production as ‘bimodal communication’.

Research with sign language interpreters has produced interesting results on this notion of two language systems or a shared system. Baetens Beardsmore (1986: 106) reported that
bilinguals who may function competently “in two languages in clearly demarcated situational contexts often find it difficult to translate spontaneously between their languages without heavy interference.” Thus those interpreters who are trained to do exactly this role of interpreting spontaneously may be making use of a shared system between two languages. Isham and Lane (1994:313) reported that “bilinguals are able to perform a task, simultaneous interpretation, in which both language systems are fully engaged, while showing good comprehension of the sentences they are processing”. They concluded that “Models of lexical relations in bilinguals that do not include a shared conceptual store are thus weakened in their ability to explain this bilingual performance”.

Lee (1983), Lucas (2000), and Tompkins (2000) all found evidence of simultaneous use of a sign and a spoken language in bilingual conversations. This simultaneous production of sign language and spoken language features may support Muysken’s argument that “in many cases at least of insertion and congruent lexicalisation, components of the two languages are not active in sequence, but simultaneously.” (Muysken, 2000: 252). Muysken (2000: 251) asserted that “most of the recent models accounting for intra-sentential code-mixing (Poplack 1980; Myers-Scotton 1993; DiSciullo, Muysken, and Singh 1986) are based on an on/off view of the languages participating in the mix: at any one point one language is active or the other”. The view of only one language being active at a time requires further consideration in the light of research into spoken/sign language bilingualism and language contact. Research on hearing bimodal bilinguals has been done by Bishop & Hicks (2005) and also Emmorey, Borinstein, Thompson & Gollan (2008), but their research has not been considered in detail for the present study which is focussed on deaf bilinguals. Future research will be needed to compare the cognitive behaviours of hearing and deaf bilinguals.

The simultaneous use of both languages may be a surface manifestation of the kind of convergence that happens between a sign language and a spoken language. Convergence occurs between many pairs of spoken languages, and can be present regardless of the kind of surface manifestation. Convergence refers to the type of contact-induced change which occurs in a language (or languages) after many speakers have borrowed so many morphological or syntactic features of the other language that the typology of one (or both) of the languages begins to resemble the other (Romaine, 1995). Myers-Scotton’s theories suggested that code-switching leads to convergence of two languages whereas Clyne asserted that code-switching is facilitated by the convergence, although code-switching can also occur without convergence. Code-switching can occur between unrelated pairs of languages, where there is clearly no convergence. Examples are Finnish/English and Hungarian/German. In the case of Auslan and English, if code-switching or simultaneous use occur as language contact outcomes, they are likely to indicate a degree of convergence between the two languages. The fact that every deaf community member has had contact with both spoken and written English at some time of his/her life allows for the possibility of
convergence between the languages, and the data from this study will be examined in this light. It must be noted that a spoken language and a sign language are produced in two completely different modalities, one oral and one visual. The term ‘convergence’ is analogous to the term ‘contact signing’ for sign and spoken languages in contact (Lucas & Valli, 1992).

Very little research on sign/spoken bilinguals has been done using Levelt’s model of speech production, or any of the adapted models by De Bot or Clyne. However, it is possible that Clyne’s model of ‘plurilingual processing’ could provide researchers with a way of explaining sign/spoken bilingual performance. The planning or intention that occurs in the conceptualisation stage may be in parallel with the next stage in the formulator of selection and encoding of both lemmas and lexical forms. As the articulation stage is implemented, in lexical forms of both languages, the conceptualization and formulation stages would continue to work in parallel. The articulator may produce signs and spoken words simultaneously, because the lemmas and lexical forms have already been selected and encoded during formulation stage. Monitoring and feedback occurs, and the “feedback informs the formulator that the facilitating item can be part of more than one language system. Feedback is made possible by the fact that active plurilinguals make plans in each of their languages”. (Clyne, 2003: 212). Emmorey et al (2008) investigated the simultaneous production of two languages by hearing bimodal bilinguals, and proposed a model that assumed interactions between the ASL and English formulators. Although the subjects of this study were ‘native users’ (sic) they were all hearing, and so the relevance for this study requires additional research as all participants in the current study were deaf. The question of access to the auditory language may affect the extent of level activity of either the spoken or the signed language.

The concept of ‘plurilingual processing’ supports Green’s (1998) and Grosjean’s (1998) proposition that for each bilingual (or plurilingual) one language may be more activated, but the other language is never completely deactivated. It also helps to demystify the production process of a sign/spoken language bilingual, which allows the individual to sign and speak simultaneously. It correlates with the proposition that the grammatical system could be from only one of the languages. However, it does raise the question of whether there may be formed a new system of grammar to which the lemmas and lexical form from both languages can conform. This new system may also be a result of the influence from the spoken language and its written form on the grammatical systems of the sign language.

2.2.5.3 Mouthing
Another area of sign linguistics that has more recently begun to be researched is that of the use of mouthing or mouth patterns by signers. From a psycholinguistic perspective, it is an area that can be linked with simultaneous production of the sign language and spoken language. It has been noted anecdotally that deaf signers often sign with mouthing, although there is no spoken component, and Schembri et al (2000) specifically mentioned the
mouthing for noun-verb pairs in the research described in their paper. Mouthing, mouth patterns, lip patterns, mouth gestures, oral components and spoken components are just some of the many terms used to describe this function of the mouth in sign language (Braem & Sutton-Spence, 2001; Zeshan, 2001; Ebbinghaus & Hessman, 2001; Sutton-Spence & Day, 2001; Page, 2004).

Three main kinds of mouthing have been described in the literature, but there is no real consensus as to the status of the mouthings or even to the appropriate terminology that describes them. The three kinds of mouth patterns are those that derive from the spoken language, those that are unrelated to the spoken language and clearly derive from the sign language, and a possible third group of mouthings that are associated with emotions. (Braem & Sutton-Spence, 2001). Researchers use various terms to distinguish between the first two kinds of patterns, but they are not consistent. Braem & Sutton-Spence (2001: 3) stated “For ease of reading in this collection, however, we have chosen to use the terms mouthings and mouth gestures except where the author has explicitly chosen to use another term”.

Interestingly, in the same volume, Zeshan (2001: 247) uses ‘mouthings’ and ‘mouth patterns’ interchangeably to refer to both kinds of mouth use.

Ebbinghaus & Hessman (2001: 145) refer to ‘mouthing of words’ [obviously from the spoken language] and compare them to “mouth gestures [that] have to be considered as independent signs in their own right”. Sutton-Spence & Day (2001: 69) offer ‘mouth components’ as an alternative to ‘mouth gestures’ as they assert that “The term gesture implies both movement and meaning. Sign linguistics does not refer to brow gestures or hand or manual gestures, so mouth gestures might be a slightly incongruous term”. See section 1.3.2 for an explanation of the term that will be used in this thesis.

Some sign linguists have described the mouth patterns associated with the spoken language as ‘borrowings’ from that language. (Schembri, 1996; Lucas, 2001). Sign linguists have also considered the mouthings or mouth gestures associated with the sign language as “being part of the formational structure of particular signs”. (Schembri, 1996: 110). Mouth gestures can display function and meaning, and are not arbitrary. (Ebbinghaus & Hessman, 2001; Zeshan, 2001; Braem & Sutton-Spence, 2001). Johnston & Schembri (2007: 290) concluded that “It is difficult to establish if mouthing has become an obligatory part of the form of a sign and thereby creates a new and distinctive lexicalized sign, or whether it remains an optional borrowing from the spoken language”.

Sutton-Spence & Woll (1999: 88) referred to ‘oral components’ as those that are not associated with the spoken language, and asserted that “It is not always easy (or desirable) to separate oral components in BSL from information given on the rest of the face.” They discussed the various functions of oral components and facial expression, supporting the
case that oral components or mouth gestures associated with the sign language have function and meaning. Vogt-Svendsen (2001) discussed the mouth gestures associated with Norwegian Sign Language as elements that are free or bound morphemes. In other words, some mouth patterns could occur with or without any sign movements of the hands, and could carry meaning of their own.

The one area of general agreement in the literature is that mouthing or mouth patterning of any kind occurs frequently in sign language and there is a range of mouth patterns available to a signer, from which at any time he/she can choose those that relate to the sign language or those that relate to the spoken language. Influencing this choice is the amount of exposure a signer has had to the spoken language in his/her lifetime. (Braem & Sutton-Spence, 2001; Zeshan, 2001). Page (2004) found that Deaf late learner signers in her study integrated English mouthing into their discourse, in essence combining the two different grammar systems. Thus the use of the mouth is one language contact outcome between a sign language and a spoken language, and is part of the bilingual behaviour of a signer. The information contained in the mouthing has information in regard to language choice and syntax used in the utterance. This will be discussed in relation to the results in Chapter 8.

2.3 Language, Core Values and Identity

Language contact outcomes may be the result of the individual expression of identity, or it may be the opposite, that identity of the individual is revealed by the types of language contact outcomes seen in the conversation. This issue will be investigated in the data, as will the issue of whether each participant identifies as as a ‘native’ signer or reveals themselves as acquiring Auslan as a ‘mother tongue’.

The term ‘mother tongue’ is not particularly helpful for discussions of language and identity, due to the connotations it has for many bilinguals. It is worth noting some of the reasons for this. It has been used in linguistics to describe an individual’s first language or their primary language, or the language of their family or ethnic group. The term assumed two things about the language of the speaker: one, that the language was learned from the mother (or the primary carer in this role), and two, that this language could be defined as the first or primary language. We now know that in many families children acquire one or more languages simultaneously as one parent transmits one language, the other parent transmits another language, and a carer may transmit a third language. Plurilinguals (those that have acquired more than one language) cannot always be clear about which language was their primary or first language.

Another perspective on the term ‘mother tongue’ is “the language an individual identifies with” (Romaine, 1995: 22). This concept of identity and the role language plays in the development of either personal or social identity is one which needs to be discussed for the purposes of
this study. Joseph (2004) refers to the dual identity of an individual as the *paradox of identity*: “On the one hand, identity is about ‘sameness’ (its etymological root)…. On the other hand identity is about who one is uniquely – first of all a name, then a self that consists of the various identities (in the first sense) of which one partakes, and finally, for some people, a completely individual essence that escapes all categorization beyond association with this particular person” Joseph (2004: 37). Every person has a need to express the unique features of themself, and yet we all have a need to be the same as others in our group or community and belong with others who are ‘the same’.

As a child grows up in a family and a community, he/she will develop a physical identity, which includes the height, weight, color of skin and hair, as well as sex, and build. During a lifetime this physical identity will change with natural aging, and sometimes by choice. In just the same way, other aspects of identity will change throughout an individual’s lifetime. Personal identity can be described as a self-concept, built on a lifetime of experiences, and defined by our need to distinguish ourselves from others. This may be exhibited through skills and talents, personality traits, or even by the number of languages spoken by an individual. Thus bilinguals and multilinguals can incorporate their language abilities into their personal identity.

Aspects of identity also include ethnic, geographical, and social identity. “Ethnic identity is allegiance to a group with which one has ancestral links”. (Crystal, 1987: 34). Perceptions and beliefs from previous generations are passed on through the language of the community, which implies group membership. Ethnic identity implies ancestral links to a group which has always spoken the same language. Writers have commented that in immigrant communities in the USA and Australia, even after speakers no longer use the language of ethnic origin as a language of communication within the community, they still perceive and claim that language as a symbol of their ethnic identity. (Crystal, 1987; Smolicz, 2001; Le Page & Tabouret-Keller, 1985).

Social identity is multi-faceted, and involves all of the roles an individual plays in society, and includes all the many groups to which the individual belongs. Aspects of identity such as physical and geographical are features over which an individual has no control. Ethnic and social identity can change during a lifetime and even momentarily within a conversation, as speakers of a language make a deliberate choice to express the identity they wish to reveal at that point in time. Language is one way in which people can express their identity within the various social networks throughout their life. Holmes (1992: 1) asserted, “examining the way people use language in different social contexts provides a wealth of information about the way language works, as well as about the social relationships in a community.”
Geographical identity is more difficult to define, as one person may base this on a city of birth, another on a particular region within a country, and another on a country or nation. All of these perspectives may reveal information about the origin or the place chosen by the individual as a place of identity. The language or dialect an individual speaks may be determined by the place of birth or residency. As Tabouret-Keller (1997: 317) stated, “The link between language and identity is often so strong that a single feature of language use suffices to identify someone’s membership of a given group”. However, the languages a person chooses to speak will be determined more by the other interlocutors with whom he/she must communicate, or the domain of the communication, and even more by the alliance the person feels with the culture and community with which he/she identifies.

Amongst monolingual and multilingual communities, there is another kind of social division sometimes referred to as social class distinction. This is a concept of some controversy, although linguists and scholars have researched the way that different types of people from different social and educational backgrounds use and speak the language in different ways. Strategies for politeness and creating social distance are evident in many languages, and these strategies are linked to the way the language is used in each culture. Crystal (1987: 42) summed up these strategies as “The markers of solidarity and distance may relate to family, sex, ethnicity, social class, or to any of the groups and institutions that define the structure of society”. As an individual joins or seeks membership of a particular group, the markers will be incorporated into the use of the language so as to identify with that group. Group identity can be reflected in the language used by the group, just as language can be reflected in the identity. As Joseph (2004: 39) commented “this is how linguistic identity functions in general: we read the identity of people with whom we come into contact based on very subtle features of behaviour, among which those of language are particularly central.”

Crystal (1987: 13) included the expression of identity as one of the functions of language. The expression of identity may include chanting at football matches, shouting names and slogans at public gatherings, affirmations at religious services, and even stage-managed audience reaction to TV game shows. This view relies on the use of language to reveal a person’s alliances or identity in a larger group within the community, and the assumption that people express rather than negotiate their identity. “Language features are the link which binds individual and social identities together. Language offers both the means of creating this link and that of expressing it”. (Tabouret-Keller, 1997: 317).

An individual’s social identity can influence or even dictate which language or form of language a person may use, and in which domain or context. Social (or cultural) identity may be the cause of a speaker talking in a particular style and the language used might be an indicator of his/her cultural identity. Allegiance to a community may be exhibited in the natural language choices a speaker makes at any time, depending on whether the interlocutors are
bilinguals or monolinguals. This is because language is not just a means of communication, but also a symbol of identity and group or community membership. Writers drawing on Tajfel's (1974, 1999) view of social identity as based on group membership, have asserted that "when individuals view their present social identity as less than satisfactory, they may attempt- at times successfully, at times not- to change their group membership in order to view themselves more positively." (Blackledge & Pavlenko, 2001: 244). Each language that a speaker uses at any given time is a statement of the community or the group with which he/she is identifying at that point in time. If the setting or the topic demands a particular language or variety of the language, the speaker accepts the protocols of that particular setting, and can switch languages mid-sentence or mid-conversation, in order to conform to the demands of the group. In this way identity can be re-negotiated and constructed differently from what may have been revealed prior to this interaction.

Recently, some writers have begun to look beyond the paradigms of viewing the relationship between language and identity as either (1) language used to express identity, or (2) language used to re-negotiate identity within group membership constraints. The relationship between language and identity is seen as intertwined, and identity is constructed in each linguistic interaction of an individual. Blackledge & Pavlenko (2001: 245) referred to this paradigm as a 'poststructuralist theoretical framework', which encompasses "sociolinguistic approaches which view identities as fluid and constructed in linguistic interaction". By using these approaches, researchers can begin "to examine ways in which language practices are bound up in relations of authority and power and larger socioeconomic and sociopolitical processes." (Blackledge & Pavlenko 2001: 246). Joseph (2004: 40) tried "to show that an understanding of language without consideration of identity can never hope to be complete, to indicate how such a consideration can enrich our understanding of language, and to draw attention to some of the methodological issues that cannot be skirted if it is to do so in any sort of serious way." The interrelationship of language and identity as 'fluid and constructed in linguistic interaction' is significant for this study.

2.3.1 Core Values
In minority communities, the mother tongue of the community often constitutes a core value of the community. However, it may not be the value of highest priority in all communities, where other core values such as family cohesion may take precedence. "Differing circumstances and challenges may lead another group to accord the highest priority to non-linguistic aspects of culture." (Smolicz: 1981). Many ethnic communities in Australia, and in particular Melbourne, retain their language through the practices of the church or religion in the community. Other communities continue to use their mother tongue during cultural festivals, or community events. According to Smolicz (1981: 84) "Core values may be defined in terms of the social system whose members identify with them; and, conversely, a social system may be defined in terms of the core values to which its members subscribe."
Smolicz, Secombe, & Hudson (2001: 168) reported in their comparative study of core values that the Greek-Australian respondents indicated a triad of core values, including family patterns, the Greek language and the Greek Orthodox Church. The Chinese background respondents rated their language as a core value only after the more important core value of the Chinese family. However, in the Latvian community in Australia, the Latvian language was seen as the most significant core value of the group’s culture. This priority on language as the cultural core value reflects what Fishman (1985: 366) maintained was the view of many activists for ethnic community mother-tongue schools in the United States, that “languages not merely reflect their associated cultures but that they create them, protect them and energize them”.

Clyne (1991: 92) expressed sympathy with the view that language can be a core value of a community, but raised three problem areas, which challenge the theory that the value of a language in a community equates with maintenance of the language in the long term. The problem areas are those of “group definition”, where diverse groups from a speech community do not necessarily form an ethnic community; “multiple group membership”, where individuals can belong to several groups or to many different sub-groups which share the same language but differ in whether they or not they claim it as a core value; and “attitudinal changes such as ethnic revivals”, where the impact of group attitudes may cause a revival of a particular ethnic community. (e.g. the rise in claims of people using a language such as Macedonian or Maltese.) Each of these issues impacts on whether individuals within a particular group would claim that their language is a core value of the community. Language is one very visible way that a community or an individual can demonstrate an identity with the values of the community. Whether the language is maintained in the long term is not consistent across all communities, but that language can be claimed as a core value is consistent.

The link between the social system and core values is provided by the group identity that develops from shared values. It is not a matter of the social system forcing any member to follow the same values, but rather because of the shared values the members of a group genuinely share beliefs and attitudes which strengthen the social system and group identity. This in turn strengthens an individual’s feelings of belonging and obligation to the group. The argument can be replicated to considering language as a core value of a community. If a community values its language highly, then that language will be a sign of an individual’s inheritance from (and/or allegiance to) that community. The group identity of the community is strengthened by the value placed on the language and its use, and maintenance of the community language. Rampton (1995: 340) developed this concept as a result of trying to get away from the term ‘native speaker’. He asserted that an individual’s relationship with a language can be viewed from a cultural perspective rather than a developmental or
performance perspective. He differentiated between “expertise” (skill, proficiency, ability to operate with a language), and ‘allegiance’ (identification with a language, with the values, meanings and identities that it stands for). In Rampton’s words “‘expertise’ and ‘allegiance’ relate to linguistic identities – to cultural interpretations of a person’s relationship to a language.” (Rampton, 1995: 340). Rampton also used the term ‘inheritance’ to refer to those who had access to a language from birth and thus inherited it as part of their earliest development. This then differentiates these individuals from others who learned a language later in life and chose to identify with a community or group, allying themselves with that group by using their language, thus sharing a core value of the community. As an individual grows within a community into which he/she was born, identity is developed through learning about oneself as a human and social being. “A person’s identity development or particular view of reality is developed through various opportunities for interaction with others, as well as the components of others’ worldviews.” (Blackburn, 2000: 224).

2.3.2 Language, core values and identity in the deaf community

The deaf community in this discussion refers to the small number of Australians with early onset profound deafness. This does not include the much larger numbers of adventitiously deaf individuals or even those individuals born with a mild, moderate or severe hearing loss which is easily assisted with a hearing aid or a cochlear implant. (Refer chapter one for a definition of these terms.) None of these individuals will use sign language as they identify with hearing people in the community and acquire their first spoken language as a hearing person. “Very few deafened individuals will acquire sign language as a primary means of communication.” (Johnston, 1998:557). See chapter three for a full discussion of the deaf community.

Language has a role as a core value, and as an expression of identity in the deaf community in Melbourne and Australia. Sign language is held in high esteem in deaf communities all over the world. (Sutton-Spence & Woll 1999; Lucas & Valli 1992; Kannapell 1993). Tabouret-Keller’s assertion that a single feature of language use may suffice to identify someone’s membership of a given group correlates to the deaf community where a single feature of sign language use can serve to identify a deaf person’s state of residence and school history. The small numbers of deaf signers with deaf parents in any deaf community who acquire Auslan as their first language often have a more positive attitude to their family and community language. However, most deaf signers have hearing parents, and the development of their personal identity is dependent on the bonds they develop with their parents and family. In conflict with this family identity is the social identity that develops from a need for contact with people who share the same experience of living in the “deaf world”, and who can communicate easily in the same language. Erting (1994: 5) articulated this conflict most succinctly as:

*this basic contradiction between the deaf individual’s social identity--constructed in part out of the need for community with others who share fundamentally similar experiences and can communicate them--and the deaf
individual’s personal identity—resulting in part from the physical and emotional bonds between parents and children, very often manifests itself as ambivalence toward both Deaf society and hearing society”.

According to Erting, the deaf person has to integrate these two competing and conflicting identities and this poses the greatest challenge for a deaf individual. It is difficult to understand how a deaf person uses the languages as a means of expressing or negotiating their identity, because of this ambivalence. Blackledge and Pavlenko (2001: 245) commented on the transition from socio-psychological approaches on viewing identity, to more ethno-graphically-oriented sociolinguistic approaches which view identity as fluid and constructed in linguistic interaction. They adopted a framework (as referred to in Section 2.3) “which emphasizes that at all times identities are embedded within larger ideological structures and discursive practices”. This framework seems useful to describe the complex way that language and identity are intricately linked in the deaf community. Kannapell (1993:1) also stated that “Deaf people may use English or speech and/or identify themselves as hard-of-hearing, as a way of not being so deaf, or they may use ASL as a way of showing they are not hearing; thus language choice reflects identity choice”. It can also be a way of showing their ambivalence to both cultures, as a result of the conflicting identities.

In addition to this internal conflict for a deaf person, some deaf people in Australia have an additional layer of identity, either as a member of a recent immigrant family or as a second or third generation member of an ethnic community within Australia. Belonging to another ethnic community may be accompanied by issues of trilingualism and identity, about which many deaf people are ambivalent in the same way as discussed above. Recent immigration programs including categories of migrants and family reunion have allowed many deaf people opportunities to migrate to Australia from non-English speaking countries. The demands on deaf people to belong to the religious and cultural groups of the ethnic communities impacts on their personal and social identity, and also on their ability to develop language skills overall. The language of the family and ethnic community is not acquired naturally, and often education of the deaf has not been accessible within the country of origin. On arrival in Australia, the deaf child usually attends a school or facility for the deaf where they may learn Auslan, as well as English literacy skills. The deaf child now has access to two languages, both of which he/she may not share with parents or family. As Kannapell (1989: 208) stated “Most deaf people do not realize how enmeshed they are in the competition between two [or more] identities with separate language and cultures. It is only when deaf people develop an awareness of their situation and face it maturely that integration and resolution of the two identities become possible”.

Kannapell (1993: 22) asserted that for American deaf people, ASL has two functions within the deaf community. It serves a symbolic function, visibly demonstrating their power and identity in the deaf community. It also provides a unifying function, as deaf people are unified by their common language. “So the two functions are different perspectives on the same
reality - one from inside the group which is unifying, and the other from the outside, which is separating”. I would agree with this proposition that deaf people in Australia are also both unified and separated by their language. Even within the deaf community, the politics of identity impact when deaf people, who grew up struggling with spoken English and did not learn Auslan until quite late as adults, become the teachers and language planners of Auslan. Those deaf people who acquired Auslan from birth as a first language often perceive these late learners of Auslan as less entitled to their ‘deaf identity’ and ownership of the community language.

The choices which deaf individuals make each time they choose one language over another may be dependent on a combination of several factors. “Language choice, like the act of speaking itself, is a well-learned and complex behaviour whose extreme complexity only becomes apparent when it breaks down. In everyday life, the bilingual will go through his or her daily activities quite unaware of the many psychological and sociolinguistic factors that interact in what are probably complex weighted formulas to help choose one language over another”. (Grosjean, 1982: 145). Some deaf people choose to use spoken language to appear to be more like hearing people, as this carries a perception of success. Others choose the sign language as an expression of their cultural deafness. They prefer to identify with being deaf. Some will move from one to the other, and claim to communicate successfully in both the hearing and the deaf worlds. McKee & McKee (2000: 3) stated “Personal identity in the Deaf community is strongly shaped by (and reflected in) language use and by one’s relationship with peers”. Thus personal identity and social identity in the deaf community are constantly in a tense relationship within the individual, with the language[s] of the dominant hearing culture[s] and the minority deaf culture reflecting the relationship of each identity.

2.4 Language Planning

Language planning is concerned with firstly, the status of a language with regard to some other language or variety, and secondly, the corpus of the language. (Wardhaugh, 1992; Daoust, 1997). The dichotomy of status/corpus planning, which was introduced by Kloss (1968: 81) has been taken up and used repeatedly by other writers. Daoust (1997: 448) asserted that “Language planning policies can never be corpus-oriented or status-oriented exclusively”. Thus if corpus planning seeks to develop or standardize a language so it can be recognised, accepted and used in all language functions in society (including the provision of interpreters for those who cannot use the other language[s]), then either deliberately or accidentally, the status of this particular language in relation to the other languages in society is affected. Wardhaugh (1992: 347) commented on the interrelationship between corpus and status planning “Even though it is possible to recognise most of the relevant parameters, language planning is still far from being a science”. Certainly language planning in the deaf community in Australia is far from being a science, with decisions until recently being made by
hearing educators who more or less ignored the existence of the sign language of the community and had no research on which to base their conclusions.

Kaplan & Baldauf (1997: 28) asserted that the separation of language planning into corpus and status “constitutes something of an oversimplification; it is, in fact, virtually impossible, in practice, to separate the two activities”. Referring to corpus and status planning, Clyne (1997a: 1) asserted that “these two types of activity are usually complementary. In order for a group to gain language status for its variety, it needs to both declare it to be a language and to define (by codification) its corpus”. Any change in the way a language is used will impact on the character of the language itself and the reverse also applies. Haarmann (1990: 120) proposed adding a third range of language activities under the term ‘prestige planning’. Kaplan and Baldauf (1997: 50) supported this additional level of activities, believing it was “useful in that it reinforces the notion that planning occurs at different levels and for a variety of purposes.” They proposed ‘acquisition planning’ as a third type of language planning, and this will have relevance for the recommendations from this current study.

Kaplan’s(1989: 194) early definition of language planning considered four categories of decision making: governmental, educational, informal and other. Governmental planning referred to the overseeing by government departments in relation to language activities for trade, tourism, and technical manuals for equipment purchased, that may be written in other languages. Educational planning “involves both corpus and status decisions – corpus decisions in defining what will be taught with what pedagogical materials, and status decisions in defining what languages will be taught in the first place and then in selling that notion to students, parents, and teachers”. (Kaplan, 1989: 194). Informal planning included the work done by language agencies, academies, and policy bodies, as well as the language activities of the various religious bodies in the community, including Saturday schools in many countries. Kaplan’s other category included agencies like hospitals, police, public transport services etc, which provide services but only in one or a limited few languages. Kaplan (1989: 195) stated that “All agencies, official or unofficial, which interact with the public engage in language-policy formulation at an unconscious, unintentional, and informal level by defining the languages in which services can be delivered”. Kaplan and Baldauf (1997: 311) described the categories of agencies of language planners as including government, education, communities of speakers, non-government, and other bodies.

For agencies and governments to make appropriate decisions for language planning, good reliable information is needed on which to base those decisions. Often the kind of information involved is not reliable, and a good example of this is any census taken in any country. The questions on language may elicit different answers, depending on how they are interpreted by the informant, and according to any political motivation of the question itself or of the informant. Census data has therefore been shown to be inaccurate over the years and lacking
detail (Clyne, 1991a, 2003; Wardhaugh, 1992). The way people answer questions about their language use at home and in the community often reveals their perceptions about their languages, who they are, and their rights to speak their languages. The answers tend to reveal more complex trends than the straightforward statistics being sought by planners for use in policy-making decisions.

2.4.1 Language planning in the deaf community

Writers have frequently described the defining moment in the history of language planning in the deaf communities around the world as the 1880 International Congress of Educators of the Deaf, in Milan (Gregory et al, 1998; Johnston, 1989, 1998; Lucas, 1989; Muzsnai, 1999; Ozolins & Bridge, 1999). The Congress was dominated by hearing teachers of the deaf, with deaf teachers being shut out of the vote for the resolution which banned sign language in schools for the deaf around the world. That resolution effectively lowered the status of sign languages in all countries and began a period of over eighty years during which no corpus planning of any kind was considered for sign languages. Despite this lack of corpus or status planning in governmental or educational arenas, the informal development of sign languages in deaf communities all over the world flourished. This informal growth impacted on the status of sign languages, as they were highly regarded by deaf signers within their own community, but perceived as deficient forms of language by hearing people (Branson & Miller, 1991; Johnston, 1989; Ozolins & Bridge, 1999). Corpus or linguistically oriented planning was spontaneous within each community, as they developed their sign language to meet the needs of every day communication with each other.

As stated in Chapter 1, the study of the linguistics of a sign language by Stokoe in the 1960s highlighted the growing demand by members of the deaf community in the U.S. for their ‘language rights’ to be recognised. As Wardhaugh (1992: 347) explained “a demand for ‘language rights’ is often one of the first demands made by a discontented minority almost anywhere in the world”. Nearly one hundred years after the congress in Milan, deaf communities around the world were becoming very discontented, and the deaf communities in the United States were beginning the journey in their quest for recognition of their language. “The recognition of sign languages as real languages and linguistic research on sign languages since the 1960s has slowly begun to reverse the situation. Not only has the research helped to empower Deaf people all over the world, but it has allowed for the discussion of sign language as the medium of instruction in deaf education.” (Lucas, Bayley, & Valli, 2003:77).

In 1989, many years after deaf people in the United States had begun to study and attain degrees at university in ASL (with the assistance of interpreters and notetakers), deaf people in Australia were still finishing their school experience with basic literacy skills at primary school levels. This was despite the early attempts at language planning (by a nationally
formed committee of deaf and hearing people) to develop the Australasian Signed English system between 1974 and 1982 (Johnston & Schembri 2007: 20). Secondary education in mainstream schools for students using Auslan was only established in the early 1980s. Lo Bianco (1990: 75) noted as one of the language problems facing Australia’s policy-makers “Although in the U.S.A. deaf people can study to Ph.D. level in American Sign Language, it is extremely difficult for deaf Australians to study and attain qualifications in Australian higher education institutions”. He went on to comment on the provision of interpreters and translators in Australia, which is inadequate for the needs of non-English speakers”. Although in recent years community interpreting has been the main planning emphasis, the provision of interpreters and translators has been inadequately planned and poorly used. There is virtually no high level accreditation provision (levels four and five of the National Accreditation Authority for Translators and Interpreters) in languages of key economic significance and poor provisions for Aborigines and the deaf”. (Lo Bianco, 1990: 75).

The first dictionary of Auslan was produced in 1989 by Trevor Johnston. Previous ‘dictionaries’ form the 1960s and 1970s were compiled by educators, not researchers, and they tended to list local signs (from one state of Australia). They were not comprehensive in any way, and were designed to be used as supplements with spoken English. As for education, the planning involved was focussed on teaching and learning in English, and specifically the development of the Australasian Signed English system (Leigh, 1995). “Unlike a natural language, however, ASE is a system devised by a committee in the 1970s as an exact representation of English in signed form.” (MacDougall, 1988). The schools which used a sign language in the classrooms were viewed as schools where deaf children who ‘could not succeed with oral skills in spoken English’ were sent. Thus the use of sign language tended to be seen as a situation of ‘last resort’ rather than a context requiring planning. See section 4.4 for a detailed discussion of the language planning that has occurred in Australia regarding Auslan and the use of the language in the education system.

2.5 Summary

This chapter has discussed the main features of the literature on language contact outcomes (including code-switching), and the four major perspectives from which these can be studied, grammatical, conversational, sociolinguistic, and psycholinguistic. The research from each of the four perspectives for sign/spoken language bilingualism was also highlighted. The literature on language and identity was reviewed as being relevant for this study, as language use is closely linked with identity in the deaf community. The question of language as a core value of the deaf community is an important one. The data will be analysed for any evidence of this issue that occurs in the conversations of the participants..

Historically, sign languages were not included in language planning by governments or language authorities in many countries of the world and Australia was no exception until the
National Policy on Languages (Lo Bianco 1987). It can be seen from the review in this chapter that Australia still lags behind some other countries in the status and corpus planning of sign language in the deaf community. This has had an impact on the esteem in which Auslan is held by both deaf and hearing people, and is relevant for this study.

The following chapters will expand on the Australian Deaf Community (in particular the Victorian Deaf community) and Australian Sign Language as they are relevant to the background of the participants and the data collected.
Chapter 3 - The Australian Deaf Community and Australian Sign Language.

This chapter will introduce the Australian deaf community and the history of its development since early settlement. The Victorian deaf community (as it is positioned within Australia) is described in more detail, highlighting some of the cultural aspects that are relevant for this study. Participants in the study make reference to the beliefs and behaviours and terminology described in this chapter, so the reader will have some context in which to place the results. Australian Sign Language (Auslan) is defined and some of the historical and philosophical changes that have contributed to the place of Auslan in the wider community and within education are also discussed.

3.1 The Australian Deaf Community

3.1.1 The Deaf and Hard of Hearing Population

A very small number of people in Australia are congenitally deaf from birth or become deaf at such an early age as to be considered prelingually deaf (specifically those children who have had no access from 3 years of age to first spoken language acquisition), and who would constitute part of the population of the deaf community in Australia. The number of Auslan users is hard to estimate, but writers (Johnston 1989, Erting 1994) generally refer to the statistic of 0.1% of the total population, which would at this date represent approximately 20,000 people. A more realistic figure according to Johnston (2006) would be closer to the census figure of 6,500 Auslan users. The Australian Bureau of Statistics has figures dating back to 1993 which refer to numbers of Australian residents with a hearing impairment, (nearly one million), but no specific questions about disability groups were asked in a census until 1996. The ABS figures were obtained via the numbers of customers presenting at Australian Hearing (and other) centers for assistive devices, mainly hearing-aids. Hence it is difficult to ascertain the numbers of people who may identify themselves as having pre-lingual deafness. Ozolins and Bridge (1999: 7) made the valid point that the distinctions between the terms deaf, Deaf, and hard of hearing “can mean that quite different populations are being studied.” Hyde and Power (1991) estimated 15,400 Auslan users in Australia, and this figure was achieved by individuals in the various deaf communities around Australia referring each other.

The Census question on language use (from 1986, 1991 and 1996) which asked if the respondent spoke a language other than English (LOTE) in the home, elicited information in a way that was not particularly helpful to ascertain accurate numbers of Auslan users (Ozolins and Bridge, 1999: 9). The responses hinted at a possible confusion about the name of the language used, and whether sign language is ‘signed’ or ‘spoken’. The number of people who did state Auslan was 1,911, and those who answered ‘sign language’ numbered 2,216. Many
respondents, both deaf and hearing, may not have understood the term 'speak' to include their sign language. The term 'speak' was not clarified in the question and no advice or instruction was provided to the deaf community on how to answer the question. In most states people referred to their home language as 'sign language' and fewer used the term 'Auslan'. The subsequent Census in 2001 produced quite different numbers following some community education and information dissemination (1,697 answered 'sign language' and 3,293 answered 'Auslan'). This highlighted two trends, firstly that more people (an increase of one-third) now called their community language 'Auslan' as distinct from the general term 'sign language', and secondly more people seemed to respond to the question as a whole.

It is important to remember that the large numbers of adventitiously deafened individuals, and those with mild or moderate hearing losses during childhood years, never use any kind of sign language, and instead identify and associate with members of the broader hearing community. The one million to two million of these hard-of-hearing or hearing-impaired people in Australia, usually have little or no contact with members of the deaf community.

3.1.2 The Deaf Community
The Australian deaf community may be as large as 10,000 in 2007, or it may be even smaller. The Census figures from 2006 indicated that the total number of people in Australia who claim to 'speak' sign language at home was 7,150. Johnston (2006) discussed in detail in his research the reasons for the smaller than expected numbers on the census figures. The fact remains that this community now defines itself by the language used and the culture shared by its members. Johnston (1989:470) put it most succinctly when he stated that “the deaf community is a fairly tightly knit community with members of the deaf community spending a large part of their leisure and social life in the deaf community, yet working in the hearing community. In this way the deaf community is really not significantly different from many of the diverse ethnic communities which go to make up an immigrant country like Australia.” Most prelingually and early onset deaf people do not perceive themselves as disabled in any way and prefer not to identify themselves by their hearing loss. Instead, they view themselves as belonging to a minority cultural community which is known by the language and social conventions shared by all. This community is often socially and culturally formalized by the use of capital D, and referred to as the Deaf community. However, for reasons stated in 1.4.1, this discussion will not follow this convention, instead using the term ‘deaf community’ to refer to the cultural and social community of signing deaf people.

It is worth noting that the deaf community includes not only members who are congenitally deaf and can be referred to as signing deaf people. Hearing children of deaf people (Coda or child of deaf adults) who acquired sign language as their first language are naturally included as members of the deaf community, as are other hearing individuals who have acquired native-like fluency through their work in the community. These welfare workers, teachers,
clergy, interpreters and others all make the size of the deaf community actually larger than the size of the population of those born deaf or who have lost their hearing before the age of full acquisition of a spoken language (Johnston, 1989).

The sign language shared by the deaf community is significant in binding it together as a community, but defining this language is a difficult task. The language is used as a mark of membership of the community (as with many other minority communities), but the variations from state to state, and those variations caused by the forms of communication imposed by the educators of deaf children over the years, have led to confusion amongst even those who identify as Auslan signers. This language use will be explained in the section 3.2.

3.1.3 The Victorian Deaf Community

It is necessary for this study to explore in more detail the Victorian, and more particularly the Melbourne, deaf community. It will be seen later in the data from the informants that their background, including which school they attended, is viewed as significant when discussing their language use. The majority of profoundly deaf people, like most of the population of Victoria, reside in or close to Melbourne, with others living mainly in the major regional centres. The culture of a signing deaf community is such that face-to-face visual communication is the preferred method, leading to a preference for residing in close proximity to each other, allowing regular and frequent gatherings to occur. Large cities or regional towns allow for access to education with other deaf children, as well as access to linguistically and culturally appropriate services such as information, welfare, advocacy and interpreting services. Unfortunately, these services are not adequate in the city, let alone in any of the Victorian country centres.

Traditionally, due to special and residential schools for the deaf being centralized in Melbourne, many deaf children from regional areas travelled and boarded weekly at a school in the city. This meant that most deaf adults knew each other or about each other from their school days, and this strong sense of identity with the community was never lost. However, since the 1980s, following state government education policy, integration into mainstream education has been the goal for all deaf students. Facilities for the deaf were established in the 1980s in four (now five) state secondary schools and several state primary schools, as well as in some Preparation to Year 12 (P-12) independent schools in the metropolitan area. Later some regional country centres established similar integrated facilities in mainstream schools. It is possible now for deaf students to attend school without ever meeting a deaf adult and only having access to the small group of students within the same school. Many of these children have been isolated from any sense of community, and have had no models for their language acquisition, other than the teachers of the deaf who may have used some artificial form of signed communication other than Auslan (see section 3.2.5), or interpreters required to work under the policy laid out by the state education department. The language
policy (Australia’s Language, 1991) is still current and advocates education of deaf students in the dominant language - English. More will be discussed in the next chapter on the effect of this policy on individual and community identity, as well as the profound effect on the community language.

3.1.4 The Central Role of Sign Language in the Deaf Community

Wardhaugh (1992:217) commented that “the exact nature of the relationship between language and culture has fascinated, and continues to fascinate, people from a wide variety of backgrounds.” This fascination is also apparent in the study of the sign language of deaf communities around the world. Johnston (1989: 471) asserted that “the use of a sign language is one of the prime defining characteristics of a deaf community--sign language is the cement that binds the community together and it is the medium that facilitates the smooth interactions thought typical of a community rather than just a collection, group or population of individuals.” The sign language of a deaf community forms a ‘core value’ as defined by Smolicz (1981: 75). Core values “generally represent the heartland of the ideological system and act as identifying values which are symbolic of the group and its membership. Rejection of the core values carries with it the threat of exclusion from the group”. The importance of sign language for identification with, and membership of, the deaf community meets these criteria as a core value. (See Section 2.3 for discussion of this issue). If deaf people wish to remain as part of the community they need to use the sign language. Members tend to use more English-like variations of their community language when mixing with outsiders, such as at work, sport, or with hearing families. “Outside their own language community Deaf people negotiate communication using combinations of speech, speechreading, gesture, mime, writing, forms of contact signing with those who know some signs, and guesswork.” (McKee & McKee, 2000: 6). Auslan is used at community functions, and for any communication between deaf people. The importance of Auslan as a core value in the Australian deaf community is just one of many unique aspects of deaf community culture in Australia. Researchers of aspects of signed conversations in various countries of the world (Lucas 2001; Sutton-Spence & Woll 1999; Metzger 2000; Chamberlain, Morford & Mayberry 2000; Schembri 1996; and Johnston 1998) have investigated aspects such as eye gaze, facial expression, and name signs. All have reached the same conclusion, that is, the place of the sign language as a core value within the deaf community.

Conversation in the deaf community can be conducted at a much greater distance than is accepted for spoken conversations. Personal observations and anecdotal evidence support claims that Deaf people can communicate across a room, across a street, or even across a football oval, if the light is good enough. In smaller spaces, such as restaurant booths or trains and trams, I have observed deaf signers sitting opposite each other, and slightly more than arms length away, to allow for comfortable signing space and movement. Noisy environments are no barrier to visual communication using sign language. Classrooms and
lecture theatres set up in rows one behind the other are not culturally friendly for deaf people, who who are known to prefer a visually comfortable semi-circle, where every person can see and be seen by every other person.

Eye gaze in signed conversation is very important, and the common practice of Australians of listening to one person and gazing at different passers-by, is not as acceptable when watching a signed form of communication. A shift of gaze is commonly perceived as a distraction from the conversation, signalling a desire to end the dialogue, or boredom with the topic. According to Sutton-Spence and Woll (1999: 94) eye gaze has five important uses in British Sign Language, and Wilbur (1980: 27) described examples of the use of gaze direction and eye blinks in the grammar of American Sign Language particularly in conditional statements, where “the ‘if’ clause was followed by an eyeblink”. Metzger and Bahan (2001: 128-141) referred to eye gaze in their discussion of discourse analysis and signed conversations, asserting that eye gaze is used as a turn-taking strategy as well as a form of repair sometimes. See section 3.2.1 for more detail. Eye gaze is used in the transcription of data for this study as an indication of who the utterance was directed to and relating the language contact outcome to the variable of interlocutor.

Facial expression is one of the non-manual features of Auslan which can contribute to intensity of signs in the language, and sometimes to the grammar of the language, equivalent to the parameters of speech which can be combined to form the phonemes of English (Schembri, 1996; Johnston, 1989). This will be discussed in more detail in 3.2.1. Facial expression can easily lead to miscommunication, if the English-speaking Australian is not aware of the grammatical contribution of the expression on the face of the deaf interlocutor. Facial expression can occur as part of a multi-channel sign when it co-occurs with the manual sign (Johnston & Schembri, 2007: 98). Whereas English has many different lexical items to express different intensity in meaning (eg good-wonderful- fantastic-incredible), Auslan signers sometimes uses facial expression as one of the ways to intensify the signs, sometimes creating different meanings. (Examples of this are the signs for MOUSE/ORGASM, the signs for CONGRATULATIONS/POPULAR, and the signs for HOLIDAY/AVAILABLE with facial expression (and sometimes mouth patterns) showing the difference in context). Sometimes English speakers do not understand the use of facial expression, and this can lead to cross-cultural conflict between members of the deaf community and the hearing community. Changing a sign by the addition of facial expression for intensity can be mistaken for anger or fatigue or even sarcasm on the face of the deaf speaker.

Name signs are another unique part of the collectivist nature of the deaf community. As McKee & McKee (2000:9) stated “The giving, using and knowledge of name signs also plays an important role in the social cohesion of a group”. In our Australian individualist culture, our
name belongs to us and we often use another person’s name when talking to them, for emphasis, or in declarative or imperative statements. In the deaf community the name of a person is used either for signing documents or for identification in the wider Australian community. Within the deaf community, name signs develop to refer to a person when they are absent from the group. Mindess (1999: 44) stated that these name signs “thus belong more to the group than to the person being referred to. Although deaf people often cherish their own name signs, it is the group’s prerogative to change a person’s name sign.” As McKee and McKee (2000: 8) found, “Name signs develop as alternatives to spoken names (given and family) most obviously because Deaf people perceive and communicate in a visual rather than an aural modality. People and their identities are experienced and coded visually, thus creating a linguistic need for a signed naming system.” On a personal note, I began contact with the deaf community as a teacher and was given a name sign by the students at the school, which referred to a position held in the school library. Later as a welfare worker and an interpreter, I earned another name sign, which is now commonly used throughout the deaf community, even when people do not know my English name. However, former deaf students who do not know me as an interpreter will still refer to me at various reunions by the original name sign, giving me membership of an even smaller group. See Section 7.9.1 for a discussion of name signs in the Victorian deaf community as seen in the data from this study.

3.1.4.1 Auslan in Deaf Culture

The rules for membership in the deaf community in Australia include a strong identification with the community and sign language, a common deaf experience, loyalty to the community, sharing information almost as a duty, and a boundary between insiders and outsiders (Johnston, 1989; Mindess, 1999). As more and more deaf people have accessed the services now available, including the wide variety of telecommunication services, and educational services such as interpreting and notetaking, they have become more exposed to the wider English-speaking community. This wider community is far more individualistic, with its emphasis on independence, and personal initiative in the learning environment and the workplace (Branson & Miller, 1991; Hall, 1976; Kannapell, 1993; Mindess, 1999). Contact with the wider community in this way will probably influence the nature of the culture of the deaf community and the way Auslan is used to express that culture in the future.

Employment in the wider community is another area which impacts on a deaf individual and their ability to live in two communities with different cultures. Competition for promotion in the workplace has in the past left many deaf people underemployed because, with no access to training in their own language and, in some cases, no access to secondary or tertiary education, they were not ready to apply for more challenging jobs. The last nation-wide survey of deaf school leavers was in 1973 and despite the fact that this information is 35 years old, it is worth noting the changes that have occurred. The Australian Federation of Adult Deaf Societies conducted this last nation-wide survey of deaf school leavers from 1960.
The possible total of those who had left a school or class for the deaf in that year was ascertained to be 76 people across Australia, but only 46 were actually interviewed (AFADS, 1973: 3). Of these, none held employment higher than a skilled tradesman, and the majority was in semi-skilled or unskilled labouring work. Some of the female respondents were working as clerical workers, or they listed their occupation as ‘housewife’. The change for the better is observable however, as many more deaf people are now managers and supervisors in various workplaces, executives at corporate level, and teachers and coordinators in educational settings. This is mainly due to better access to education in their preferred first language with other supports such as interpreting and note-taking during their education. Others have returned to tertiary education and gained teaching qualifications in order to teach Auslan as a LOTE (Language Other Than English) in educational institutions and community and neighbourhood houses.

Context is an important issue when considering conversations between two deaf people in the community. Hall (1976) asserted that along with the words of a message (the code), context plays a very important part in understanding the meaning. He described the difference in the amount of context in a message thus: “A high-context (HC) communication or message is one in which most of the information is either in the physical context or internalized in the person, while very little is in the coded, explicit message. A low-context (LC) communication is just the opposite: i.e., the mass of the information is vested in the explicit code.” (Hall, 1976: 79). Hall contended that no culture “exists exclusively at one end of the scale”. Metzger & Bahan (2001: 116) state that “Context is relevant to the analysis of discourse structure because it is through the use of particular expressions and utterances within specific contexts that people can convey and comprehend what is being communicated.” According to Mindess (1999: 47) “American deaf culture would be placed on the high-context end of the continuum, while mainstream American culture would be found on the low-context side.” Whether or not the Australian deaf community follows this position on the continuum is yet to be researched, but it is true that deaf people share many common experiences from a lifetime of struggling to gain equal access, and they share a common language which is highly dependent on context. To enter a conversation (or ‘overhear’ one) amongst deaf signers one must have shared their experiences to be able to grasp what they are talking about. On the other hand, a spoken English conversation can be overheard by someone not involved in the experience, and be understood by that person, because English transmits more information regarding the situation or context in the spoken message.

In summary, it can be seen that there are many differences between the culture of the deaf community and the wider hearing community, and the above examples are only a few of the most obvious. More significant is the impact these shared cultural and linguistic experiences of Deaf people have on the communication within the deaf community. The data from this study will be analysed in light of these issues.
3.2 Australian Sign Language

3.2.1 The Structure of Auslan

Auslan, in common with other sign languages, uses signs rather than spoken words, and the signs can be modified grammatically to change their meaning. Sign order is important for establishing the topic of the sentence, but the same action can be described with several different orders of signs as long as the signs are modified the same way in each. One way of describing Auslan is by five parameters which combine to modify the signs of Auslan, these being handshape, location, movement, orientation, and non-manual features (which in earlier days was often referred to simply as expression). These parameters are comparable to the features of articulation which can be combined to form the phonemes of speech in English. In spoken English reference is made to voicing, manner and place of articulation.

(Johnston, 1989; Schembri, 1996). The term ‘phonology’ is used for the study of the smallest features of meaning that combine to form larger components of meaning in human language. This same term is now used in sign linguistics to equate with spoken language linguistics, even though the Greek root word ‘phon’ may seem at odds with the study of visual sign languages. “The study of sign phonology began with the work of William Stokoe, the American founder of sign linguistics” (Sutton-Spence & Woll, 1999: 154), and this practice continues today to use the terms from spoken language linguistics.

In Auslan, Johnston (1989: 485) stated that “there are 31 major handshapes (with 32 variants making a total of 61 handshapes in all)”. Signs can be one-handed, two handed, or double-handed where each hand has the identical shape. The other four parameters are:

- Location refers to the point in space or the point of contact with the other hand where the sign is made. Neutral space is the space directly in front of the signers chest, where many of the signs are produced.
- Movement can refer to the movement through space of the hands, or simply the movement of the hands as they change shape or orientation. According to Schembri (1996: 17) “many signs use simple movements, while others may be realized as complex combinations of different types of movement.”
- Orientation refers to the direction of the palm and fingers, and the description makes reference to the direction in which the main part of the hand is pointing, not the fingertips. Some signs may share the identical location, handshape and movement, but the difference in meaning is apparent from the orientation.
- Non-manual features are the fifth parameter of the grammar of Auslan, including facial expression, and head nods and shakes, shoulder movements, and mouth movements. Facial expression has been broken down by Johnston (1989: 490) to include eyebrows, eyes, mouth and cheeks. Wilbur (1980: 24) described some of the research into the use of facial expression in the grammar of American Sign Language. This included research into the use of raised eyebrows, head tilts and
nods, and the use of cheek muscles and upper lip muscles. Sutton-Spence and Woll (1999: 88) stated that “the important parts of facial expression… are the actions of the cheeks, brows, eyelids and eye gaze” in British Sign Language. In addition “BSL also uses facial expression (and especially oral components) to give information about manner”. This was in reference to the adverbial information on the face when verb signs are inflected. (Sutton-Spence and Woll, 1999:125). Sign linguists generally refer to these features as ‘non-manual’ as compared to the more frequent manual signs (e.g. RUN, WALK, TALK). This has also been the practice in the description of Auslan. (Johnston & Schembri, 2007; Johnston, 1998; Schembri 1996). Schembri was the first to apply the term ‘multi-channel signs’ (Brennan, 1984) to Auslan signs that combined the manual form of the sign with any of these non-manual features. He stated that “In sign formation, the use of facial expression, head movements and mouth patterns together form the most important non-manual features.” He provided a table (see below) showing an “overview of facial expression types (as well as head and body movements) that are available to the Auslan signer, subdivided into movements and actions of the head, eyebrows, eyes, nose, mouth, and cheeks” (Schembri, 1996: 32).

- Other components of signs described by some linguists include the stress and duration of signs, and the rate of repetition of signs. (Johnston, 1989; Schembri, 1996). “Sign languages use visual rhythms, rhymes, and repetition to create cohesive discourse and involve addressees” (Metzger and Bahan, 2001: 138).

Further research has developed and refined this description of Auslan and signs since 1989 (Johnston & Schembri, 2007) but the above description will suffice for the purposes of this study. I will include (where relevant) as many as possible of these components of Auslan signs in the transcription of the data for this investigation. See below for a Table of the non-manual features in Auslan.
### Table 1 Non-manual features in Auslan (From Schembri, 1996: 32)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-manual movements &amp; expressions</th>
<th>Non-manual movements &amp; expressions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Head</strong></td>
<td><strong>Mouth</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaking the head</td>
<td>Opening the mouth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodding the head</td>
<td>Closing the mouth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turning the head to the left</td>
<td>Poking out the tongue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turning the head to the right</td>
<td>Protruding the lips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tilting the head to the left</td>
<td>Rounding the lips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tilting the head to the right</td>
<td>Vibrating the lips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tilting the head backwards</td>
<td>Pressing the lips together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tilting the head forwards</td>
<td>Drawing the lips back</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moving the head backwards</td>
<td>Stretching the lips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moving the head forwards</td>
<td>Turning up the corners of the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moving the head from side to side</td>
<td>lips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Turning down the corners of the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>lips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pushing the tongue into the cheek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pushing the tongue down behind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the lower lip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Biting the lips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sucking in air</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blowing out air</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eyebrows</strong></td>
<td><strong>Cheeks</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raising the eyebrows</td>
<td>Puffing out the cheeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowering the eyebrows</td>
<td>Sucking in the cheeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eyes</strong></td>
<td><strong>Shoulders</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blinking</td>
<td>Hunching the shoulders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closing the eyes</td>
<td>Moving the shoulders forward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opening the eyes</td>
<td>Moving the shoulders backwards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opening the eyes wide</td>
<td>Turning the shoulders to the left</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrowing the eyes</td>
<td>Turning the shoulders to the right</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directing the gaze forwards and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>down</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directing the gaze forward and up</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directing the gaze to the left</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directing the gaze to the right</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nose</strong></td>
<td><strong>Body</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrinkling the nose</td>
<td>Moving the body forward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moving the body backwards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Turning the body</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to the grammatical modification of signs, Auslan grammar also involves some ordering of constituents (sign/word order), and the use of special lexis (grammatical signs/words), amongst other factors. One example of the difference in ordering of constituents is the placement of nouns and adjectives. In English the adjectives usually come before the noun, but in Auslan the adjectives can come after the noun or the noun may simply be modified to display largeness, or smallness, or even a plural form (Johnston & Schembri, 2007: 137). Sutton-Spence & Woll (1999: 50) commented that “it is important to understand that BSL does have its own rules for the order of signs and that these rules are different from English. This is important for people who want to use simultaneous signing and speaking. It is impossible to speak English and sign BSL at the same time.” The situation is very similar in Auslan, as it is not possible to produce sentences simultaneously in English and Auslan unless the sentences are of very short length. If the simultaneous production of speech and sign continues, either the signing begins to become very English-like, or the spoken English becomes more like Auslan in structure and order. In other words the grammar of one language makes way for the other.

#### 3.2.2 Early Development

With the arrival of the first convict ships to Australia in the late 18th century came the first deaf people, and they may have brought with them the sign language of their original countries,
mainly England, Ireland and Scotland. Early immigrants from these same nations also brought their sign languages (Carty, 2004). Sign languages differ from nation to nation, and develop naturally, in the same way as spoken languages develop when people come together to form social communities. Sign languages differ from one part of the world to the next, just as spoken languages do. Thus Australian Sign Language (Auslan) originated from British Sign Language (BSL) and Irish Sign Language. Some of the new arrivals to Australia were either deaf themselves and brought the sign language as their main form of communication, or they produced children after arrival on Australian shores, and these deaf children learned their sign language from deaf adults in the settlement. Very little information is available about these early settlers.

In the late nineteenth century the system of education for the deaf in Britain and Ireland was mainly residential schools, with many of the teaching and non-teaching staff being deaf themselves. The sign language used by all these adults was accessed by the children for communication, as well as reading and writing in English. At this time two schools for the deaf were established in Australia by deaf men from Britain. The school in Sydney was established in 1860 by Mr Thomas Pattinson, who was educated at the Edinburgh Deaf and Dumb Institution (sic). The school in Melbourne was founded in 1860 a few weeks after the Sydney school, by Mr Frederick J. Rose, himself educated at the Old Kent Road School for deaf children in London. As Johnston (1989: 474) stated “It is indicative of the educational levels being achieved at the time that both schools were founded by deaf people”. Both these schools were mainly residential, although some pupils did attend daily if they lived close enough to do this. Parallel with this development was the education system closely linked to the Catholic Church in England and particularly in Ireland. Irish Catholics brought the Irish one-handed alphabet and Irish signs to Australia, and it seems that these owed a lot to contact with French sign language and the French one-handed alphabet.

It can be seen that from the very beginning of settlement and the start of an education system for the deaf in Australia, there have always been two signing systems: “a ‘Catholic’ system (a one-handed alphabet with Irish/French-based signs) and a ‘Protestant’ system (a two-handed alphabet with BSL-based signs)” (Johnston, 1989: 474). This situation has continued in Australia in every state until today, with most people using the two-handed system within the larger deaf community, and those educated in the Catholic system knowing both systems of sign language and using the one-handed system only amongst themselves and families as well as for church services. Only those deaf people who attended the Catholic schools for the deaf, and their children continue to be bilingual in the two sign languages in this way. None of the informants in this study were bilingual with these two systems.

Writers tell us that graduates of these first schools for the deaf had a strong command of written English and some went on to become teachers themselves in the same schools, and
leaders in the deaf education community (Flynn, 1999; O’Reilly, 2007; Thompson; 1990). It must be noted here that Auslan, being an ‘oral’ language, does not have a written form. Therefore to become literate, deaf students need English. The success of these first schools for the deaf could be measured by the level of the students’ command of written English. Unfortunately, whether this level of educational success was reported correctly or not is irrelevant now as in any case it did not continue. A survey of 1960 school leavers conducted by the Australian Federation of Adult Deaf Societies in 1973, included a question in the interview about the amount of reading done by the participants. Daily newspapers were the only literature read on a daily basis, and the only stated additional reading by deaf people in any state of Australia was popular magazines, or instructional material, and the frequency varied from ‘weekly’ to ‘occasionally’ to ‘nil’. By 1960 it was apparent that school leavers no longer had a strong command of written English, and this has continued until recent times. The teaching of spoken English (‘speech’) had become the dominant focus of education, to the detriment of the teaching of the English or Auslan language, but the language of the community remained Auslan which continued to develop from the first systems brought to Australia into a fine, rich language, allowing full, smooth and easy communication for all who used it.

3.2.3 Development across state boundaries
Despite the fact that Australia is so large a country and the population so widely spread, Australian Sign Language has developed in all states in a similar fashion. Other than minor local variation which does not hinder understanding from one state to another, differences claimed by some authors exist between the ‘north’ (New South Wales and Queensland) and the ‘south’ (Victoria, South Australia, Tasmania and Western Australia) (Johnston, 1989: 474). Johnston and Schembri found in their research that there are also differences between states, and not just between north and south. “There are also a number of state-based lexical differences that cut across this major dialect division, such as AFTERNOON.” (Johnston & Schembri, 2007: 46). Johnston & Schembri also assert that the differences are mainly in the signs for numbers, colours and some other signs surrounding signs and questions. The question can be asked as to how this has happened when so many groups of immigrants and early settlers arrived in so many different places on the coastline of Australia. Johnston (1989: 474) gave four reasons preventing wider variation in the sign language between different states. Firstly, the Australian population (both deaf and hearing) was concentrated mostly in the larger cities, predominantly in Melbourne and Sydney which were the settings of the first established schools for the deaf. Secondly, teachers for schools in other cities either trained or came from the two schools for the deaf, in Sydney and Melbourne. Thirdly, other teachers and workers with the deaf continued to come from Britain and Ireland bringing with them the same influences from the original sign languages; and fourthly, the deaf communities were soon to benefit from the same developments that benefited the hearing communities, that is cheap transport from one state to another, allowing the language to be transported along with
its speakers. This situation parallels the situation with spoken English in Australia, where there is remarkably small variation across Australia. Mitchell and Delbridge (1965: 13) contended from the results of their study that “Australia is, generally speaking, linguistically unified”. Horvath (2004: 626) also stated that recent studies of Australian English found that although regional and social variation exists, the differences are quantitative rather than qualitative.

The few differences that did develop between the north (NSW and Qld) and the south (Vic, SA, WA and Tas) function as forms of identification by members of the deaf community as to where the speaker grew up, and which school they attended.

3.2.4 A Change of Philosophy

The history of education of deaf children throughout the world has been the history of a debate between those educators who advocated the use of sign language in the classroom and those who have prohibited its use. The 1880 International Congress of Educators of the Deaf in Milan, Italy passed a resolution banning sign language in schools for the deaf, and saw the start of a world-wide movement against the use of sign language in the education of deaf children. (See also section 2.4.1). This event is still viewed retrospectively with dismay by many linguists, members of deaf communities, and current educators of deaf people, as it had a devastating effect on deaf people all over the world (Johnston & Schembri, 2007; Gregory et al, 1998; Johnston, 1989, 1998; Lucas, 1989; Muzsnai, 1999; Ozolins & Bridge, 1999).

Deaf teachers and deaf support workers lost opportunities for employment in the education field, and it would be one hundred years before these deaf community members would again achieve any prestige in the wider community. Deaf children were required to learn to speak the dominant spoken language of the hearing community, and in the years devoted to the struggle of producing recognizable and acceptable speech, many would give up or simply resign themselves to never learning a complete language, spoken or signed. In a case study conducted in the Budapest School for the Deaf in 1997/98, Muzsnai (1999: 287) found that “by the time deaf pupils in the case study school had reached the upper grades of the primary level they had become resigned to not finding any meaning behind their learning activities”. He stated that “regardless of the methodology chosen by educators, the education of deaf people still remained deficient, and was not able to meet its goals. Deaf children remained grossly undereducated compared to their hearing peers”. (Muzsnai, 1999: 280).

The education system began to promote a class difference within the deaf community, of those who could use the dominant spoken language of the hearing community (oral and prestigious) and those who failed this system and had to accept sign language as their only alternative (manual and second-rate). Two separate groups of educators became known as
were “those who consider Sign languages normal or most appropriate for deaf people” and
oralists tried “to teach deaf people to speak orally, in a subtractive way, to the exclusion of
Sign language and often forbidding the use of Sign languages”. This exclusion caused
negative attitudes towards sign language even amongst the deaf community members
themselves, as well as among the hearing communities. Despite these negative attitudes, and
the generally low educational standards achieved by deaf students ever since 1880, sign
languages all over the world, and Auslan in particular, have managed to survive in the deaf
community, being used in playgrounds, social settings and in deaf families, where they are
passed down from generation to generation.

Johnston (1989: 475) claimed that another even more traumatic event than the 1880 Milan
Conference, impacting on Auslan development, was the closure of residential schools for the
deaf in many states of Australia. Others, such as parents of deaf children, viewed this event
as providing opportunities for more normal family lives for deaf students who had traditionally
been sent to a residential school as young as two or three years of age. Special schools for
the deaf remained a strong option for the education of deaf children, with students attending
on a daily basis. These schools tended to fall into the same categories as mentioned above,
that is a ‘manual’ signing school, an ‘oral’ school where signing was not accepted (or even
banned) and where oral skills were encouraged and focused on, and a ‘Catholic’ school in
which teachers or religious workers taught the students generally also focusing on ‘oral’ skills.

3.2.5 Signed English
The most profound impact to date in Australia on the use of sign language has been the
to this as the final blow, as educators of the deaf attempted to give recognition to visual
communication, but at the same time restrict its use to follow English structure and grammar.
The development of Signed English followed an ideology known as Total Communication
(Denton, 1976), where signs were allowed as long as they followed English word order and
highlighted visually features of English not seen in the sign language used by deaf people at
that time. Woodward (1973b: 58) commented, “To me, total communication does not just
mean signing and speaking at the same time. Total communication means allowing deaf
people a choice: speech when appropriate, and signing *Ameslan* [ASL] when appropriate”. Many educators of the deaf during the 1960s and early 1970s however, were in agreement
that the biggest problem facing the children was the acquisition of “language”. In blissful
ignorance of the range of grammatical features of Auslan (including space and facial
expression), and in the struggle to convince hearing parents to use visual communication with
their children at home, an artificial system of encoding English on the hands was developed.
In Australia the Australian Sign Language Development Project committee developed a
dictionary of signs for use with English lip patterns in an attempt to standardise the signs used
in education of deaf children across Australia. One aim as expressed in the introduction to the 
Dictionary of Australasian Signs was “to record enough signs to enable Signed English to be 
generated, thus allowing for the reproduction of the word order and inflections of English” 
(Jeanes & Reynolds, 1982).

By the 1990s concerns were raised over the success of this method of communication in the 
classroom with deaf children. “Despite the widespread adoption of the total communication 
philosophy and its most frequent application in simultaneous communication, concerns have 
emerged about the relative effectiveness of its practices from both receptive and productive 
perspectives” (Hyde, Power & Leigh, 1998: 117). Critics had begun to attack it on several 
fronts, including the inability of teachers to maintain a high level of correspondence between 
the spoken and signed outputs.

Originally intended to assist teachers and parents of children up to eight years of age in the 
homes and in educational settings, Signed English continued in use following the first children 
through their secondary and tertiary education, until today when the third generation of deaf 
students is being influenced by teachers who are still using some forms of Signed English in 
the classrooms around Australia. For many of these deaf people, Signed English was the only 
form of manual/visual communication they had exposure to, until they left school and joined 
the deaf community. Even trying to join the deaf community social groups became a difficult 
task, as their form of Signed English, with some Auslan signs and many contrived signs and 
borrowed ASL (American Sign Language) initialized signs used in restricted ways, meant that 
their communication was unfamiliar to native signers. Branson and Miller (1991: 157) stated 
that “For the Deaf these signs are devoid of the phonemic level of meaning that is 
fundamental to the hearing person’s reading of the written word or perception of the signed 
English word. They are shapes devoid of expression”.

Signed English was thought to allow teachers and parents to sign and speak English at the 
same time. Although seeming to give legitimacy to the role of signing in the classroom, it was 
the role of the dominant spoken English language that was actually paramount in the minds of 
hearing educators. As Skutnabb-Kangas (2000: 230) pointed out, “Sign language often has 
the same type of ideological status for them as the mother tongue with supporters of 
transitional bilingual education, i.e., it is used as a tool to make the transition to the dominant 
language easier and its full learning and use is not seen as a linguistic human right”. 
Speaking and signing in English was supposed to assist children with residual hearing as well 
as demonstrate ‘good and proper’ English usage visually. In order to do this, in the words of 
Erting (1994: 22) “invented signs to represent English grammatical and derivational affixes 
and function words” were added to Auslan signs, ignoring the fact that Auslan (as with many 
other sign languages) made use of non-manual grammatical signals such as location, 
direction, movement and sign modulation, to name just a few. This use of artificially contrived
signs and grammatical markers meant that deaf children were exposed to a strange mixture of signing and speaking, with successful spoken or written English competence still out of reach for most, and knowledge of and fluency in the natural community language delayed until their post-education years. Zeshan asserted that “In countries where such systems do exist, however, signed-language users are often bilingual in the two modes of signing, and this can be an important avenue for indirect language contact between the signed and the spoken language, mediated through the use of the signed code that represents spoken-language structure.” (Zeshan, 2004: 11).

3.2.6 Cued Speech

A further form of communication, ‘Cued Speech’ is a supplement to some of the ‘oral’ programs in Australia. The Roman Catholic system of education advocated the use of oral-aural skills in education, but acknowledged that for many profoundly deaf students, this form of communication would never be successful. After a visit by Dr Orin Cornett to St Mary’s School for Deaf Children in 1970, they began using the system he devised which was ‘Cued Speech’ (Cornett, 1967). This system of cues, consisting of hand signals that alerted deaf students to the differences between ‘p’, ‘b’, and ’m’ on the lips, and ‘d’, ‘l’, and ‘n’ on the palate, and the voiced ‘g’ and unvoiced ‘c’, to list just a few examples. This system of cueing was invented by Dr Many of the past students of this system have informed me of their secret delight in turning these cues for oral speech and articulation into signs which they used in private with their peers in the playground or dormitory. These ‘signs’ became known amongst each class of students and are still used amongst them today in social situations.

3.3 Summary

This chapter has described some of the most pertinent features of the Australian and Victorian Deaf community considered relevant to this research study, and some cultural and contextual perspectives that impact on the conversations of the deaf participants in this study. The way in which the culture and language of the Australian (and Victorian) deaf community is perceived by the wider community was discussed and how that perception correlates with the attitudes towards sign language communities as described by researchers working in other countries of the world. Reference to these issues will be made in Chapters 6, 7 and 8 in the data analysis and discussion.
Chapter 4 - Auslan in its Social Context.

This chapter examines the place of Auslan in the deaf community and in the wider hearing community in Australia. In particular the place of Auslan in Auslan/English bilingualism is discussed. Some of the differences in sign/spoken language bilingualism in recent literature are highlighted. I will also discuss the patterns of variation in Auslan including age, gender, ethnic and regional across Australia, highlighting the relevance of this to the results of the data collected for this study. Attitudes to Auslan are examined as they pertain to the comments of the participants in this study, and a brief history of language planning issues surrounding Auslan and English is also included.

4.1 Bilingualism in the Deaf Community

Bilingualism in the deaf community can take two forms. Firstly there is bilingualism in two or more sign languages. As previously stated Ann (2001: 43) asserted that studies on this kind of bilingualism have focused on attempting to “understand the notion of foreign accent as it relates to learners of second sign languages”. Secondly, where most research has been concentrated, there is bilingualism with a sign language and a spoken language. In chapter 3 I have already elaborated on the reasons for the variation in sign language used in the Australian deaf community, and in particular the Victorian deaf community. Historic migration patterns, and the education policies of the past two hundred years have meant a multiplicity of styles and varieties of signing all of which are recognized by speakers as Auslan. Ann (2001: 43) lists the kinds of bilingualism in any sign and spoken language deaf community as:

- native signers of xSL who are fluent in a spoken language (reading, writing and speaking);
- native signers of xSL who read and write a spoken language fluently but do not speak it;
- native signers of xSL who are fluent to varying degrees in reading and writing a spoken language;
- deaf signers of xSL as a second language who read and write a spoken language but do not speak it;
- second language xSL signers who first learned a signed version of a spoken language;
- native signers of xSL who learned another sign language as a second language;
- first/second language xSL signers who speak a spoken language.

Ann notes that there are many people with an acquired hearing loss at a later age who may use forms of signed codes for a spoken language, and some deaf people who use Cued Speech, a system of cueing the articulation position with handshapes near the mouth. (See chapter 3 for further discussion). Neither of these are natural sign languages, and these people cannot be considered bilinguals on the basis of these systems.

The current research includes subjects who fit the second, third, fourth and fifth kinds of bilingualism categories. The first and last categories would largely include hearing people, who are not part of this study, and the category of native signers who have learned another sign language as a second language is also not included in this study.
4.1.1. What is Bilingualism?

Bilingualism has been described in a variety of ways. The categorisation of definitions of bilingualism into ‘normative’, ‘descriptive’ and ‘methodological’ originated with Van Overbeke (1972). Normative definitions specify a need for a particular level, such as “native-like control of two languages” (Bloomfield 1933: 56). They require bilinguals to be ‘double monolinguals’ which means they should not ‘mix their systems’ and should only switch between the languages deliberately (Clyne, 1997b: 301). As stated in Chapter 2, Haugen (1953) used a methodological definition which is a minimal one indicating a starting point such as speakers being able to produce utterances in each language. Still other linguists have used descriptive definitions which sub-categorise, e.g. into ‘passive’/‘receptive’ bilingualism, or ‘active’/productive’ bilingualism. (Hockett, 1958: 16).

Lotherington (2000: 43) used descriptive terms when she asked “Do our children qualify as bilinguals with a few years of a LOTE under their belts? Does bilingualism mean that a person can read in two languages too? Does a bilingual have to be able to function in two different cultures as well?” And further, (2000: 45), she posed the question “what do you say when you can function very basically in a language, albeit with so-so grammar and even more so-so pronunciation?” Lotherington (2000: 48) further referred to a methodological definition based on Haugen’s position from 1953, and stated that “Bilingualism is about functionality. If you can communicate effectively and in a range of situations in a second language, you can consider yourself to be bilingual. There are degrees. Clearly some people are ‘more’ bilingual than others. True balanced bilinguals (who have equal command over two languages) are rare”. Baker (1993: 6; 2006: 7)) summarised the four skills of bilingualism in two dimensions, in a table as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Oracy</th>
<th>Literacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Receptive skills</td>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Productive skills</td>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>Writing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table shows bilinguals with a variety of skills in one or the other language, “in two dimensions: receptive and productive skills; oracy and literacy.” As Baker points out, these four language abilities do not exist in black and white terms. “The multi-colored landscape of bilingual abilities suggests that each language ability can be more or less developed”. (Baker, 2006: 7). This table correlates with the language abilities of many deaf people as their receptive and productive abilities in signed Auslan and written/spoken English vary greatly.

4.1.1.1 Sign language bilingualism

Sign language bilingualism research has traditionally been modelled on existing spoken language frameworks and assumed commonality of the issues. However, there are three unique differences between bilingualism in spoken languages and bilingualism in a sign language and a spoken language, which have a significant impact on the sociolinguistic and
psycholinguistic perspectives, as well as language and identity theories. As explained in section 1.2, these differences include:

1. Bilinguals of spoken languages usually share the minority language with their parents and do not speak this language with the wider community. However, any sign language in a deaf community (including Auslan) is a minority language, which the speakers share with other people in the deaf community, but do not necessarily share with their own parents who use the spoken language of the wider community.

2. Bilinguals of spoken languages share a group identity with their parents, siblings and ancestors, which usually includes the language of the home. Significantly, in the deaf community the sign language is the community language but not the language of home with parents. The group identity is shared with other deaf people using the sign language rather than with the family at home.

3. Bilinguals of spoken languages often tend to shift to the language of the wider community over time, reserving the minority language for communication at home. In the deaf community there is no shift over time to the majority spoken language (due to the physiological nature of deafness).

Grosjean (1992) proposed five features of bilingualism that are specific to deaf people. Firstly, that there has been little or no recognition of deaf people’s bilingual status. Secondly that deaf bilinguals will, because of their hearing loss, remain bilingual throughout their lives from generation to generation. In addition he included the following features; (3) certain language skills in the majority language may never be fully acquired by deaf bilinguals; (4) although movement takes place along the language mode continuum (see below) deaf bilinguals rarely find themselves at the monolingual sign language end; and (5) “the patterns of language knowledge and use appear to be different and probably more complex, than in spoken bilingualism. When a sign language bilingual uses sign language with one interlocutor, a form of signed spoken language with another, a mixture of the two with a third, forms of simultaneous communication (sign and speech) with a fourth, etc, [it involves] diverse behaviours”. (Grosjean, 1992: 4). This last difference is evidenced in Melbourne where members of the deaf community use various forms of sign language, or signed forms of English, or simultaneous communication in their daily conversations. According to Grosjean (1992: 4) most deaf people, “unless they are communicating with a monolingual member of the majority language (via the written modality, for example), they will most often be with other bilinguals and will thus be in a bilingual mode”.

Grosjean (1995, 1998) proposed that bilinguals function along a continuum which at various times induces a particular language mode. “At one end of the continuum, bilinguals are in a totally monolingual language mode”, either language A or language B, and “At the other end of the continuum, they are with bilinguals who share their two languages”. The decision as to which mode a bilingual individual was functioning in was motivated by the sociolinguistic conditions of the encounter. In 2001, Grosjean repositioned this continuum to describe bilinguals as being in a monolingual mode at either end of the continuum and as being in a
bilingual mode in the middle of the continuum. Thus an Auslan/English bilingual would find him/herself on a continuum which looked like this:

MONOLINGUAL  AUSLAN<------------>AUSLAN/ENGLISH<---------->ENGLISH MONOLINGUAL

Bilinguals may find themselves in a monolingual mode (where the other language may be almost ‘deactivated’) when communicating with other monolinguals of either language, and in a bilingual mode when communicating with other bilinguals, where both languages may be activated to different levels or to the same level.

In addition to Grosjean, other writers (Branson & Miller, 1991; Muzsnai, 1999; Skutnabb-Kangas, 2000) also highlighted the fact that too often the sign language of a deaf community was not considered part of a bilingual’s repertoire, and ignored by linguists and educators alike. Recognition is not given to a deaf individual’s bilingual status, and the idea that a deaf person with knowledge of a spoken language other than English, in addition to his/her sign language and English, might be multilingual had never been considered until quite recently. Skutnabb-Kangas (2000: 225) referred to this as ‘invisibilisation’ and gave as an example: “only mentioning minority children’s or adults’ competence in a dominant language, and not in their mother tongue, as in much of North American research; to the extent that they can be labelled as ‘having no language’ if they are not yet speakers of English”. This has been the traditional view of deaf children and adults in Australia, and even as Auslan was gaining recognition as a language, educators continued to report on the ‘language competence’ of deaf children and adults only in English (spoken and written), as if English was the only language to be considered. In Tompkins’ research, her respondents stated that English had always had a place in their homes and “a status as a bona fide language, but the same was not always true of their native ASL. Participants expressed the intuitive recognition of their “sign language” as an important link to their families and deaf communities, but they reported that ASL was not perceived to be a formal language by their parents, their teachers, or themselves, at least not in their early years.” (Tompkins, 2000: 156).

Even when communicating with other deaf people, Auslan signers are faced with the multiple forms of sign language, and constantly move from one to the other throughout the interactions. The many forms of sign language or signed spoken language reveal a great deal of information about their multiple identities as they switch between their English experience and their Auslan experience. The way deaf people express their bilingualism is an example of the assertion by Dewaele, Housen & Li Wei (2003: 5) that “Bilingualism is more than the instrumental advantage of being able to communicate in several languages; its main importance is social and psychological.” The following sections discuss some of the issues of this shared experience of deaf adults and some of the issues raised in sign/spoken language bilingualism. Chapter 7 will analyse the results of the data from this study from a sociolinguistic perspective and discuss some of the language and identity issues that arise from Auslan/English bilingualism.
4.1.2 Diglossia in the Deaf community

Diglossia in bilingual communities was discussed in section 2.2.4, and included reference to Ferguson (1959) and Fishman (1971). Early research by Stokoe (1969) in the USA led him to suggest that Ferguson’s concept of diglossia was applicable to the deaf community in the USA, with signed English as the H form, and ASL (American Sign Language) as the L form. Woodward and Markowicz (1975) asserted that Fishman’s description of bilingual diglossia (dealing with unrelated languages) more closely explained the situation in the deaf community. However, more recent studies by Cokely (1980) and Lee (1982) disputed this finding. Lee asserted that “In an unchanged setting, switching between languages directly contradicts Ferguson’s (1959) guidelines for the function of language varieties in diglossic situations” (Lee, 1983: 195). According to Davis (1989: 86), more recent research “suggests that alternative analyses are needed to describe the ASL-English contact situation. In fact, the situation cannot be adequately described by the traditional model of a bilingual-diglossic continuum”.

Deuchar (1978) conducted research in the Reading deaf club in the 1970s and found evidence of a diglossic situation between the variety of BSL used in church services (by a hearing missioner) and the variety of BSL used in the social setting of the deaf club activities. However, it can be argued that the hearing missioner’s use of language may not be the same as a deaf person would have used in church, and the assumption that the way BSL was used in a more English-like form justified categorising it as the ‘H’ variety was not true. In fact these two forms of the language may have been just register variation depending on the settings. The amount of switching and mixing among various forms of sign language, from the sign language varieties to more English-like varieties, suggests that no one register of the language is used constantly in one setting, and no individual signer uses the same variety the same way in the same setting. No research is available in Australia about the use of Auslan and English in diglossic H or L functions, although anecdotal observation reveals that deaf people use Auslan and English in a variety of ways in a multiplicity of settings.

It seems that using the term diglossia as a way to describe the situation in sign language communities is now abandoned (Ann, 2001). Despite this, Ann made the crucial point that deaf people are still restricted in their ability to use sign language in all situations, and this is important when considering the status of Auslan in the wider community as well as in the deaf community.

“However, the idea that diglossias exist in sign language situations captured the idea that societies by and large have hearing values. This means that sign languages are still not as prestigious as spoken languages in general, and that deaf individuals are still prevented from doing many things in their sign languages in their societies. Rather, they must learn a spoken (or a written) language or hire an interpreter to accomplish certain things”. (Ann, 2001:45). Perhaps from this perspective alone, it is tempting to view a deaf population as a diglossic community, where the spoken language is the formal or higher variety and the sign language is perceived to be the less formal or low variety.
Considering the way deaf people must learn literacy through a written language which is closely related to a spoken language, leads to a unique view of bilingualism and language use in a deaf community. This highlights the difficulties of learning literacy without a phonetic knowledge of the spoken language and without the visual characteristics of a written system such as is available to Chinese speakers. Bilingualism in a deaf community includes all the varieties of the sign language in the community, as well as the written language of the majority community, and studies of sign/spoken bilingualism must take into account the issue of literacy in the written language.

4.1.3 Language shift in the Deaf community

Although there can be no shift to the majority spoken language over time (due to the physiological nature of deafness), the influence of the spoken language (English) can be seen in the features of the sign language (Auslan) which change over time, and which are evident in code-switching data. Just as access to higher education and provision of appropriate support of interpreters and notetakers has increased over the last two decades, so have the language contact situations between Auslan and English. Subtitled television, videos and movies have had a profound impact on the deaf bilingual's access to a visual form of 'spoken' English. All free-to-air television channels currently caption all programs between 6.30pm and 10.30pm.

The telephone typewriter (TTY) was introduced to Australia in the 1970s, and has been available to deaf and hard of hearing people, in the same way as other telecommunications equipment is available from the major telecommunication providers, since the 1990s. The communication protocols of written English, such as greetings, farewells etc now proliferate in the signed communication of deaf people. In addition, the use of SMS (short message service) on mobiles has had a significant impact on the access of deaf bilinguals to instantaneous communication. The shortcuts, and styles of SMS mirror some of the communication styles of email interactions, with their own forms of greetings, farewells, and indicators of emotions (for example, SMILE! or Tee Hee!). The forms of politeness in these text communications have also had an impact on face-to-face Auslan communication. As these forms of English influence the daily interactions in Auslan, deaf people find themselves quite comfortable using more English-like communication rather than their native Auslan, sometimes even with other deaf native speakers. More research (that is beyond the scope of this study) is needed on the impact of this on the long-term survival of native sign languages, including Auslan.

As stated in section 3.1.1 a further issue that will probably impact on the rate of language shift in the deaf community in Australia is the current size of the Australian deaf community. From census figures in 1998, 2001 and 2006, statistics of enrollments of deaf children in early intervention programs and preschools, as well as other research, it seems that the size of the
signing deaf community in Australia may be changing (Johnston, 2006). There may be multiple factors contributing to this trend, but if this change in the demographics of deafness is proven to be true over the next five to ten years, it will inevitably lead to a smaller population across Australia using Auslan. The effects of this will lead to changes in the communication, social and cultural functions of Auslan, and possibly to an endangered language scenario. The effect of this is not so much a shift to the majority spoken language of the wider community, but rather the slow disappearance of a community, and thus the decline of a need for the language.

4.1.4 Language Contact in the Deaf community

The study of language contact in deaf communities is only recent, and has developed slowly. Ann (2001:34) asserted that the explanation for this fact involves an understanding of political considerations. “Sign languages are often oppressed by speakers of spoken languages, deaf signers may be prevented from establishing a community, and sign languages may not be encouraged or even permitted in schools for the deaf”. The recent research into language contact has revealed many similar phenomena occur in deaf communities as occur in bilingual (or multilingual) spoken language communities. Schembri (1996: 105) stated that “since fewer than one in a thousand Australians (or 0.1% of the general population) is deaf, Auslan signers form a very small signing community surrounded by a much larger English-speaking community”.

Research in other sign/spoken language communities shows that the sign language is influenced by the spoken language of the wider community. English and Auslan are in contact, and it is anticipated that data from this present study will show that as both are used in the community, English has a profound impact on the use of Auslan in the deaf community. “English is the language of literacy for all Auslan signers, as well as the dominant language in the workplace, education system and mass media”. (Schembri, 1996: 105). Ann (2001: 48) mentioned “outcomes of language contact in sign language situations that produce unique results, unlike what is found in spoken language situations”. Even interpreter training texts advocate for interpreters to be aware of the wide variation of use of sign language and spoken language by deaf signers, and the prevalence of code-mixing and code-switching and outcomes of contact between the sign language and the spoken language (Napier, McKee & Goswell, 2006: 47). The main kinds of outcomes include fingerspelling, (acronyms or abbreviations, initialized (single letter) signs, and whole English words), loan translations (semantic transference) and mouthing. All these are examples of contact outcomes between a sign language and a spoken language. (Sutton-Spence, 1994; Lucas, 2001; Valli & Lucas, 2000; Sutton-Spence & Woll, 1999; Schembri, 1996; Ann, 2001).

1. Fingerspelling – This is an integral part of Auslan even though it is actually English letters of the alphabet represented on the hands. “The fingerspelling alphabet is one way for
signers to represent written English words on the hands, so that written words of English can be used in and mixed with the sign language of the deaf community’. (Schembri, 1996: 105). Older deaf people fingerspell more often and seem to prefer to do this, than younger people who prefer to use more signs. (Schembri, 1996; Sutton-Spence & Woll, 1999). This factor of age on the use of fingerspelling is reported by sign linguists in most of the researched sign languages of the world (Sutton-Spence, 1994; Lucas, 2000 & 2001; Sutton-Spence & Woll).

Generally fingerspelling is used to spell names of places and people, terms in English which do not have a recognized sign in Auslan, and sometimes terms that do have a sign in Auslan. Whole English words are often spelt in full if they are only three or four letter words. Common examples of these are L-A-W, #SON, #ZOO, #SO, #AND, #YES, #EGG, #BUT, and #JOB. Many of these are lexicalised as denoted by the # preceding each item (See next paragraph).

The fingerspelling alphabet also gives rise to the use of first or single letter signs, based on the fingerspelled first letter of the English words. “In informal signing, signers often fully fingerspell an English word when they first introduce it into the conversation, but then later simply fingerspell the first letter of the word to refer back to it”. (Schembri, 1996: 107). At times these single letter signs have developed into lexicalised signs of which Schembri cited examples such as Daughter (D-D), FATHER (F-F), MOTHER (M-M), TOILET (T-T), and QUEENSLAND (Q-Q) among others. Valli & Lucas (2000: 68) described this as lexicalisation because the “separate signs [of the fingerspelling letters] do seem to become like one, to be used like other ASL signs, and to follow the rules of ASL signs”. Schembri (1996: 107) stated that “there are many examples of signs in Auslan that have developed out of commonly fingerspelt words. These signs are examples of lexicalised fingerspelling, because they have become lexicalised signs in the language”. These signs follow the rules of Auslan too. Sutton-Spence & Woll (1999: 222) described this as another example of the way “in which BSL uses fingerspelling…. All fingerspelling loans in BSL use the beginning of the English word”. As with ASL and BSL, Auslan sometimes combines the first letter of the English word with a movement to produce a sign. The movement may seem to have a meaning of its own, or may be completely arbitrary. (Schembri, 1996; Sutton-Spence & Woll, 1999). Examples of this in Auslan are ENGLAND, FRIDAY, GOLD, MILLION, and TOILET. In all of these signs the letter handshape acquires an extra movement to become a sign.

Acronyms and abbreviations are another way in which Auslan signers borrow from English. The days of the week are usually indicated by the first three letters as: M-O-N, T-U-E-S, W-E-D, T-H, F-R-I, S-A-T, and S-U-N. Other common abbreviations are used for the many organizations and associations within the deaf community, such as V-C-O-D (Victorian Council for Deaf People), V-S-D-C (VSDC Services for Deaf Children), V-C-D (Victorian College for the Deaf), D-S-A (Deaf Sports Australia), and A-S-L (American Sign Language).
The established lexicon of Auslan can be found in the various dictionaries, but new signs can be created by signers using parts of the language to produce a new meaning. Some new signs are created from fingerspelling, by spelling the whole word at the beginning of a conversation, but gradually modifying the form of the fingerspelt pattern as it is spelt over and over again, so that the reduced form is used throughout the rest of the conversation as a sign recognized by all speakers involved. This local lexicalisation is a recognized process in ASL, Auslan and BSL. (Valli & Lucas, 2000; Schembri, 1996; Sutton-Spence & Woll, 1999; Schembri & Johnston, 2007).

2. Semantic transference (loan translations) – Another way in which Auslan borrows from English is as Sutton-Spence and Woll (1999: 221) stated happens in BSL. Each sign is translated “sign for sign, or morpheme for morpheme from English to BSL”. In this way signs are translated literally into English, and examples of these are the signs for CLASSROOM, (made from the two signs CLASS and ROOM), or WORKSHOP (from two signs WORK and SHOP). Some of these translated terms have been accepted into Auslan with little or no question by the community, but others have been more controversial, and not readily accepted by some sections of the community, particularly when there are already signs in Auslan which cover equivalent concepts. Examples of these are BREAKDOWN, (made from the two signs BREAK and DOWN) when the sign for COLLAPSE is not borrowed from English and could be used for the same concept, and BACKGROUND (combining the signs for GO-BACK and GROUND) when the single Auslan sign for BACKGROUND is already available. “There is no doubt, however, that loan translations such as these (and many others) are widely used in the signing community”. (Schembri, 1996: 110; Johnston & Schembri, 2007:183).

3. Mouth patterns – Auslan, like ASL and BSL, borrows many mouth patterns from English, as well as making use of mouth patterns within the grammatical features of the language, which are unrelated to English words. (Schembri, 1996; Sutton-Spence & Woll, 1999; Valli & Lucas, 2000; Zeshan 2001; McKee (2007). The mouth patterns borrowed from English are referred to as “spoken components” of the language by Sutton-Spence and Woll, while Schembri distinguished the English-related mouth patterns from the lip patterns used with Auslan. Mouthing often occurs simultaneously with the other form of borrowing from English, fingerspelling, so that the signer will mouth the English word as it looks, while fingerspelling the word at the same time. Mouthing in both BSL and Auslan is under-researched although the available research is growing, and it is becoming clear that there is wide variation amongst signers as to the amount of mouthing and the different situations and kind of mouth patterns which are used. (Schembri, 1996; Sutton-Spence & Woll, 1999; Johnston & Schembri, 2007). See section 2.2.5.2.1 for more detailed discussion of mouth patterns/mouthing.
4.2 Variation in Auslan

According to Lucas, Bayley, Reed & Wulf (2003: 84), systematic research into lexical and social variation of in American Sign Language began in the 1960s when Croneberg published his two appendices to the Dictionary of American Sign Language on Linguistic Principles in 1965 (Stokoe, Casterline and Croneberg, 1965). In ‘The Linguistic Community’ (Appendix C) and ‘Sign Language Dialects’ (Appendix D) Croneberg described social and cultural aspects of the American Deaf community and particularly regional variations in sign language (which he defined as ‘horizontal variation’) and variations due to social class (which he defined as vertical variation’). The following sections 4.2.1-5 discuss the social and cultural variations that occurs in Auslan and section 4.2.6. focusses on some of the regional variation in Auslan.

4.2.1 Social class variation

The spoken language communities in Australia may be differentiated according to class based on income, education or family background. However, within the Australian deaf community these same issues are not perceived to hold the same value. Deaf people were more likely to be working in unskilled or trade work than the general population (AFADS, 1973) and only recent generations since the 1980s and 1990s have found access to tertiary education possible with the aid of interpreters and notetakers. The main factor which could be said to reveal a class distinction in the deaf community is that of family. Possibly only about five per cent of Australian deaf children have deaf parents, and these children acquired their Auslan as a true first language. These members of the deaf community become linguistic role models for the other ninety per cent who learn their sign language after starting school or in one of the few early intervention programs which provide access to deaf adults and other deaf children for a few hours per week. The native language signers are held in high esteem in the deaf community, as members of a linguistic elite. (Sutton-Spence & Woll, 1999; Lucas, 2001).

4.2.2 Age differences

Age is probably the most visible vertical variation in the language of groups of Auslan users, and age has an impact on the way Auslan is used in the social context for many of the same reasons found in the different forms of English spoken between generations of Australians. However, there are some unique impacts of age in the deaf community which deserve elaboration. Firstly, as stated in section 4.2.1, the fact that the majority of deaf children do not have deaf parents means that the language is learned in a variety of other ways, often from non-fluent signers (other deaf children or hearing adults) and this leads to great changes in the language from one generation to another. Auslan is passed on from grandparents to parents to children in only a small number of families. A second factor (as discussed in section 3.2.2) is the changes in educational philosophy throughout the history of Australia. Early institutions with adult deaf teachers using signs changed to follow the oral methods of education which prohibited the use of signing. Later some schools used only fingerspelling to
encourage English skills, while the Catholic education system used the Irish fingerspelling alphabet. The 1970s saw the development of contrived systems of signs based on English, and recently the trend has been to bilingual programs using Auslan and written (and some spoken) English. All of these changes are reflected in the variation of signing used in the Australian deaf community, so clearly that deaf people can be recognized, their school pinpointed and their age gauged almost exactly, just by the way they sign. Johnston & Schembri (2007: 48) refer to technological changes which lead to new signs developing according to the generation which saw the development of the new technology. They give TELEPHONE as a clear example of change across generations.

A further area of variation by age is seen in the use of fingerspelling which “is used more extensively by older members of the community (particularly those over seventy years of age), and older signers also tend to fingerspell more English functors than younger signers.” (Johnston & Schembri, 2007: 48). Schembri & Johnston (2007b) found that deaf signers over the age of 51 made more frequent use of fingerspelling than younger signers. Additional research by Schembri, Johnston & Goswell (2006) has shown that the location of signs can change depending on the age of the signer as well as the region in which they were educated and lived. See Section 4.2.6 for a discussion of regional variation in Auslan.

4.2.3 Gender variation
Sutton-Spence & Woll (1999: 26) stated that “In some sign languages the difference between men and women’s signing is very great, to the extent of mutual unintelligibility”. However this is not the case in Auslan which is a comparable sign language to those researched by Sutton-Spence and Woll. Boys and girls have generally been educated in co-educational settings, although accommodated in separate dormitories in residential schools. The areas of major difference tend to be around the way the two genders use signs for bodily parts and functions, sexual activities, and swear words. There has been very little research in this area in Australia, and although Johnston & Schembri (2007) included some results from their project on language variation in their publication ‘The Linguistics of Auslan’, further research will benefit the community.

4.2.4 Ethnic variation
Aboriginal communities in the north, north-east and north-west of Australia use signs for specific purposes and functions within their communities, but they bear little resemblance to Auslan used in the deaf community. Some indigenous deaf children have been educated apart from their community in residential schools for the deaf in the larger cities of Australia, and these children tend to use Auslan for communication at school with peers, and local community signs at home. Some children and adults have incorporated Auslan into sign systems from family groups. However, almost no research exists as to any major differences
in the use of sign languages in the indigenous communities, bilingualism of deaf individuals, or the types of bilingualism in the indigenous communities with deaf members.

Some immigrant families in Australia have arrived in Australia with deaf children, but in the main these children have not had enough access to the sign language of their country of origin to cause any variation in their use of Auslan once they have acquired it. Those deaf people who migrate to Australia at an older age and who have had access to a different deaf community sign language in their country of origin do tend to sign Auslan with some variation, but again it must be stated that there is very little research available to verify what is anecdotal knowledge. There is also no research known to this writer available as to the number of deaf immigrants who have had deaf children after arrival in Australia, and might have used the sign language from the country of origin with their children.

Until recently, many schools and facilities for deaf children encouraged parents to use spoken English to their deaf children at home, with or without Auslan, and discouraged the use of the spoken home language, despite the fact that the home language was being used with all the other hearing children in the family. Baetens Beardsmore (2003: 18) referred to Cummins’ description of “the mistaken advice schools give to parents, such as abandoning the home language or providing extra tuition in the language of the wider environment.” In Australia, the practice of discouraging the use of the language from the country of origin led to two effects on the language use of these deaf children of migrants: either they were isolated from the natural communication of the rest of the family, and only had limited access to English and Auslan; or they developed their own ‘home signs’ for communication within the family, and these signs influenced their Auslan used with their peers in the deaf community. Many families with deaf children (not only those from ethnic backgrounds) developed their own home signs for speed and convenience. These home signs did influence the variety of language used by these individuals in the deaf community.

4.2.5 Religious variation
There is some variation in the signing of deaf people who have been educated in the Catholic deaf education system, due mainly to the use of the Irish fingerspelling alphabet, and its associated initialized signs. (See section 4.1.4) These deaf people have grown up with two signing systems, and continue to use the Irish alphabet and signs among themselves, and even in a larger group gathering, where the differences are very apparent. In addition, Auslan interpreters take care with the way various church groups use signs to portray the Bible references, prayers and psalms. The main differences appear to be between the Auslan varieties of Roman Catholic, Protestant and the Pentecostal groups. Auslan signs used in the Jewish deaf community can also vary from the Catholic and Protestant varieties, due to the strong links to ASL and the American Deaf Jewish community. However, there is very little research in this area.
4.2.6 Regional variation – north and south

As discussed in Chapter 3, Johnston (1989: 474) refers to the Auslan dialects of the north (Queensland and NSW) and the south (Victoria, South Australia, Western Australia and Tasmania), but this regional variation is so small as not to interfere with understanding. Due to the way the schools were staffed by people from the same countries of origin and then by graduates of those schools, and also the way deaf people have benefited from cheap travel within Australia, Auslan is largely consistent in form in every state. The few differences that do exist can be a source of pride and identity for each state community, but do not necessarily hinder communication between individuals. These few differences do serve to identify people from particular schools in particular states, and support Tabouret-Keller’s assertion (1997) that a single feature of the language is sufficient sometimes to place an individual from that school or city. Johnston & Schembri (2007) found that the regional differences that do exist are more obvious in the older age groups of each state. Younger signers seem to show less difference in the usage across regions. “There appears to be a lessening of the differences in some areas of the lexicon (particularly in number signs, for example) in younger signers, particularly those who have been exposed to a more standardised use of ASE-based signing in school (many of the signs used in ASE were based on signs used in the southern dialect of Auslan).” Johnston & Schembri, 2007: 47. [NB – ASE = Australasian Signed English]

4.3 Attitudes to Auslan

An attitude of hearing people that needs to be highlighted in this study relates to the fact that in our society deafness is generally regarded as a disability. The equating of deafness with ‘dumbness’ and hence ‘stupidity’ taints the attitude of many towards deaf people and the Auslan language. The gestures and movements of sign language are seen to be part of this ‘dumbness’. As Branson & Miller (1991: 148) explained, “Coupled with this, at least in middle class Anglo-American culture, is a definition of politeness and good behaviour which explicitly excludes as rude and even grotesque those manual and facial expressions which are an essential part of communication through sign language”.

A consequence of the above attitudes of hearing people and educators of the deaf towards deafness and the use of signing is that deaf people themselves have developed a protective and ambivalent attitude towards their own sign language. “Shunned and suspicious of the hearing world the Deaf have often closed ranks around their language, seeing it as an exclusive marker of Deaf identity to which the hearing should not and even cannot have access. Where their language has received recognition they have felt threatened, fearing the breakdown of identity if outsiders should gain access to it”. (Branson & Miller, 1991: 152). As Johnston & Schembri (2007: 282) assert that, on the basis of their observation “many deaf
people have internalized negative language attitudes towards signed language, because of the higher status of English in the wider community.”

Since the 1970s, educators of the deaf have tried at different times to interfere with or completely ignore the existence of Auslan, by artificially making a visual English-like language, with contrived signs, cues and other means. These introduced changes have had little impact on the native sign language of the deaf community. “Unfortunately for the language planners, the changes have not been as great as they would have liked. Hearing people often try to invent new signs or sign systems for deaf people (e.g. new fingerspelling alphabets or completely new systems such as Paget-Gorman) but these have never been totally accepted”. (Sutton-Spence & Woll, 1999: 37). The wider hearing community (as evidenced by the range and increasing number of enquiries to study and learn Auslan at the Victorian Deaf Society and at Kangan-Batman College of Technical and Further Education, Auslan Studies Department) has more recently embraced Auslan as a community language to be learned and used as any other language. This change in attitude to acceptance of the language has on one hand been beneficial for the deaf community in bringing both communities closer through communication. On the other hand, many deaf people fear the loss of identity if their language is used by anyone other than deaf people. Their language may no longer be a mark of their difference and disadvantage, and may no longer be the bond which binds the whole community. It is this fear which causes the ambivalence in the attitude of many deaf people towards Auslan and its acceptance by the hearing community now. (Branson & Miller, 1991; Sutton-Spence & Woll, 1999; Lucas, 1989).

Popular fears and misconceptions of the wider community regarding bilingualism in spoken languages are also held by hearing and deaf parents for their deaf children who are bilingual in a sign language and a spoken language. The fears as described by Baetens Beardsmore (2003: 11-25)) are: ‘parental fears’ (Is bilingualism is right for the deaf child?); ‘cultural fears’ (Will bilingualism mean the child will become completely acculturated into the deaf community to the exclusion of the hearing community?); ‘educational fears’ (Will bilingualism in Auslan and English affect the deaf child’s academic progress?); and ‘politico-ideological fears’ (Is bilingualism a threat to the child identifying with Australia as a whole?). Additional fears mentioned include purist fears (the effect of bilingual usage on language norms), moral fears (moral standards may decline because of a perceived status comparison of the sign language with the spoken language), and fears about the cost of bilingualism, to the community and to the individual. These fears also impact on the attitudes held by both hearing and deaf people towards Auslan.


4.4 Language planning

4.4.1 Status Planning
In 1960, the Australian Federation of Deaf Societies conducted a survey of deaf school leavers from around Australia. This was possibly the first time that the success of the education programs for deaf students had ever been researched and the choices the students made after leaving school had ever been questioned. The survey was carried out in New South Wales, Victoria, Queensland, Tasmania, South Australia, and Western Australia. The survey was conducted by the Deaf Society in each state, to gather information on “current and past employment history, home and family, finance and property, education, religious worship, reading habits, social interaction and language and speech skills” of the school leavers. (AFADS, 1973: 2). In fact only four states provided useful information, as no respondents could be contacted in South Australia and Tasmania in that year. The publication containing the results of this survey stated that “the styles of communication used by deaf people include fingerspelling and/or signing, speech and speech reading, writing or combinations of these styles”. The results revealed that without exception all school leavers from that year were aged 15 or 16, and the only post-school education undertaken was trade training in the form of apprenticeships, or simply on-the-job training. The only kind of reading undertaken by the respondents was daily newspapers and in some cases popular magazines in addition. Very few respondents were then members of local libraries.

After ‘total communication’ was introduced in many schools for the deaf (where spoken English was supplemented by artificial signs or visual cues), the Institute for Special Education at Burwood State College (now incorporated into Deakin University) undertook another study of hearing-impaired school leavers in Victoria in 1974. This survey included students from two big metropolitan schools for the deaf and one smaller school in a provincial city, as well as students who were then in regular schools with support from the Visiting Teacher of the Deaf Service. Some of the students tested from these schools and services were from rural areas, boarding in Melbourne, but generally the study was considered to be representative of a metropolitan group. One of the metropolitan deaf schools was noted to be an ‘oral’ school and the other was described as a ‘combined method’ school. Although this study was on a smaller scale, the same lower levels of achievement than the hearing population could be seen in this study too. According to Power (1975: 23) “this study emphasises the fact that there is a large gap between the academic achievement of most deaf children and their possible potential, and that new ways must be sought to assist them to bridge that gap”. He concluded that while it is recognised that deafness is a barrier to learning, the gap is so large that it cannot simply be attributed to this physiological barrier, and educators must question the use of resources to educate the children, and called for more concentrated efforts. (Power, 1975: 32). Concurrently with these surveys and studies, the use of forms of signed communication alongside spoken English began to spread in
schools for the deaf, as well as in some facilities and units for the deaf within regular schools in Australia. Perhaps this was a response to the need for more educational resources to be marshalled and hence better language planning for education and employment arenas.

In 1980 Multicultural Television (now SBS) began to produce the 6.25pm News Headlines with brief English subtitles. The station was overwhelmed by the response from members of the deaf community to captioning of English News bulletin. The captioning was actually intended for those non-fluent in English but it was apparent that it provided access for thousands of deaf people. Multicultural Television then instituted a short trial of having the News Bulletin signed in one corner. Deaf people realized that they ought to be able to access the news regularly in this way, and began to lobby for more subtitles or interpretation of all TV programmes on all free-to-air stations. In 2003, the Australian Association of the Deaf (AAD) announced that free-to-air TV stations in Australia had finally agreed to increase captioning to 70% of programmes between 6.00am and 12 midnight by 2007. Currently deaf people can access captions to all the prime time programs (between 6.00pm and 10.00pm), which includes the ‘soapies’ on the commercial TV stations.

In 1982 the Senate held an enquiry into the need for a national language policy in Australia. A first report was released in 1984. In 1987 Minister Susan Ryan commissioned Joseph Lo Bianco to compile a policy statement on languages. This National Policy on Languages named Australian Sign Language in the deaf community as a community language. Four years later John Dawkins, the Minister for Employment, Education and Training, released the Green (The Language of Australia) and White (Australia’s Language: The Australian Language and Literacy Policy) papers, which according to Branson & Miller (1991: 136) “came as a real blow to the Deaf community [ ] devoting only eleven lines ‘to the deaf and hearing-impaired’ as a whole, but much of what did appear was ill-informed.” In 1990, in the Green Paper, the Federal Government acknowledged Auslan as the first language of the profoundly deaf, and the 1991 White Paper included the statement, “Provision should be made within the teaching of English (including literacy) and languages other than English to meet the needs of the deaf and hearing impaired.” Branson & Miller (1991: 136) further stated that “The White paper was even more ambiguous in its attitude to Auslan”. “It did at least recognise Auslan as the language of the deaf community, but still did not support the use of “Auslan as a medium of instruction in schools” (Branson & Miller 1991: 136). The Companion Volume to the White paper included a section on language provisions for the deaf and hearing impaired. It recognised Signed English, Cued Speech, and Auslan, and acknowledged for the first time that most deaf children needed to learn English in the same way that non-English-speaking migrants learned English, as a second language. It stated that “Auslan is an indigenous Australian language, having developed from British and Irish sign languages brought to Australia. An estimated 15,000 to 20,000 deaf Australians use Auslan (Hyde and Power, in press) and it is actively passed on to children.” (Australia’s Language,
Companion Volume to the Policy Paper 1991: 20). Despite the fact that this Companion Volume was peripheral to the main Policy, being based on informed submissions rather than any policy of the Minister, some enthusiasm was generated in the Australian and particularly the Melbourne deaf community, and it spurred on deaf people to enrol in TAFE and University courses of further education in order to become qualified as teachers of this newly recognized language.

Mainstream primary and secondary schools in Victoria began to offer Auslan as a LOTE (Language Other Than English), as a response to the teaching of other LOTEs in all Victorian primary schools, and this immediately increased the need for more qualified teachers of this community language. A few years later in the mid 1990s some schools for the deaf as well as some mainstream schools, which previously had been promoting Signed English, changed their policies to ‘bilingual’, and attempted to implement programs that offered classes taught in either spoken English or Auslan. The Thomas Pattinson School for Deaf Children in Sydney, NSW, and the Claremont School in Hobart, Tasmania, are just two examples of school in other states which began similar programs. In 1998/99 two schools in Victoria, one mainstream and one special school for the deaf, were selected as part of the Victorian Government’s Bilingual Schools Program, and obtained funding to employ additional teaching staff capable of modelling Auslan with native fluency to the students. Other schools employed deaf teacher-aides, who could be accessed, even part-time, by the students for Auslan conversations. Even schools which had always conducted predominantly oral programs (focusing on the auditory skills of the students and spoken English), introduced Auslan as a LOTE to their deaf students, and invited deaf adults to visit the children as role models of socially, culturally, and linguistically successful and confident members of both the hearing and deaf communities. Not all of these changes were due simply to the change of policy by the government, but also to the change of community attitudes, and the desire of the general hearing community to learn more about Auslan. This certainly raised the prestige of Auslan, and encouraged many members of the deaf community to begin research in various ways into their own community language. As May (2003: 117) stated, “educational and linguistic research over the last 40 years has demonstrated unequivocally that bilingualism is a cognitive advantage rather then a deficit and that being educated in one’s first-language provides the most effective means of subsequently transferring those first language skills to a second language”. As this research from spoken language settings is applied to sign/spoken language settings, it is hoped that Auslan/English bilingual programs will become the norm for all children in any school that educates deaf children.

In 2002, after many years of lobbying by the Australian Association of the Deaf (AAD), the Australian Federation of Deaf Societies (AFDS), and the Australian Sign Language Interpreters Association (ASLIA), the Australian Government Department of Family and Community Services commissioned ORIMA Research to undertake a study on the supply and
The demand for Auslan interpreting. The ORIMA report was released in 2004, and in the subsequent budget, the Australian Federal Government announced an initiative in the budget to provide 18.4 million dollars over a period of four years to be administered by a central agency to provide Auslan interpreting in specified private medical and health consultations. This level of support for Auslan interpreting services in any setting in Australia was unprecedented and acknowledged the use of Auslan by the deaf community in a broad and public way. This initiative occurred in the same year that the Central Health Interpreting Service in Victoria closed its doors, and some public hospitals were struggling within their budgets to provide spoken language (let alone sign language) interpreters in emergency departments. (The CHIS closure in Victoria did not have a profound impact on Auslan interpreting as the majority of interpreters worked for the Victorian Deaf Society Interpreting Service.) The announcement of the funding drew attention to Auslan as the language used by the deaf community, and highlighted the increased status that Auslan now held in the wider Australian and particularly the Victorian community.

4.4.2 Corpus planning
As stated in Chapter 2, corpus planning in Auslan occurred only in an informal way in community and religious settings, as Auslan was never included in the government or educational settings until the 1980s. During the years of ‘total communication’, during the 1970s and early 1980s, dictionaries were produced for people wishing to learn this kind of communication. The Signed English dictionary, A Dictionary of Australasian Signs, was a description of every agreed sign by the national panel convened to develop this form of communication. The deaf community of Australia did not approve the contents of this dictionary, but parents and hearing people trying to learn to communicate with deaf students did, in fact, ensure its wide-spread use right across this country and New Zealand. Later in 1989, Trevor Johnston completed the mammoth task of publishing the Auslan Dictionary: A Dictionary of the Australian Deaf Community. The full volume attempted to include a lexicographic description of every sign and its usage around Australia in the numerous deaf communities. Originally it included the Signed English signs which were commonly used by different groups of deaf people by the late 1980s, but a later edition in 1998 omitted many of these signs which were never accepted by the native signing community in any state. In this way, the dictionary may have taken on a corpus planning function role, beyond its original descriptive and lexicographic role in both communities. The usage of a sign in the second edition of the dictionary is described using the terms ‘Australia wide’, or ‘restricted’ and ‘southern dialect’ or northern dialect’ which gives the reader information about the usage of the sign in particular states. Johnston and colleagues travelled around Australia to the various metropolitan and regional deaf communities to gather this information by face-to-face interviews. Deaf teachers of Auslan now refer to it as a source for signs and their appropriateness, and refer hearing students of Auslan to it for the same reasons. Teachers of
the deaf in many schools around Australia, attempting to run bilingual programs, also use this dictionary now to confirm the use and acceptability of a sign in their classrooms.

A second dictionary, edited and published by VSDC Services for Deaf Children, in Melbourne, Victoria, was a compilation of signs “most commonly used throughout Victoria” (Bernal & Wilson, 1998: IX), and although the signs could be recognized by deaf people all over Australia, regular users of Auslan in other states, particularly the northern states, would notice the variations. This dictionary is still very useful for families, educators and any interested people because it made use of photographs, with superimposed arrows to show the movement of the signs. Some users of the dictionary may have found this dictionary easier to navigate than the Johnston dictionary, as deciphering the sketches in the former called for some experience in reading sign descriptions.

As access to secondary and tertiary education has been possible throughout the 1980s and 1990s, Auslan has had to develop rapidly to enable deaf students to cope with new terminology. As technology has developed, so has Auslan developed new signs to name the new forms of technology, and to provide sign equivalents for the English terms which regularly appear in tertiary lecture settings. Signs such as TELECOMMUNICATION, TECHNOLOGY, FAX, INTERNET, EMAIL, MOBILE and many others have developed in recent times, and signs such as TRAIN, and TELEPHONE have appeared in various forms as the named item changed its appearance with the advent of electricity and cable connections. As deaf students studied subjects such as biology, chemistry, genetics, medicine and other sciences, so signs have developed to allow students and interpreters to communicate appropriately in lectures. In the past as deaf people had no access to these forms of study, fingerspelling was the only way to represent these kinds of terms. However, it is almost impossible to interpret a lecture, delivered at normal speed, entirely by fingerspelling, let alone allow the student to understand it!

Despite all the influences brought to bear on the signing of the deaf community, Auslan has survived and developed and continues to be the accepted language of members of the Australian deaf community. However, without many signers even realizing, the effects of the years in an oral school where signing was banned (and many deaf children ‘made up’ their own signs), the years of using Signed English, and the years of using a system of cues for improved speech skills, have resulted in a range of sign language varieties in the deaf community. Some of these varieties are more like English and some are more like Auslan. As in other bilingual immigrant communities in Australia, many members of the deaf community are able to communicate across all varieties, and others have difficulty communicating in any but their own preferred variety. This leads to an ever-changing use of language, from more Auslan-like signing to more English-like signing, and this has broad sociolinguistic implications. Many of the signs which were included in the first Signed English publications tended to be southern dialect signs, especially those of the colours, numbers and other
commonly used signs. This led to rejection of the dictionaries by some parts of the Australian deaf community as they implied that the northern dialect signs were in some way less ‘correct’ than those of the southern states.

4.5 Summary
In this chapter I have attempted to give an overview of the way Auslan is used and belongs in the social context of the deaf community and the wider hearing community in Australia. Previous research is included which describes how, through contact with English, as well as other sign languages, Auslan signers have borrowed features and incorporated them into Auslan as it is used today. The variation in Auslan, including differences marking class, age, gender, ethnic group, religious denomination and region, has been explained. Education policies in Australia did not traditionally include Auslan until the 1980s and 1990s, when Auslan began to be considered alongside other Languages Other Than English (LOTEs). Now among the deaf community there is an assumption that the wider community is aware of their language, and that many hearing people are actively involved in learning it in the proliferation of classes and courses around the nation. Governments too, both state and federal, have begun to highlight the needs of deaf members of the wider community in the funding provisions for interpreting and language services in education, health and employment. Each of these issues has relevance for the data from this study.
Chapter 5 - Methodology and Data

Chapters 3 and 4 have provided an overview of Australian Sign Language and the Australian deaf community to allow an understanding of the conversations of the participants in this study. This chapter will discuss the data collected from this study and the methods of data analysis. The theoretical frameworks and terminology as described in Chapter 2 that I have used in this thesis are also clearly outlined. The definition of the language contact phenomena (including code-switching) that I found in the data is included in this chapter.

5.1 Introduction

Early research into language contact outcomes in the deaf community has been problematic. The absence of full linguistic descriptions of sign languages has made comparisons between two or more sign languages challenging, but it has also made comparisons between spoken language contact phenomena and sign language contact phenomena very difficult. Despite these problems, the contact between a spoken language and a sign language in a deaf community is still an area of interest to both sign linguists and spoken language researchers, for the possible light it may shed on language contact research in general.

This study focuses on the contact between spoken English and Auslan by adult deaf bilinguals, and not by hearing bilinguals who have full access to spoken English. The study examines the use of both languages by deaf people who have varied degrees of exposure to the spoken form of English (depending on their hearing loss) and to the written form of English (depending on their educational background). I have analysed the data from this study assuming that features of both languages will naturally be present, depending on the interlocutors and other factors. The analysis is qualitative, describing what happened in the interactions and what I found. The analysis includes a description of the conditions under which the results occurred.

Lucas and Valli (1988: 210) noted three shortcomings with research that preceded their study:
1. Differential signing skills – “Researchers who have described the variety of sign language occurring in the contact situation have observed that the variety appears to include features of both ASL and English”. Much of the data in their studies included language from both native and non-native signers, and this had an impact on the data collected from the research. This issue may not be completely resolved in this study despite the fact that I restricted the participants to deaf people, either in their workplace with deaf colleagues, or at home with family. This eliminated from the data the specific language contact phenomena of hearing people using Auslan. However, hearing children were still present in the family settings, and hearing adults did intervene in the workplace settings. In addition, the sample of deaf subjects included both first language acquirers and second language learners of Auslan,
because this mix of participants was a relevant characteristic of the deaf community. The data obtained in this study did include features of Auslan and English that can be attributed to the differential signing skills of some of the participants. However, as this is the norm rather than the exception in the community, and it was exactly this kind of language that I wanted to elicit, I determined that the study was not diminished by the mixture of deaf participants nor by their signing skills. Johnston & Schembri (2007: 283) warn that “When we describe signing deaf communities and their languages, we must be clear not only about the type of data we base our generalizations on but also about whom we are making a generalization—signers generally, deaf signers of various backgrounds, or native signers (deaf or hearing).” In this study (as stated above) the language outcomes and descriptions are clearly from deaf signers of various backgrounds and it is on that basis that this study must be understood. (Although naturalistic data was the aim of the research, see Section 5.4.2 for a discussion for the observer’s paradox).

2. Dearth of descriptions – Lucas & Valli (1988: 210) reported that amongst all of the mentions of language contact in the literature they could only find three studies that described the language contact variety linguistically, and only one was data-based. In Australia this is the first targeted study of the language contact between spoken English and Auslan, and it is expected that the data gathered for this research will stimulate future discussion of contact varieties between Auslan and English.

3. Use of the term ‘pidgin’ – This term has been employed to describe the language contact phenomena in the deaf community resulting from the influence of the artificial signing systems known as Signed English, or Signing Exact English on the native sign language. One example of the use of this term term can be seen in Woodward (1973c) in his description of Signed English and its characteristics. The classic pidgin situation occurs when there are more than two languages in contact, and the target language is withheld from the native speakers. Lucas & Valli (1988: 210) pointed out that “the sociolinguistic situation in the deaf community does not seem to coincide with the ‘classic’ pidgin situation”. The deaf person who spends most time in the deaf community, using their native sign language (see Section 1.4), still has “extensive exposure and contact with English”, in educational settings, and through print and broadcast media. “The result for native ASL signers in American society is a maintained bilingualism” (Lucas & Valli, 1988: 211). The current research aimed to describe some of the language contact outcomes (including code-switching), which occurred in the four videoed settings, and to document them. The examples of signing phenomena were described as Auslan or the contact outcome as it appeared to be influenced by English or another language, but I did not attempt to compare any data to pidgins in use in other communities.

The intention of this research was to gather evidence of a range of language uses (which have or have not been seen in other sign-spoken language contact situations), and to analyse and document this data for the deaf and hearing community in Australia. The research was
qualitative in nature, with the aim being to simply record phenomena of language contact by deaf individuals as a stimulus for further quantitative research.

5.1.1 Terms and Definitions.
It was necessary to define the terms used in this study specifically to refer to language outcomes which occur in the contact between a sign language and a spoken language. In particular it must be stated here that I have used Auslan to refer to the signed communication (with or without mouthing or lip patterns) and English as the spoken communication. In no way is there any intention to lead the reader to an assumption of any ‘pure’ form of Auslan. Auslan (as described in Chapter 3) is the result of many influences including many mouthing, lip patterns and transfers from English, both written and spoken.

The terms used for the data analysis in this study include four others that need particular clarification: ‘transference’ (lexical, syntactic, and semantic), ‘fingerspelling’ and ‘simultaneous production’. These are not entirely analogous to the forms of code-switching (as it is variously described) between spoken languages. As discussed in Chapter two, the term code-switching has been used in multiple ways by researchers in recent literature. All four terms are defined below.

Firstly, I used Clyne’s definition of ‘transference’ as “the process of bringing over any items, features or rules from one language to another, and for the results of this process”. Thus the data analysis in chapter 6, 7 and 8 includes use of the terms ‘lexical’, ‘semantic’ and ‘syntactic’ transfers, referring to features of English that were transferred into Auslan utterances as signs (lexicalised fingerspelling) or features of other sign languages transferred into Auslan. While there is ongoing research into the place of fingerspelling in any sign language, I have viewed any fingerspelling as a form of transference, even if it has become a sign form, in order to categorise this phenomenon, and to highlight the place it has in the outcomes of language contact between a sign language and a spoken language. Examples of transfers found in the data include: WHAT DO, HAVE TO, and OF COURSE. See Section 6.2 for a detailed discussion of these.

Secondly fingerspelling is the visual representation of the letters of English words on the hands of the signer. This has been described in detail in Section 4.1.4. Examples are B-O-S-S-Y, R-E-C-E-S-S, D-O, and O-U-T.

For the third and most unique feature of the language contact of the participants in this study I employ the term ‘simultaneous use’ to define the simultaneous use of lexical items and syntactical and semantic features of both languages as the bilingual participants sign and speak at the same time. Other writers have referred to this as bi-modal communication (Lee, 1983). Johnston & Schembri refer to this as a form of signing that ‘combines’ aspects of both
A significant amount of signing behaviour among deaf people themselves and with hearing people is not actually conducted in Auslan or English but, rather, in a language system that results from a mixture of both languages". (Johnston & Schembri, 2007: 40). Lucas & Valli (1992) refer to this as ‘contact signing’, as the spoken and sign language come into contact and features of both languages can appear in the resultant communication. This kind of ‘contact signing’ includes the use of signs simultaneously with mouthing and spoken English words and this particular phenomenon is one feature that I have focused on in this study. An example of this is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VOICE</th>
<th>friend</th>
<th>good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOUTH PATTERN</td>
<td>friend</td>
<td>good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM FEATURES</td>
<td>Eye gaze to camera nod nod</td>
<td>Eye gaze to hearing son</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIGN GLOSS</td>
<td>PRO$_{3}$ FRIEND SIGN SOME GOOD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGLISH MEANING</td>
<td>Some of his friends sign quite well.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this example, above, the bold terms show how the participant signed, mouthed and vocalised the word GOOD/good simultaneously. In order to differentiate between the two languages when used in this way by the participants, I have used Auslan to refer to the signed communication (with or without mouthing or lip patterns) and English as the spoken communication. See Section 5.5.2 for a detailed explanation of the transcription method.

Code-switching, in this study was viewed as a complete change from one language to the other (alternational code-switching as defined by Muysken (2000: 32), involving a change from signing to speaking, or a change from speaking to signing. See Section 6.3 for examples of this switching from one language to the other.

For the purposes of this study, the data is documented and analysed from three perspectives (linguistic, sociolinguistic and psycholinguistic).

5.1.2 Pilot Data Collection.
A pilot collection of data was conducted, with one male deaf participant in a workplace conversing with his colleagues. This main participant was a native user of Auslan, from a third-generation deaf family. The data was non-experimental and non-scripted, although suggestions for questions to be asked during the videoing were given to the participants in advance. These questions did not form the basis of the conversations but they did assist when the conversation seemed to be faltering.

The first scenario involved the main participant and two other male deaf people holding a conversation about his role when he was off-site giving lectures about the services provided by his organisation. Both of the other two male participants were not native users of Auslan, one being a second language learner of both English and Auslan, with other spoken and written languages (Hindi and Urdu) used at home in the family. The other participant had attended a Roman Catholic residential school for the deaf, living away from home and family
for long periods of time from the age of three. He had learned Auslan from the other children, in secret from teachers who used only auditory methods of teaching speech and other subjects.

The second scenario involved the same main participant explaining his off-site lectures to two hearing work colleagues, both female, and both second language learners of Auslan.

The results of this small data collection revealed some transference occurring in both scenarios. The main participant explaining his role transferred lexical items and syntactic structures of English in several utterances, including when he was attempting to quote the kind of questions that hearing people at his lectures had asked. In addition, there was more evidence of transference in the second scenario, by the two colleagues who were native speakers of English, even though both were fluent users of Auslan.

The results of this pilot project encouraged me to proceed with the same methodology to collect data as evidence of the use of Auslan and English by deaf bilinguals in conversation.

5.2 Selection of Participants

The four groups of participants in this project volunteered their participation after learning from other community members about the research. They contacted me in person, when I saw them either in the course of professional contacts in the community as an interpreter, or at social functions in the community. Information days during Deafness Awareness Week, Deafblind Awareness Week, Expos or exhibitions, and national and state deaf sporting events are also occasions when deaf people gather together. Thus it was easy to be approached face-to-face by deaf people keen to be involved. Two groups of participants were work colleagues in two different agencies, and the other two groups of participants were families of mixed deaf and hearing members. The families described themselves as ‘bilingual families’ because of this mixture. For these participants, the minimum threshold based on a self-rated description of ‘bilingual’ meant a fairly high competence in both languages, and I did not question the family members as to their definition of bilingualism.

I did not have any preconceived criteria in mind other than requiring deaf participants in order to gather samples of language use between deaf adults and their deaf or hearing children in the home, and deaf adults in the workplace. My reasons for using deaf adults were twofold: the first was that hearing learners of Auslan were, in the majority of cases, second language learners, and the outcomes of the contact situations between a hearing person’s spoken English and signed Auslan were not the focus of my interest. I wanted to centre on the way deaf adults used their knowledge of English and Auslan, regardless of their physiological hearing loss, and their capacity to use spoken English. Some of the deaf adults in the study
were first language learners of Auslan, and second language learners of English. Others were second language learners of both Auslan and English and I was keen to see if they used their languages in a way that was different to that of hearing people. The second reason for only using deaf adults was that even hearing children of deaf adults (Codas), who acquire Auslan as their first language, have been found to use their languages in a different way from other bilinguals including a phenomenon named “Coda talk” (Bishop & Hicks, 2005; Bishop, 2006). This transference of Auslan or sign language grammar and lexicon into their spoken English is an interesting but completely separate issue, which was not within the scope of this study. Adult deaf bilinguals, whether first or second language acquirers of Auslan and spoken English, were the participants for the research project. No criteria relating to place or level of education, birth order in the family, number of deaf children in the family, place of birth or other ethnic background was used for selection of candidates. There was no way to control these factors as all the participants were volunteers. The way these factors appear in the samples of participants is purely random, other than the fact that because they were volunteers the participants were aware of my research and had professed an interest in the use of English and Auslan in their family or workplace. In all, the data from eight participants was analysed for this study, three in each workplace setting (Participants A,B,C, and D,E,F), and two parents in each of the family settings (Participants G and H, and Participants I and J). The way in which they used their languages in conversation with either the hearing or deaf interlocutors (children or adults) was of interest to see what kind of contact outcomes including switching (if any) occurred in the language of deaf adults.

The choice of home and workplace as scenarios for the research was made to see if different language contact outcomes were apparent in each setting. Venue and domain are two of the variables which can influence language choice and promote code-switching. (See chapter 2). Clyne (2005: 28) states that “In most cases but not all, home is the domain with the greatest use of the community language. In most cases but not all, school and work are the domains in which English is most likely to be used.” This seemed to be equally true for most Deaf adults who we would expect to use Auslan at home, but we would expect to see them use more English in the workplace. Certainly, these two venues are anecdotally believed (in the deaf community) to show the clearest difference in the language use of deaf adults. At home it has been commonly perceived that deaf adults relax and use Auslan with their partners and children, but at work they mix with hearing speakers of English who do not use sign language and adjustments have to be made by the deaf adults and these adjustments influence their language choices. Their use of language (either written or spoken) is believed to be more English-like in structure and word order. However, the domain of school was the context in which all the participants in both venues were asked to converse, and so this changed the domain in this study. This study was an attempt to capture data that would show the way domain influenced language choice and whether other factors were more influential. No
attempt was made to compare individual participants in two settings, but to capture language contact outcomes of different bilingual participants in different settings and to describe it.

5.3 Description of Participants

The following tables include reference to the level of deafness of each participant. These levels are explained in Chapter 1, Section 1.4. The adult deaf participants are identified by letters of the alphabet from A to J, whereas the children, both deaf and hearing, are identified simply by their position in the family. They were not considered participants for the purpose of data analysis, except where their utterance or presence was a factor influencing the response of the parental participant. I have included the age group of participants in the second column of each table.

**Workplace Setting 1** - The first group of participants was from a workplace in an educational early intervention agency. All three were professionals working with young deaf children and their parents in the early developmental years, assisting the families with strategies for language development as well as all other areas of early childhood learning. The following table summarised the characteristics of the participants in this setting. Within the family column, both the family in which the participant grew up as well as their current spouse was described.

**Table 2: Participants in Workplace Setting 1.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WP 1</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Deafness</th>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Identity</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Language at home</th>
<th>Language at work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>40-50</td>
<td>Severe to profound</td>
<td>Hearing family. Deaf spouse</td>
<td>Identified as culturally deaf</td>
<td>Family worker</td>
<td>Auslan and some English</td>
<td>Auslan and some English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>40-50</td>
<td>Severe</td>
<td>Hearing family. Hearing spouse &amp; children</td>
<td>Identified as hard-of-hearing</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English and some Auslan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>40-50</td>
<td>Profound</td>
<td>Deaf family. Deaf spouse.</td>
<td>Identified as culturally deaf</td>
<td>Family worker</td>
<td>Auslan</td>
<td>Auslan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participant A - A deaf family worker in the organisation, who visited families with other staff of the agency, and provided modelling of Auslan language and communication strategies for families of young deaf children. She was severely deaf from birth, and attended one of the larger schools for the deaf in Melbourne. Although her family used English at home during her childhood, she was always happiest using sign language. She married a culturally deaf man (see section 1.4), and had two hearing children. She was fluent in Auslan, and she and her husband used Auslan in the home with their children, although she could use spoken English with her children at times.
Participant B - A teacher of the deaf, severely deaf from birth, who had attended hearing schools throughout her own school life. The language used at home was mostly spoken English with some gestures. She was literate and well-spoken in English, and had learned Auslan later in her life when she began to mix in the Deaf community for social reasons. She was married to a hearing man with two hearing children of school age, and English continued to be the language used for communication at home.

Participant C - A deaf family worker for the same organisation, who was born profoundly deaf, and lived for most of her young life with her deaf family. Auslan was the only language used at home. She first attended a residential school for the deaf in Victoria, which encouraged only English speech and oral/aural communication. During this time she said she was never happy at school. Later she attended a different school for the deaf on a daily basis, and this school used sign language as the main method of communication. “The sign language used was different from what the deaf used for normal communication and most of the teachers did not understand the language used by the students during playground and social interaction”, was the way she described it in the discussion with the other subjects on tape. She married a deaf man, and the language used at home was Auslan.

Workplace Setting 2 – The second group of participants was from an organisation which provided case management, interpreting and information services for deaf people. The following table summarised the characteristics of the participants in setting 2. Within the family column, both the family in which the participant grew up as well as their current spouse was described. As all three volunteered themselves, there was no selection which allowed me to control the fact that one participant was not a native Auslan signer. He grew up in London, and so his use of Auslan was punctuated with signs from BSL and ASL.

Table 3 – Participants in Workplace Setting 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WP 2</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Deafness</th>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Identity</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Language at home</th>
<th>Language at work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>30-40</td>
<td>Profound</td>
<td>Hearing family</td>
<td>Identified as culturally deaf</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>English with minimal Auslan signs.</td>
<td>Auslan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>30-40</td>
<td>Profound</td>
<td>Hearing family. Hearing spouse and children, all fluent in Auslan.</td>
<td>Identified as culturally deaf</td>
<td>Caretaker</td>
<td>Auslan and English.</td>
<td>Auslan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>50-60</td>
<td>Profound</td>
<td>Hearing family. Deaf spouse</td>
<td>Identified as culturally deaf</td>
<td>Information Worker</td>
<td>Auslan</td>
<td>Auslan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participant D – A casual Auslan teacher for the organization, who only attended the office one afternoon per week for preparation for evening Auslan classes. She was born moderately deaf, but her hearing had slowly degenerated so that at the time of data collection she was profoundly deaf. She was the only deaf member of her family and communication at home included both spoken English (which she had to lipread) and some Auslan signs.

Participant E – A deaf man (originally from England) whose first language was BSL. He had grown up in the London area, attending programs for deaf students in mainstream schools.
He had continued his study until he tried to enter university without provision of interpreters or notetakers. He was not successful, but managed to gain some training in counselling, drug and alcohol awareness, and social welfare before moving to Melbourne with his deaf Australian wife. He worked as a community education/information worker with the organisation, in the area of drug and alcohol awareness.

**Participant F** – A deaf man who worked as a caretaker for the organisation. He had attended a residential school for the deaf in another state as a boarder from the age of 2.5 years, where communication was strictly oral and signs forbidden. Some signs were acquired from the other children attending the school, but it was not until after leaving school and returning to the family home in Melbourne that he started to acquire Auslan in depth. He married a hearing woman and had three hearing children. The language used at home was Auslan between him, his wife and children, but often the hearing members used spoken English and he stated that he was sometimes left out unless he demanded to know what was being discussed.

**Family Setting 1** – The third group of subjects was a family unit of two deaf parents, with three children, two deaf and one hearing. The family was culturally deaf (See section 1.4), and mixed with the deaf community, but also played sport in regular community and school teams. The following table summarised the characteristics of the participants in setting 3. Within the family column, the family in which the participant grew up is described. The column for language used at work also included the language used by the children at school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family 1</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Deafness</th>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Identity</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Language at home</th>
<th>Language at work/school</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participant G (mother)</td>
<td>40-50</td>
<td>Severe</td>
<td>Hearing family</td>
<td>Identified as culturally deaf</td>
<td>Teacher of deaf with multiple disabilities part-time</td>
<td>Auslan and English</td>
<td>Auslan and English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant H (father)</td>
<td>40-50</td>
<td>Profound</td>
<td>Deaf family</td>
<td>Identified as culturally deaf</td>
<td>Teacher of Auslan part-time</td>
<td>Auslan</td>
<td>Auslan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Son</td>
<td>15-20</td>
<td>Hearing</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Identified as hearing</td>
<td>Secondary school student</td>
<td>English and Auslan</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daughter</td>
<td>10-15</td>
<td>Severe</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Identified as culturally deaf</td>
<td>Secondary school student</td>
<td>Auslan and some English with siblings</td>
<td>Auslan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Son</td>
<td>10-15</td>
<td>Profound</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Identified as culturally deaf</td>
<td>Primary school student</td>
<td>Auslan</td>
<td>Auslan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Participant G, the mother**, was severely deaf from birth, but attended hearing schools, and had developed excellent spoken English skills. She was most comfortable using Auslan for communication at home but could switch quite comfortably to spoken English with her hearing son and others in the wider community. She worked part-time as a teacher of deaf people with additional disabilities and as a teacher of Auslan.
Participant H, the father, was born profoundly deaf, a member of an extended deaf family, with grandparents and cousins also deaf. He attended schools for the deaf for his education, and became a part-time teacher of Auslan. He rarely used spoken English, being most comfortable in his first language, Auslan.

The first son, 15, hearing, was attending a mainstream secondary school that had a facility for deaf students, and this meant that his deaf siblings could attend the same school. He was equally fluent in English and Auslan at home and at school.

The daughter, 13, severely deaf from birth, used Auslan unless forced to try to communicate with hearing teachers or people in the public domain. She attended the same secondary school as her brother, within the deaf facility. Previously she had attended a segregated school for the deaf.

The second son, 11, profoundly deaf, used Auslan almost exclusively. He attended a mainstream primary school, which also had a facility for deaf students. Previously he too had attended a segregated school for the deaf.

Family Setting 2 – This second family unit consisted of a deaf mother of three hearing children and two deaf children, and a second deaf mother of one deaf son. Neither of the mothers worked on a full-time basis. Culturally the family was comfortable in the deaf community, with the three deaf children attending a large segregated school for the deaf, and the three hearing children attending local mainstream schools. Some were involved in local sport and recreation activities with their friends, as well as attending some specific deaf community sport and activities. The language used at home was a mixture of Auslan and English, although during the videoing the deaf members of the family mentioned that the hearing members often used English and did not always include the deaf members. The following table summarised the characteristics of the participants in setting 4. Within the family column, the family in which the participant grew up is described. The 'language used at work' column also includes the language used by the children at school.

Table 5 – Participants in Family Setting 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family 2</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Deafness</th>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Identity</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Language at home</th>
<th>Language at work/school</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participant I (mother)</td>
<td>40-50</td>
<td>Profound</td>
<td>Deaf family.</td>
<td>Identified as culturally deaf</td>
<td>Home duties</td>
<td>Auslan</td>
<td>Auslan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Daughter</td>
<td>15-20</td>
<td>Hearing</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Identified as hearing</td>
<td>Casual work</td>
<td>English and Auslan</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second daughter</td>
<td>15-20</td>
<td>Hearing</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Identified as hearing</td>
<td>Casual work</td>
<td>English and Auslan</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third daughter</td>
<td>10-15</td>
<td>Profound</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Identified as culturally deaf</td>
<td>Secondary student at a school for the deaf</td>
<td>Auslan</td>
<td>Auslan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Son</td>
<td>10-15</td>
<td>Profound</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Identified as culturally deaf</td>
<td>Secondary student at a school for the deaf</td>
<td>Auslan</td>
<td>Auslan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth daughter</td>
<td>10-15</td>
<td>Hearing</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Identified as hearing</td>
<td>Secondary mainstream school student</td>
<td>English and Auslan</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant J (mother)</td>
<td>40-50</td>
<td>Profound</td>
<td>Hearing family</td>
<td>Identified as culturally deaf</td>
<td>Home duties</td>
<td>Auslan</td>
<td>Auslan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Son</td>
<td>15-20</td>
<td>Profound</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Identified as culturally deaf</td>
<td>Secondary student at a school for the deaf</td>
<td>Auslan</td>
<td>Auslan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Participant J, the mother,** was born deaf and attended a Roman Catholic school for the deaf which insisted on oral skills and no signing. She was born into a deaf family, and the communication used at home was Auslan with the Irish Catholic fingerspelling alphabet as well as the two-handed alphabet. All her children could communicate fluently in Auslan incorporating either alphabet.

**The first daughter** was hearing and attended a local mainstream secondary school, with no other children from deaf families, and no deaf students. She was fluent in Auslan and English and used both to communicate with the different members of the family.

**The second daughter** was also hearing and attended the same school as her older sister. She was equally fluent in both English and Auslan.

**The third daughter** was born deaf and attended a school for the deaf in Melbourne. She used mainly Auslan with the family.

**The first son** was born deaf and attended the same school for the deaf in Melbourne. He used mainly Auslan with the family.

**The fourth daughter** was hearing and attended the same local secondary school as her older sisters. She used both Auslan and English to communicate with the different members of the family.

**Participant J, the second mother,** was born deaf and grew up with her hearing family. She had attended a school for the deaf in another state before leaving for work, marrying, having a son, and later moving to Melbourne as an adult. She used Auslan to communicate with all the children.

**The second son** was deaf from birth, and had attended a school for the deaf in another state before moving with his mother to Melbourne. He attended a school for the deaf in Melbourne and used Auslan to communicate with all the members of the family.

### 5.4 Method of Data Collection

Contacting each group to arrange a suitable time to visit and set up the video camera in a suitable room was challenging for several reasons. The Workplace Settings required a time of the week when it was quiet, all three staff were present at the same time, and other staff were not inconvenienced by the interruption. In the end it was actually simpler to arrange these settings for data collection than it was to visit the homes of the families. Trying to set up a time when all of the family were at home at the same time and available for the video session became very involved and required a great deal of patience. Usually the activities of the children (sport or social) meant that each time a weekend appointment was made it had to be put off for another time. Fortunately, because the families had volunteered, they were all keen
to be involved in the research, and they kept contacting me by email to reschedule our arrangements.

Each group was asked to sit in a relaxed way so that their conversation could be videotaped, and all signs captured by the camera. Despite the aim of a relaxed setting, difficulties were created because the cramped signing space impacted on their level of comfort during the conversation. The natural circular setting for comfortable signed communication was not possible, as all subjects needed to be facing the camera. This meant that subjects could not easily and naturally look at each other during the conversation. Except in Workplace Setting 1, all subjects found the camera intimidating at first, although there seemed to be no overt reaction to the presence of the researcher in the role of observer and participant in the discussion. In each setting the participants were told the aim of the data collection was to gather evidence of the way language (Auslan and spoken English) was used by bilingual deaf adults in conversation. Each conversation was videoed for at least 45 minutes, with Workplace Setting 1 and Family Setting 1 each providing 1 hour of video tape.

Questions were asked by the researcher to all the participants at different times to prompt the conversation in all settings. These questions occurred naturally as the conversation progressed, and related to topics that the participants were comfortable and relaxed talking about. They were asked if the participants looked at the camera and indicated that they had run out of things to discuss or if the participants were not sure what to talk about. In addition, within the family settings, the conversations occasionally became heated between the non-participant children or when the hearing children started to dominate the conversation. By asking questions 3, 4, 6 and 7, I was able to redirect the conversation back to include the participant adults.

1. Do you speak English to the hearing children or do you sign all the time at home?
2. Between the school for the deaf and the mainstream school with a deaf facility, which school was better and why?
3. Can you remember how you learned English?
4. Can you remember how you learned Auslan?
5. Can you hear or do you lip-read?

Questions directed to the hearing children in two settings were:
6. Is it easier for your parents to visit the school with the deaf facility than it was at the other school?
7. How do you communicate with your parents? Do you sign or use voice sometimes?

In addition to these interposed questions from the researcher, several other factors impacted on the conversations in each setting:
Workplace Setting 1:
1. Other staff were wandering in and out of the staffroom where the conversation took place and this distracted the participants from the videoing, and interrupted their own conversation, as they turned to speak to the new interlocutor.
2. One hearing member of staff joined the conversation during the videoing, and was accepted by the participants into the conversation.
3. The group adjourned to another room for morning tea, with more hearing staff and the conversation then involved far more use of voice, code-switching and simultaneous production of both languages by the deaf participants.

Workplace Setting 2:
1. The room in this setting was very small with a table in front of the participants. The participants had to be asked to sign above the height of the table to ensure the camera captured all the signing, and the hands were not obscured by the table.
2. The lighting in this setting was distorted somewhat by the glare from sun through windows in the small room. The data gathered was more difficult to transcribe as some facial expressions were difficult to decipher in the glare.
3. Unlike the first setting where the participants had been working together for some years and had a very friendly relationship, this group of participants had only worked together for a short time. This impacted on the kind of conversation they shared with each other. Their conversation tended to be less smooth in the transitions and turn-taking.

Family Setting 1:
1. The family cat was attracted to the light on the camera and interrupted proceedings several times to investigate. The children found this most amusing, and it helped to create a relaxed atmosphere.
2. The father directed his remarks to the camera and the researcher, rather than to the rest of the family, and this led to two conversations happening simultaneously. The other members of the family sometimes resumed their own discussion while the father was addressing the camera.

Family Setting 2:
1. The large family group involved eight people grouped around a large kitchen table for the videoing. This caused more movement of the camera back and forth to catch all the conversation on the tape, and sometimes utterances had occurred before I was able to get the speaker/signer on camera.
2. Another issue of turn-taking was that the hearing siblings often interjected with comments or questions in response to comments from the participants. The deaf siblings tended to wait until their turn was indicated by the adult participants, or they were directly asked a question by another family member. The unique dynamics of having so many hearing and deaf members of a family in conversation became more apparent in this setting.
3. Other family visitors were present in the house during the videoing and occasionally wandered into the kitchen and observed the conversation. This caused some distraction as heads were turned to see who was entering the room, although no participant actually talked to any of the observers.

5.4.1 The Task.
In each setting the subjects were asked to converse with each other about their school life (either now or in the past), and compare it to the school life of their hearing siblings or to current practices in schools for deaf and hearing students. They were asked to converse with each other and not directly to the video camera (although not always successfully).

In Workplace Setting 1 and Family Setting 1 very little intervention was required from the researcher, and the conversation was almost entirely directed by the participants. In Workplace Setting 2 and Family Setting 2 the participants seemed to lack the same confidence and sought more help from the researcher (by looking at the camera and occasionally laughing) to keep the conversation going.

5.4.2 The Observer’s Paradox
Sociolinguistics involves the study of natural language use, but the only way to study it is to observe it. As soon as a sociolinguist observes language use, it is of course no longer natural! Labov, who was the first to describe this paradox, stated “Our goal is to observe how people use language when they are not being observed” (Labov, 1972: 61). Ethically, participants should be informed that they are being observed, and this can cause a change from their natural language use. All the participants in this study were aware that they were ‘performing’ for the camera. The time of the videoing had been arranged beforehand, and the presence of the video camera immediately indicated an artificial situation to the participants. Despite the fact that each of the settings would have been non-threatening (being in a familiar family or work situation), the camera and the researcher would have had some effect on the signing that occurred. For the purposes of this research, a video camera was the only resource available to capture this visual language that has no written form. This imposed a limitation on the kind of data collected, and the researcher was a necessary part of the procedure to control the camera. Other than secretly videoing subjects without their knowledge, no other course was available for this kind of data collection. The main strategy used to counteract this paradox was to encourage the participants to discuss a topic that was familiar and comfortable enough that they would perhaps forget that they were being observed and also forget the camera was even there.
5.4.3 Communicative Environment
In all settings the communicative environment was light, friendly and included laughter and humour. Only in Workplace Setting 2 did the participants seem less relaxed, as they did not know each other as well as the participants in the other three settings.

The communication used in each conversation was primarily monolingual sign. A few of the participants sometimes used spoken English simultaneously with Auslan. Whenever the researcher intervened in the discussions with a question, it was asked using Auslan in simultaneous production with English, in order that the question would be recorded on the video, and that all the deaf and hearing participants in the families would receive the question at the same time. In addition, the use of voice by the researcher gave an opportunity to see if any switching would occur from Auslan to spoken English immediately after the question, or indeed any other contact outcome. (The simultaneous use of spoken English and some Auslan signs is still common practice by some teachers of the deaf in educational settings. As has been described in Chapter 4, this practice has influenced the way many deaf people communicate, and they are often unaware of their own bilingual behaviour.)

5.4.4 Norms and Genre of the interactions
The genre of each setting was that of a conversation between acquaintances or friends. The same banter and interaction occurred as in any friendly exchange of workmates or families.

The conditions of the interactions were that:
1. The researcher did not participate in the discussions, but could intervene with questions to keep the conversation running smoothly. In WorkPlace Setting 2 and Family Setting 2 the participants relied more heavily on this intervention by the researcher to support their conversations.
2. The conversations between the participants did not include the researcher for any length of time. This was violated only by Participant H (father) in Family Setting 1, when he attempted to start up a conversation with the researcher while other members of the family continued their side of the discussion with each other.

5.5 Data

5.5.1 Data description
Approximately four hours of data were collected for this study, between forty-five minutes and one hour from each setting. Each hour of video was transcribed into English, and the samples of language use that were of interest for this research, including use of fingerspelling, name signs, examples of transference of features of English into Auslan, and most uniquely examples of simultaneous use of both languages (contact signing) were transcribed in the style described in 5.5.2. A total of 33 examples were identified and transcribed for analysis in this study. This was the total of all the kinds of language use in the data. Only one example of
each kind was included for discussion as many examples were repeatedly used by each of the participants. Multiple examples of the use of fingerspelling and name signs were used by the deaf participants in each setting, and one example of each kind was transcribed in detail for discussion of these features of language use in Auslan and English. Instances of transference from English into Auslan were found in each of the settings and transcribed for the data analysis in following chapters. In the workplace settings, some instances of simultaneous use were found. In both the family settings, however, the parents used simultaneous use several times in their communication with the children, particularly the hearing children. All of these examples were transcribed for the analysis and discussion. (See chapters 6, 7 and 8). The data revealed several other interesting features of the language use of the participants and examples of these were also transcribed for the discussion in Chapters 6, 7 and 8.

All of the data in this study was collected in a face-to-face conversational setting, and no telephones, telephone typewriters (TTYs), or written forms of communication were used. This would be an interesting separate area of research, as the use of TTYs, faxes, emails and most notably SMS text message services on mobile phones, has resulted in written forms of English by deaf and hearing people that more closely resemble spoken constructions.

5.5.2 Transcription method
As the videoing of each group was completed, I began the analysis of the data, a process that was continuous throughout the study. Watching each video involved checking for interaction events, turn-taking, code-switching, and other forms of language use. Draft transcription was done of all the data, allowing me to find relevant data to transcribe accurately. Detailed transcription was done on the 33 samples of interest and relevance to this study. As there is no written form of Auslan, transcription involved several parallel lines describing each part of the signed and spoken communication, as well as facial expression, mouth patterns, and a gloss of the English translation of the signs. This line in the transcription is labeled SIGN GLOSS as the term GLOSS is used differently for sign transcription than in conventional linguistic glossing – see discussion and table of conventions below. The lines are labelled: 

VOICE (the vocalized or spoken English part of the utterance),

MOUTH PATTERN (the mouthing and lip patterns without vocalization),

NON-MANUAL FEATURES (the relevant facial expression including movement of eye-brows, chin, head and shoulders etc),

SIGN GLOSS (showing the meaning of the Auslan signs as well as any fingerspelling)

ENGLISH MEANING (translation of the meaning of the whole utterance).

An example of a transcription is shown here from Participant B in Workplace Setting 1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B</th>
<th>VOICE</th>
<th>MOUTH PATTERN</th>
<th>NM FEATURES</th>
<th>SIGN GLOSS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Remember walk</td>
<td>Eye gaze to C</td>
<td>WALK REMEMBER WALK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ENGLISH MEANING  

I remember walking

VOICE

MOUTH PATTERN

School

in the bath

Bath

bed

bed

NM FEATURES

Eye gaze to book  Tap feet  Eye gaze to C  Smile  Laugh

SIGN GLOSS

SCHOOL BOOK OPEN CLOSE HOME BOOK BATH BOOK BED BOOK

to school reading books,  home again,  in the bath  and in bed.

This form of transcription seemed to allow for the reader not familiar with Auslan to follow the meaning of the utterance, as well as clarifying the difference between use of English Voice with an Auslan sign, or the use of Mouth Patterns (either relating to the Auslan or relating to an English word) with the Auslan. The line for Non-Manual Features allowed for other information about eye gaze, facial expression and head movement to be included. A switch, transference or simultaneous production was indicated by highlighting the spoken English words and Auslan signs in BOLD.

The SIGN GLOSS line contains information about the signs used in the utterance, but is not a complete linguistic grammatical glossing. In the sign linguistics literature, the word ‘gloss’ is conventionally used to mean the signs of the sign language in a written form. However in spoken language linguistics, the term ‘gloss’ refers to a morpheme by morpheme transcription of the utterance. I decided to use the term SIGN GLOSS to avoid any confusion between sign or spoken linguistics. Some of the transcription in this line however, will include some brief morphemic terms such as PRO (pronoun), POSS (possessive pronoun), and POINT (a sign with the index finger which may be a locative or a determiner). Auslan does not have distinct pronoun signs for ‘he/she/it. The index pointing sign is sometimes used in a way that is analogous to the way pronouns are used in spoken English (Schembri & Johnston, 2006). It can be located in three places: PRO₁ (close to the body of the signer) used for first person I or We; PRO₂ (pointed at the addressee) used for second person You; and PRO₃ (away from the body of the signer, pointed at some other place) used for third person He/she/it. This POINT sign can also refer to a place that has been discussed previously by name, and is then referenced in the same location in space by the POINT.

In a similar way, the location of other signs may be indicated by giving the gloss for the sign such as CHAIR, followed by LOC₁ indicating that the sign was produced closer to the signer’s body, in the middle of the signing space. LOC₂ may be to the left or right of the original sign placement or it could be further out from the body. LOC₃ then refers to the third placement of the same sign. The location of a sign can also be incorporated into the gloss of the sign itself, with the subscript number following the sign, as in CHAIR₁. This means the sign was produced near to the signer’s body. The transcription in this study will include this feature of incorporation of the location of a sign. (See Table 5 below.)
This location parameter can be used for pluralisation as well as a sequence of events involving the same topic. In this way the gloss line can show the sign used and the meaning in English, as well as the additional grammatical features of inflection for pluralisation, or intensity. In the example given above, the reader will note that there is no pronoun ‘I’ at the start of the utterance, because the pronoun was established earlier in the conversation. The participant had established that she was talking about herself and the ‘I’ was understood by the other participants. (This is akin to some ‘pro-drop’ spoken languages, such as Spanish, Italian, Greek and Slavic languages, where the pronoun can be dropped, but the verb is conjugated and gives the listener the information about the pronoun.) Auslan can inflect the verb to indicate the pronominal reference but often the subject is established at the start and the same pronoun is understood until a new pronoun is introduced by the speaker. In Auslan, according to Johnston (1998: 590) “Unlike English, ‘I’ is often not signed at all unless it is stressed”. Schembri & Johnston (2006) found that pronouns are often deleted because it is clear from the context, and many plain verbs occur without any noun or pronoun representing the actor.

In sign linguistic research, signs are glossed in UPPER case, and the Voice and Mouth Pattern components are shown in lower case. The Voice and Mouth Pattern lines are in italics in this study to show the non-manual components quite clearly. Non-manual features such as ‘grin’ for the action of the mouth and ‘up’ for the movement of the raised eyebrows are fairly self-explanatory. If the brow movement is ‘up’ for a question, the transcription will show ‘brows up?’ The use of the term Mouth Pattern is to distinguish between the vocalized components of the communication and any sub-vocalised patterns that could be seen on the mouth. Investigation into whether a pattern was related to English words, or whether it could be part of the formational structure of a sign was not part of this study. Of interest, however, was the occurrence of the mouth patterns and whether they were the usual pattern for either the English word or the Auslan sign. (See Chapter 2 for a full discussion of the issues surrounding Mouth Patterns). In the majority of examples from this study, the mouth pattern matched the English word as it was vocalized, and so the transcription shows the English word. Often, the articulation did not sound like the complete English word, but as it was obviously the mouth pattern that conformed to the spoken language, it was transcribed in full. In only one case in this data did the mouth pattern deviate from that normally associated with Auslan, and for this I used a phonetic transcription. For the rest I used English orthography, and followed the practice of Sutton-Spence & Day (2001: 71) who stated “Difficulties in deciding what was not seen because it had not been produced and what had been produced but was not visible meant that we did not attempt to distinguish full or partly articulated mouthings”. It was enough to be able to distinguish between the mouth patterns that related to spoken English and those that related to Auslan. Vogt-Svendsen (2001:37) also concluded from her data that the transcription of the mouth patterns as two separate forms may be useful if it is necessary to look for the differences of distribution of each. “In my opinion,
however, it will usually be most convenient to use the same transcription system and treat them as one single type”. (Vogt-Svendsen, 2001: 37). I followed this procedure for my transcription.

Fingerspelling is indicated by a hyphen between the letters of the word and between successive words in a fingerspelt phrase. An example is M-T-E-R-I-N Secondary College, or S-T-G-A-B-R-I-E-L. There is no sign or visual indication convention for the juncture between signs or fingerspelt ‘words’ in Auslan, and so I have extended the hyphen pattern to the juncture between the two words Mt Erin, so they are shown in a continuous pattern. This is how they would usually be fingerspelt.

Fingerspelling that has become part of the core lexicon of Auslan (lexicalized fingerspelling) is indicated by the use of # preceding the word. Thus #CLUB indicates that the sign CLUB was not used, but instead the fingerspelled form was used.

SIGNS that are a compound of two signs or one sign with a modified action for the negative meaning are indicated by a hyphen between the two gloss words of the sign, as in NOT-WANT. Signers are often found to produce two signs at the same time, one with the left hand and one with the right hand. This is indicated by = between the two glosses, as in SCHOOL=THERE, meaning ‘the school that was there, in that place.’ (See Table 5 below.)

The following is a table of the transcription conventions used in this study, based on the conventions as shown in Johnston (1998: 576) and incorporating other conventions from Johnston (1991) and my own conventions.

**Table 6 – Transcription conventions used in this study:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transcription Feature</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LH RH BH</td>
<td>Left hand, Right Hand, Both Hands</td>
<td>RH to mouth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIGN GLOSS</td>
<td>Meaning of a sign</td>
<td>CHAIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLOSS-GLOSS</td>
<td>Two or more word gloss</td>
<td>BOTH-OF-US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLOSS+GLOSS</td>
<td>Gloss with a second sign that negates the meaning of the first sign</td>
<td>WITH+OUT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLOSS+++</td>
<td>A repeated sign</td>
<td>JUMP++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLOSS=GLOSS</td>
<td>Two signs made at the same time on left and right hands</td>
<td>SCHOOL=POINT = That school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLOSS−</td>
<td>Direction of sign is to the signer as in ‘Teach-me’.</td>
<td>TEACH−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLOSS(SE)</td>
<td>A contrived Signed English sign not usually used with Auslan</td>
<td>SIZE(SE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-L-O-S-S</td>
<td>Fingerspelt word</td>
<td>B-U-T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLOSS1, 2 etc.</td>
<td>Incorporation of location 1 = near or on the signer 2 = near or at the addressee 3 = away from 1 and 2.</td>
<td>CHAIR1 CHAIR2 CHAIR3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Non-Manual Features

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gesture</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Smile</td>
<td>The facial expression and other features are shown on a bar above the GLOSS to which they apply.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head tilt down/up</td>
<td>Brows up? (Indicates eyebrows up for a question)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brows up</td>
<td>Eye gaze to………</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nod</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### GLOSS-YEAR-OLD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TWO-HALF-YEAR-OLD</td>
<td>The number sign is made with initial contact on the nose to signify years of age.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWO-HALF-YEAR-OLD</td>
<td>Two and a half years old.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PROCL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LH-PROCL RH-PICK</td>
<td>A sign using a proform classifier to represent an object</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5.5.3 Attitudes to Auslan and Deafness Observed in the Data

Each of the following four issues surrounding deafness and Auslan can be seen in the transcribed examples from the data and highlight the attitudes of the participants towards their language.

Firstly, each of the deaf adults, during their discussions of family life, early school days and learning experiences, were observed to express similar attitudes to being deaf and using
Auslan. The first common issue concerned the lack of sign language fluency of the teachers in the segregated schools for the deaf. (All the participants, except one, were educated in Australia, and their teachers used forms of English and Australian signs. The one exception was educated in Britain, but the experience with teachers and their fluency in the sign language seemed to be the same). All remarked on their repetitive education year after year, even in the secondary years of schooling.

The second issue to be expressed was the positive and transparent communication of the playground in the schools for the deaf. All the participants who attended schools for the deaf, remembered that as children they could share their stories and feelings quite naturally with each other with no barriers, and yet when they returned to the classroom communication became stilted, restricted, and in many cases punitive as teachers resorted to physical means of controlling the student behaviour. Some participants also commented on their return home at the end of the day or after a term of boarding, to a home with very limited or no communication. Most of their enjoyment of school was their ability to join in with others who used the same language.

The third issue that emerged in the data was the sense of isolation from both the mainstream teachers and the other students by those adults who had attended regular mainstream education during their early primary and secondary years. This sense of isolation was accompanied by a belief that he/she was the only deaf person in the world, as they never knew another deaf person. All remarked on their positive feelings of shock and surprise when they did finally meet another deaf person (usually in their late teens), and their joy at their “home-coming” into the deaf community.

The last issue that consistently emerged, both from the adults and the children in the families, was the standard of education experienced in the regular mainstream schools compared to that in the segregated schools for the deaf. The social environment and more natural communication between students in the schools for the deaf was not seen as a strong enough reason to ignore the better education offered in the regular mainstream schools.

Each of the above issues is discussed in detail in Chapter 7, as they emerged in the data.

5.6 Summary
In this chapter I have described the theoretical framework of my research and the methods of selection and data collection that I chose to use. I have discussed the various aspects of the methodology including the collection of data by video camera, in small group settings, with task as provided to the participants. Some of the factors that impacted on the naturalistic nature of the data collection were discussed. A table of the transcription conventions is provided for reference to Chapter 6, 7 and 8. I have highlighted some of the language and
identity issues surrounding Auslan and deaf education settings that emerged in the videoed discussions, and these will be discussed in more detail in Chapter 7. These included the lack of sign language fluency of teachers in schools for the deaf, the positive shared communication with other deaf children in the playground, the sense of isolation from the teachers and students in mainstream settings, and the perceived standard of education in segregated schools for the deaf compared to that in mainstream schools. The following chapters examine the data from linguistic, sociolinguistic and psycholinguistic perspectives.
Chapter 6 - Analysis of Results – Linguistic Perspective

Chapter 6 will present an analysis of the data from a linguistic perspective. The fingerspelling observed in the data is discussed, both lexicalized patterns and full fingerspelling, as well as some of the functional reasons for its use. One example of every kind of fingerspelling was transcribed and discussed. The discussion will also focus on the examples of semantic and syntactic transference from English into Auslan, and the simultaneous use of Auslan and English, as well as the conditions under which these occurred in the data. The functional reasons for fingerspelling and the reasons or purpose of some of the other language contact outcomes are formulated on the basis of observation at the time of data collection and viewing the video recordings during transcriptions. The way the contact outcomes occurred were compared with the list of functions by Sutton-Spence and Woll (1999) and factors influencing outcomes as proposed by Clyne (1991).

6.1 Fingerspelling

Fingerspelling is one of the unique outcomes of the contact situation between a sign language and a spoken language. Fingerspelling of whole English words, abbreviations, acronyms and single letter lexicalised signs is commonly used in Auslan to represent the English word or term, usually when there is no sign available, or sometimes even when there is a sign available, to clarify in cases of ambiguity. Some linguists have concluded that fingerspelling is a representation of an English event (but not an English event itself) occurring in the sign language (Ann, 2001; Sutton-Spence & Woll, 1999; Davis, 1989). In fact, Davis compared the action of fingerspelling a word to the English phonological event of spelling out or naming the letters of a Spanish word such as junta [jei yu en ti ei]. (Sic, Davis, 1989: 97). Lucas (2001: 6) refers to the contact phenomenon of fingerspelling as the unique contact between the writing system developed to represent a spoken language and the sign language. Sutton-Spence & Woll (1999: 16) also refer to fingerspelling as representing the written form of English, not the spoken form. “Fingerspelling is not BSL though, because it does not use BSL vocabulary”. Linguists seem to be in agreement that fingerspelling is a unique feature of sign/spoken language contact situations and it functions somewhere between the sign language and the spoken language. If this is true, then terms such as ‘loan phenomena’ and ‘borrowed features’, which are often used in discussion of sign/spoken language contact situations are not helpful in understanding the place of fingerspelling, even when considering code-switching. Sometimes the fingerspelling is integrated into the sign language and sometimes it is not. Signers ‘bring over’ the orthographic form of English letters and represent them in a visual way on the hands for Auslan. Whether the fingerspelled words are integrated or not depends on whether they are able to be signed in an alternative way, and whether the fingerspelt pattern has taken on a form of its own to become a lexicalised form. If there is no other way of representing the words, as for proper names and addresses, then I suggest they
can be considered unintegrated forms of transference (as defined by Clyne, 1991 & 2003). The inevitability and need for this form of representation becomes more understandable as there is no alternative way to manually show these forms except to resort to written language.

On the other hand a great deal of fingerspelling in sign language (including Auslan) is lexicalised (See section 2.2.2.2 for a discussion of full fingerspelling and lexicalised fingerspelling). In this form the fingerspelling would be considered to be integrated. It has become part of the core lexicon of Auslan so that it is equivalent to signs when used. Many of the examples in this chapter may have been transference when first used, but they have been used repeatedly until they have become lexicalised into Auslan.

### 6.1.1 Proper nouns – names of people places and address

The first and most notable feature appearing in the data collected from all four settings was the use of fingerspelling for proper nouns, (names and addresses) etc. In common with other sign/spoken language pairs such as BSL/English and ASL/English (Sutton-Spence & Woll, 1999; Valli & Lucas, 2000), proper nouns from English can be represented in Auslan by fingerspelled forms of the written English terms (Schembri & Johnston 2007b). The use of fingerspelling in these situations to convey the information from English seems inevitable.

Sutton-Spence & Woll (1999: 17) estimated that fingerspelling used for the names of places and people and for whole words that did not have equivalents in BSL accounted for about a third of all uses. Schembri & Johnston (2007b) found that common nouns were the most frequently fingerspelled terms, and proper nouns (although at 32.1%) were second in frequency of use. Other reasons included clarification when the sign was new or was a regional sign unknown to the interlocutor, or to introduce a new concept that did not yet have a specific sign, and even when there was a sign, to be specific about the meaning of the sign. (See Section 2.2.2.2 for a discussion of these reasons). As in BSL, fingerspelling is commonly used in Auslan for the names of people and places and the following examples of its use in this study support the proposition that it constitutes more than a third of all uses of fingerspelling. Schembri & Johnston (2007b) found that the number of fingerspelled words increased for those aged fifty and over, and even more for those aged seventy and over. All the adult participants in this study (except one) were aged between thirty and fifty years of age, and this would influence the number of words fingerspelt in this study. Participant F attended a school which enforced oralism, and he explained that he came to learn Auslan later when he was approximately nineteen years of age.

In this study the percentage of fingerspelling of common nouns was 44%, and fingerspelling of proper nouns fingerspelled was 38%, which is consistent with Schembri and Johnston’s findings. Fingerspelling of other parts of speech accounted for the other 18%. It is acknowledged that the number of proper nouns fingerspelled in this study was clearly
weighted due to the fact that the discussion surrounded school days which has to included names of former schools, teachers and pupils.

**Participant A** – This participant referred to several teachers from her time at school by name and fingerspelled these names as well as the names of schools she attended and days of the week: M-I-K-E-E-G-A-N; A-S-H – her own name; P-E-J – formerly Princess Elizabeth Kindergarten, later known as Princess Elizabeth Junior School; V-S-D-C – Victorian School for Deaf Children; T-A-Y-L-O-R-C-O-L-L-E-G-E – a mainstream college in the city. All of these were forms of representation that could not be signed any other way.

**Participant B** – Names of schools and places were fingerspelled: V-S-D-C; S-T- K-I-L-D-A (referring to the school on St Kilda Rd which was VSDC); D-E-P-T- EDUCATION (a combination of fingerspelling one word and signing the second term).

**Participant C** – Names of teachers and schools were fingerspelled: V-S-D-C; M-I-K-E-E-G-A-N; J-U-N-E-B-E-R-R-Y; S-T-G-A-B-R-I-E-L (St Gabriel’s School for Deaf children in Sydney); S-Y (Sydney); R-C (Roman Catholic).


**Participant E** – M-T-P-L-E-A-S-A-N-T (a school in England); M-E-R-M-A-I-D-T-A-L-E (name of a fairy tale), R-M-I-T; L-A (Los Angeles - this was fingerspelled firstly using the Auslan two-handed alphabet and a second time, using the one-handed ASL alphabet); L-O-N-D-O-N; B-S-L (British Sign Language).

**Participant F** – P-O-R-T-S-E-A (Delgany School for the Deaf in Portsea); P-O-R (Portsea); QUEEN-C-L-I-F-F (Queenscliff, another combination of a sign with fingerspelling to convey the English name); R-C; S-Y; S-T-G-A-B-R-I-E-L; S-T-K-I-L-D-A (The school for the deaf on St Kilda Rd in Melbourne); M-O-N-A-S-H (Monash Secondary College Deaf Facility); C-H-R-I-S-T-I-N-E-T-H-O-M-A-S.

**Participant G** – M-T-E-R-I-N (Mt Erin Secondary College Deaf Facility); V-E-R-M-O-N-T (Vermont Secondary College); V-S-D-C; S-C-O-R-E-S-B-Y (referring to a football club); E-B-S-U (football club), P-O-P-E-Y-E (the cartoon character); J-O-S-H (the name of the child).


Participant J – T-O-W-N-S-E-N-D-H-O-U-S-E (a school for deaf children in Adelaide); T-H (Townsend House); B-R-I-G-H-T-O-N-P-P (Brighton Primary School in Adelaide, with a deaf facility); B-B (Brighton Primary School); S-E-A-C-O-M-B-E (a secondary school in Adelaide with a deaf facility); V-C-D. This participant also referred to teachers who assisted her son with English tutoring: M-R-G and M-R-T (Mr G and Mr T, using the first initial of their names). Her eye gaze at this point was at her son, who nodded in recognition of these shortened forms of the names of the teachers.

It can be seen from the fingerspelled names above, that many were recurring as all the participants repeatedly referred to some of the same schools or facilities for the deaf in their conversation. In all of the above uses of fingerspelling there was no alternative way of expressing the name of the person, other than the use of name signs (see Section 3.1.4 for a discussion of name signs), which may not have been known to the other participants in the setting. Not all the schools or facilities had name signs, and of those that did, some such as St Gabriel’s School in Sydney and St Mary’s School for the Deaf at Portsea, had a very similar name sign, differing only in handshape. (The sign for St Gabriel’s School is based on the Irish alphabet “G” and for St Mary’s the sign is based on the Irish alphabet “P” for Portsea.) This may have been the motivation for the continued use of fingerspelling for the name sof schools or people. In each of the four settings the conversation was between participants who had not all shared the same educational experience and therefore the name signs for the schools were not necessarily shared knowledge.

The following table shows the total times the more common names were fingerspelled in all four settings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proper Name</th>
<th>Number of tokens</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P-E-J</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V-S-D-C</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-T-K-I-L-D-A</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-O-R-T-S-E-A</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-T-G-A-B-R-I-E-L</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V-C-D</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-M-I-T</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-M-I-T</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-Y</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All other proper names only occurred once as used by any one of the informants.

Similarly, the English titles of many familiar books and stories that do not have name signs were typically expressed by fingerspelling the title. The transcription of these and the discussion is included in Chapter 7. They included “Snow White and the Seven Dwarfs”, “The Mermaid’s Tale” and “Popeye”.

6.1.2 Fingerspelling for Other Reasons

Fingerspelling for other reasons will include forms of Auslan that are actually lexicalised fingerspelling forms. Originally they were spelled in full, but have become so integrated into Auslan that they have become a sign. These are noted along with the examples of full fingerspelling, as examples of patterns used. Personal interviews with deaf Auslan teachers (some of whom were also qualified linguists) confirmed that the examples below are not all considered to be lexicalised in the Auslan community, although many are lexicalised in BSL and in ASL. It must be acknowledged here that this is self-reported data, collected after the thesis had been largely completed, and as such may not be entirely reliable. Those examples that all readily agreed are lexicalised are notated with the use of #. In this way these words function as signs, but it is interesting to see which terms have become lexicalised and which are still considered to be full fingerspelling. Many are possibly becoming lexicalised, but when fingerspelled they appear clearly with each individual letter seen in full.

Participant A - The use of fingerspelling for #M-FRI – Monday to Friday was an example of the seventh reason stated by Sutton-Spence & Woll, where it has become part of the core lexicon of Auslan. Days of the week are commonly represented in the deaf community by the first one, two or three letters of the English name, and have become an integrated form of transference or lexicalised into Auslan. In other words they are part of the core lexicon of Auslan, although Johnston & Schembri (2007: 181) still list these forms as part of the broad range of borrowings (sic) from English into Auslan, as “English words that are abbreviated”.

R-E-G-U-L-A-R, R-E-C-O-G-N-I-S-E - both of these occurred in a retelling of the story about one teacher who asked the meaning of certain signs the students had used in the classroom. As the students tried to explain the meaning of a sign [ALWAYS GO THERE], the teacher wrote the English word for the same meaning on the blackboard – ‘regular’. The participant explained how she began to learn that both Auslan and English had a place in her world and that there was a relationship between both languages. The fingerspelling of R-E-G-U-L-A-R and R-E-C-O-G-N-I-S-E related to the second of the uses as defined by Sutton-Spence & Woll in section 6.1.1, where a new concept was learned in English, for which she already
knew the Auslan sign and meaning. The communicative effect was to show her knowledge of both languages to her interlocutors and also to show how she first gained this knowledge.

B-O-S-S-Y – Once again recounting the word used by a teacher written in a report card and read to her by her mother. One way to sign this concept is to use a sign more usually meaning ‘boss’ or ‘manager’, but because this word was part of an event in school, and was written in the report card, the story required the specific English word to be clarified. It was spelled out in full by the participant suggesting that although for her it is now a familiar pattern, for others it may not be a lexicalised form. The response from one interlocutor was to use the sign ‘BOSS’ rather than to repeat the fingerspelled from.

R-E-C-E-S-S – A common way of signing this concept of a break in the day equates to ‘PLAYTIME’ or ‘FREE’ and is not the chosen register between adults. Although there was a Signed English sign from her school days it was clearly not used by this participant, possibly because mixing of Signed English signs and Auslan signs was not sanctioned by the majority of the deaf community. Some individuals commonly integrate some signs from Signed English in Auslan but in this instance the participant did not.

R-E-L-Y – There were other ways of signing this concept of relying on other hearing students for notes of class lectures during her time at secondary school. This is an example of the use of fingerspelling for clarification and to emphasise meaning.

T-U-T-O-R – The sign most commonly used to convey this concept would be TEACHER. This participant probably chose to spell the English word to emphasise the extra support she had received in the classroom at this college. This is another example of the second reason as listed by Sutton-Spence & Woll.

#KEY^PUNCH – referring to a job in the workplace in the past. Although there was another sign for a key to a door, it was obviously not the appropriate concept for this data entry process. The fingerspelled form of #KEY has become a lexicalised sign in Auslan. The sign for PUNCH was a classifier sign which was dependent on the word ‘key’ for its context, and in another context it would indicate other kinds of ‘punching’. This is an example of what Johnston & Schembri (2007: 183) refer to as a loan translation where the English word is translated literally into Auslan [ ] “creating signs that pass into the language without notice, such as SUPPORT^GROUP or SPORT^CAR ‘sports car’.” This kind of semantic transference is widely used in the signing community. (Johnston & Schembri, 2007; Sutton-Spence & Woll, 1999).

#DO – as used in MUM #DO SHOP: Auslan has not traditionally had an auxiliary verb meaning ‘do’ as in this example, where it could have been expressed as MUM SHOP or MUM
GO SHOP. Johnston and Schembri (2007: 177) state that “The fingerspelled D-O, for example, is most often used only as a main verb in Auslan (TOMORROW PRO-2 D-O WHAT? ‘What are you doing tomorrow?’), and less often as an auxiliary verb (as in the English example ‘what do you want?’).” The #D-O is a syntactical integrated transfer from English that is seen in several transcribed examples in this study. It has become a lexicalised form in Auslan now.

PRO, S-P-Y WITH POSS, LITTLE EYE START WITH – This was recounting a game which was played in the classroom with all the children. The whole phrase constituted a semantic transference into Auslan, and the only word that was fingerspelt was ‘spy’. This seemed to be for emphasis and clarification of the concept of ‘spying’ because it is a literal translation into Auslan “reflecting the the grammatical and semantic patterning of English rather than those more typical of Auslan.” (Johnston & Schembri, 2007: 183). This was an example of the fourth use of fingerspelling according to Sutton-Spence & Woll (1999: 17).

U-S-E YOUR VOICE PLEASE – a quote from a teacher or parent from school days. The use of fingerspelling in quoting from an English speaker can be used in Auslan to retain the accuracy of the original expression. There is a sign in Auslan for ‘use’ but this participant chose not to use it. See also Sutton-Spence & Woll (1999: 17) and Gumperz, (1982: 78) as they refer to direct quotations influencing the language contact outcomes.

P-O-O-R EDUCATION, TRUE P-O-O-R-L-Y, E-V-E-R-Y#WEEK, H-A-P-P-Y,
Y-E-A-R-TEN, T-A-X-I, K-E-E-P-G-O-I-N-G, N-O-T-I-C-E – All these concepts could have been adequately signed and yet this participant chose to fingerspell them. Some of them are lexicalised forms in Auslan, and some have signs available depending on the context. The reason seemed to be for emphasis and/or clarification. They may also be examples of the sixth reason as stated by Sutton-Spence & Woll in 6.1.1, that it is sometimes quicker to fingerspell them and avoid any confusion than to have to deal with questions of clarification from the interlocutors.

Participant B - MISS #OUT – Traditional usage of Auslan would be the sign MISS (see Johnston 1998: 294), but this participant signed the phrasal verb, including the fingerspelling of #OUT) as used in English. This transfer of an English expression probably had sociolinguistic motivations which will be discussed in Chapter 7.

#BANK – Apart from this lexicalised form, there were at least three signs available for this concept, yet the participant chose to fingerspell it in reference to work opportunities after leaving school. It is not uncommon for the whole English word such as this to be fingerspelled when only a few letters are involved (Johnston & Schembri 2007). This would be considered an integrated transference as it has become lexicalised in Auslan now.
There was at least one commonly used sign for this concept, but it was again an example of a commonly fingerspelled concept. It is possible that it has now become a lexicalised sign, although Johnston & Schembri describe this as being fingerpelled because it is a conjunction borrowed from English.

A comparison of the ‘burning the bra’ episode in women’s liberation, with the discarding of hearing aids at the age of ‘freedom’. There was no specific sign for this concept in Auslan and so the fingerspelling was inevitable. This is an example of the first use of fingerspelling as described by Sutton-Spence & Woll.

Participant C – T-O-T-A-L – Used for emphasis to explain the total lack of early intervention in her day. The workplace for Participant C was an early intervention agency, so a comparison with improved present day intervention services was implied. This fingerspelling is a semantic transfer from English as well as the literal spelling of the word.

These were used for emphasis when relating the experience of removing hearing aids forever. Silence, for many profoundly deaf people, is preferable to the strange and unintelligible noises received through a hearing-aid, and is equated to relaxation. There was a definite slowing of the pace of fingerspelling with this phrase, which coupled with the facial expression, added to the emphasis.

This seemed to be for emphasis as part of sharing the humour of attempting to succeed in ‘hearing a sound’ in audiology sessions in order to receive the reward offered by the teacher - a lolly.

There was a Signed English sign for wood, but it was not commonly used in the deaf community and this participant used the more commonly fingerspelled form. This is another example of an English word translated literally into Auslan as described by Johnston & Schembri (2007).

This was in reference to living with a deaf family where the volume control was always ‘off’ on the TV. None of the family members benefited from the volume, and they had no way on knowing if it was loud or soft, so the usual habit was to keep it turned off. A common way to sign this expression would be a classifier handshape and positioning the sign to show the action of turning or sliding the volume control button but for emphasis Participant C used fingerspelling.

Participant D – B-U-L-L-Y – This was a reason for this participant to immerse herself in books at school, because there was LOT B-U-L-L-Y (a lot of bullying). There were ways of
signing this concept in Auslan using classifier signs to indicate the specific kind of abuse, but perhaps in reference to school bullying this participant wanted to be very clear about her meaning and so used fingerspelling. This may be an example of recent lexicalisation, as there was disagreement amongst the deaf professionals that I consulted in the community as to whether this is lexicalised or not.

#BUT – Signs were available for this sign but as it was a small three-letter word, it was fingerspelled just as easily. Johnston & Schembri (2007: 182) state that "For many Auslan signers #HOW, #BUT and #ABOUT are fully lexicalized signs in which little of the original fingerspelled sequence remains." However in this token, the whole pattern of B-U-T was clearly evident.

#BANK – As with participant B, this could have been signed in several ways, but for emphasis or just for convenience and timesaving, the lexicalised form was used.

Participant E – E-N-G – An abbreviation used and understood by other participants to mean ENGINEERING, a subject studied at university. The same sign could be used when discussing an engine in any vehicle, but as the context was about university study, it was in this case understood to mean the subject of ‘engineering’. It is usually (as in this case) followed by the Auslan sign for ENGINE to clarify the meaning of the abbreviation. There is no Auslan sign specifically for ENGINEERING. It is worth noting here that it is common in Auslan to fingerspell the first three letters of the unfamiliar and multi-syllabic English word to which the signer is referring. It is not in this case any reference to the common English academic abbreviation as in “B. Eng” for Bachelor of Engineering.

H-U-M-I-D - This was an English term that was commonly spelled as there is no equivalent sign in Auslan. Alternative ways of signing the concept may have been available, but this is an example of an English word that does “not have a lexicalised equivalent in Auslan”. (Johnston & Schembri, 2007: 178).

R-E-S-P-I-T-E-WORK – Another English term which does not have an equivalent sign in Auslan and is used frequently by deaf people involved in this kind of work in their own community. This is a discipline-specific term that does not have a lexicalized equivalent in Auslan and is always fingerspelled.

#HOW – This is the common form of signing HOW, as the fingerspelt pattern #HOW has become a lexicalised sign encompassing all three letters in one movement. This has become part of the core lexicon of Auslan and on detailed examination signers often only produce H-W with the O tapped slightly during the motion. There is a Signed English sign for HOW
(possibly originally an old Auslan sign) which is sometimes used, but the more common expression is the fingerspelled pattern.

**Participant F** – ‘#BUT HEAR NOT DEAF ONLY THREE-YEAR-OLD MAYBE FOUR-YEAR-OLD HARD’. The concept ‘but’ has three Auslan signs, one of which is the lexicalised fingerspelling pattern. As this participant also added spoken English at this point in the conversation, it can be inferred that the lexicalised fingerspelling was chosen for emphasis in this case. (See the section 6.3 for the transcription of this utterance and further discussion).

#CLUB – The Auslan sign for this is sometimes confusing when interlocutors are not clear about whether it is referring to the DEAF SOCIETY (the service provider organization) or the DEAF CLUB (the recreation group run by the deaf members). The participant seemed to fingerspell this word to be specific about which group was being referred to. This is an example of the third reason as listed by Sutton-Spence & Woll, as it avoided the regional Australian sign and any confusion for the interlocutor for whom BSL was a first sign language.

#TH (Thursday) – This was another example of the first two letters of the day of the week that have become part of the core lexicon of Auslan, and accepted as representing Thursday on all occasions. It was another example of the transference of the orthographic form of English into the visual form of Auslan.

S-W-E-A-R – This fingerspelling followed the Auslan sign for SWEAR. According to Gumperz (1982: 78), the function would be reiteration, as the conversation was in reference to which English words the participant could articulate very clearly. When swearing, he was reportedly very clear in spoken English, so the term was both signed and fingerspelled to emphasise the humour.

O-U-T-I-N-G – This was a lexical transfer from English, used in the discussion about planning activities for a support group for deafblind people. It is commonly employed in the Melbourne deaf community when referring to excursions for any groups, and there is no common equivalent sign for this concept.

R-O-C-K-I-M-B-I-N-G – A classifier sign was used to demonstrate this activity and the participant also clarified the term by fingerspelling it. As it was a new term introduced to the conversation, as part of explaining the kind of outings for the support group, it would fall under second of Sutton-Spence & Woll’s reasons for fingerspelling use.

#ZOO – This was a commonly fingerspelled word that is accepted as part of the core lexicon of Auslan. There is no discreet sign for this word as the fingerspelled form has become a lexicalised sign.
Participant G – S-E-V-E-R-E, P-R-O-F-O-U-N-D – These were terms commonly used to describe the level of deafness and no sign equivalents existed for these in Auslan. The sociolinguistic reasons for this will be discussed in Chapter 7.

D-O-I-N-G – This is a transference of an English construction as Auslan has not traditionally had a verb meaning ‘do’ in the same way as English. See the next section for a transcription and discussion of this utterance. #DO is a lexicalised form in Auslan now, but this participant spelled the whole English form of D-O-I-N-G which is not a lexicalised form.

Participant H – Other than proper names, no other fingerspelling was used by this participant. This participant did not contribute much to the discussion, (and when he did it was direct to the camera and the researcher), so the data did not reveal any language contact phenomena of significance in this research.

Participant I – #BUT – The use of the lexicalised form may have been for emphasis or intensity because there were two other commonly used signs which were equivalent to the English word ‘but’.

E-Q-U-I-P-M-E-N-T – There was no equivalent sign for this English concept in Auslan, although the first two letters only could be used (E-Q) as a short way of fingerspelling the concept. Fingerspelling the whole word was the only other way to represent the concept, apart from explaining it by using a series of other classifier signs to indicate the kinds of equipment used in a particular setting.

K-I-N-D-Y; #KK – The first is an abbreviation for kindergarten which did not have a specific sign in Auslan. #KK is a lexicalised form known to refer to Kindergarten in context. It is also often seen as a lexicalised form of KITCHEN, so it is probable that the added fingerspelling of K-I-N-D-Y was to clarify the context. It is interesting to note that the full fingerspelled form is the usual spoken English form used in South Australia and NSW, whereas the more common abbreviation in Victoria would be kinder and K-I-N-D-E-R. It follows the Australian English practice of forming diminutives of ‘kindergarten’ with kindy or kind which are also regional variations. This participant’s children started their school in Adelaide, and the family have continued to use this form.

G-R-A-M – An abbreviation of the word ‘grammar’, in reference to the grammars of Auslan and English. This is not a common form in the community and may be idiosyncratic to this signer. See Chapter 7 for a more detailed discussion and the transcription of the utterance. There is no equivalent sign for ‘grammar’ in Auslan, which suggests that the reduction of the English word has become part of Auslan for this participant.
#HOW – This was the common form of signing HOW, as the fingerspelt pattern HOW has become a lexicalised sign encompassing all three letters in one movement. As with Participant E, the same explanation applies.

Participant J - OLD #DAYS – This was most probably fingerspelled to clarify that the participant was referring to days in the past, and not any day of the week. See Section 7.7 for more discussion of the sociolinguistic perspective of this usage.

#OF COURSE (ASL) – This whole expression was a transfer of an English expression into Auslan. There is no sign in Auslan for ‘of’ in any context, although there is a contrived Signed English sign that is used by some individuals. The sign used by this participant for ‘course’ was a loan sign from ASL that had a more restricted meaning referring to a set of subjects undertaken by a participant in an educational ‘course’. It is now used widely in Australia (see Johnston, 1998: 400) for the same meaning, but is used by this participant to mean ‘as a matter of course’. The whole phrase will be discussed in more detail in Section 7.7.

The following table shows the number of tokens of each fingerspelled term (for other reasons) if it appeared more than once. All the other fingerspelled terms occurred only once by any signer:

Table 8 – Number of Instances of each Term.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fingerspelled term</th>
<th>Number of tokens</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#MON to #FRI</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#HOW</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#OUT</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-O-S-S-Y</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#DO</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#BUT</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#BSL</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#CLUB</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-U-T-I-N-G</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following is a summary of the other reasons (excepting proper names) for the fingerspelling as seen in this data. The first reason given as ‘English word with no signed equivalent’ indicates those words which may not have been commonly used in Auslan and therefore did not yet have any lexicalised form, or for which other signs were often used to describe the same concept (e.g. PLAYTIME for recess). The shortened forms of E-N-G and G-R-A-M were attempts to spell a term for which the complete spelling was not familiar to the participant, judging by the facial expression which accompanied the fingerspelling. (See Chapter 7 for a more detailed description of the utterances in which these terms occurred).
Each of the examples is listed only once, although some occurred multiple times throughout the data:

Table 9 – Reasons for Fingerspelled Term.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Reasons for Fingerspelling</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English word with no sign</td>
<td>b-o-s-s-y, r-e-c-e-s-s, l-i-b-e-r-a-t-i-o-n, w-o-o-d-w-o-r-k,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>equivalent i.e the fingerspelling is</td>
<td>e-n-g, h-u-m-i-d, s-e-v-e-r-e, p-r-o-f-o-u-n-d,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the signed equivalent in Auslan</td>
<td>e-q-u-i-p-m-e-n-t, g-r-a-m (mar),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New concept</td>
<td>R-e-g-u-l-a-r, r-e-c-o-g-n-i-s-e, t-u-t-o-r, r-e-s-p-i-t-e,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o-u-t-i-n-g, r-o-c-k-c-l-i-m-b-i-n-g,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional sign not well known</td>
<td>Many of the examples of fingerspelling of proper names could be included here, as the name signs were regional and so the names needed to be spelled as some signers would not have known them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English idioms</td>
<td>punch, miss [out], k-i-n-d-y,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>old #days, s-p-y,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euphemisms</td>
<td>s-w-e-a-r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenience and time-saving,</td>
<td>r-e-l-y, s-p-y, p-o-o-r, p-o-o-r-l-y, e-v-e-r-y, h-a-p-p-y, ,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emphasis</td>
<td>t-a-x-i, k-e-e-p-g-o-i-n-g, n-o-t-i-c-e, t-o-t-a-l, a-l-l-s-i-l-e-n-t,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r-e-l-a-x, l-o-l-l-y, b-u-l-l-y, y-e-a-r,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Lexicon of Auslan</td>
<td>#Mon - #Fri, #if, #but, #how, #zoo, #do, #use, #off, #of, #course, #key, #out, #bank, #club, #kk</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.2 Transference from English into Auslan

In Workplace setting 1, Participant C used a Signed English sign. (See Chapter 3 for a discussion of the history and use of Signed English in the deaf community). The following is a transcription of the Signed English sign used by this participant with the transfers highlighted. The participants discussed their use of hearing-aid as children and whether they found them useful or not during their school days:

**Example 1**

C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VOICE</th>
<th>Laugh</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOUTH PATTERN</td>
<td>Nod nod nod</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM FEATURES</td>
<td>Wide eyes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIGN GLOSS</td>
<td>MOVE V-S-D-C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGLISH MEANING</td>
<td>I moved to VSDC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**VOICE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MOUTH PATTERN</th>
<th>Wide eyes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NM FEATURES</td>
<td>Eye gaze to A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIGN GLOSS</td>
<td>ASK HEARING-AID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGLISH MEANING</td>
<td>I asked about hearing aids</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the above interaction, Participant C talked about changing schools from Portsea to VSDC, and in doing so she found that the rules about wearing hearing-aids were different at VSDC. As she was about to explain the rule at VSDC, she paused and asked Participant A if she had to wear hearing-aids at school. Participant A answered in the negative, which was the same answer that Participant C received from the teachers during her time of arriving at this school. The question was in the present time, but the answer was reminiscent of Participant C’s school days, and her narrative continued with her surprised stare, and a repetition of the story to her mother at home. Each time the expression ‘have to’ was signed, it was done using a Signed English sign TO. It could have been signed quite differently, or it could have been fingerspelled, but the participant chose to use an English-like expression, probably as a recall of the kind of signing used in her school days. It is an example of syntactic transference as Clyne defines it (2003: 77). It is also an illustration of “contact induced structural change” (Thomason & Kaufman, 1988; Backus, 2005). In this case the contact between spoken English and Auslan has allowed the signer to use a structural pattern from English in her Auslan. Over time this kind of transference can cause changes to the structures used in Auslan.
Participant A also used a feature of English transferred into Auslan, and it supports anecdotal evidence that this commonly appears in language usage of deaf Australians. Participant A questioned Participant C about what they usually did on the weekend:

**Example 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>VOICE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MOUTH PATTERN</strong></td>
<td>You</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NM FEATURES</strong></td>
<td>Eye gaze to C up?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SIGN GLOSS</strong></td>
<td>PRO₂ DEAF FAMILY WHAT #DO WEEKEND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENGLISH MEANING</strong></td>
<td>What did you do on the weekends with your deaf family?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C</th>
<th>VOICE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MOUTH PATTERN</strong></td>
<td>MOTHER FATHER GO DEAF-CLUB INVOLVE DEAF WORLD OPPOSITE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NM FEATURES</strong></td>
<td>My parents would always go to the deaf club, as part of our deaf world, but</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SIGN GLOSS</strong></td>
<td>PRO₂ R-C DEAF GROUP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENGLISH MEANING</strong></td>
<td>you were the opposite, involved in the Catholic deaf group.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this example, Participant A asked C what she normally did on the weekend, as a member of a deaf family. Participant C replied that her family always attended the regular deaf club activities, whereas A, with her hearing family, attended the activities organized by the Catholic church for deaf people. This is an example of what Johnston & Schembri (2007: 177) refer to as part of the non-native lexicon of Auslan, where the fingerspelled #DO functions as the main verb as it is used most often in this form. This token was only one of several in this study that seem to point to frequent use by all participants.

**In Workplace Setting 2**, another use of the verb ‘do’ occurred. Participant F had just stated that he does a lot of voluntary work with deafblind people, and Participant E requested more detail:

**Example 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F</th>
<th>VOICE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MOUTH PATTERN</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NM FEATURES</strong></td>
<td>Eye gaze to D Eye gaze to E up?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SIGN GLOSS</strong></td>
<td>YES PRO, SORRY INTERRUPT WORK INVOLVE WHAT DEAFBLIND V-U-D-B-C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENGLISH MEANING</strong></td>
<td>Yes, I'm sorry to interrupt, but I do a lot of work with deafblind with the VUDBC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E</th>
<th>VOICE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MOUTH PATTERN</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NM FEATURES</strong></td>
<td>up?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SIGN GLOSS</strong></td>
<td>DEAFBLIND WORK WHAT #DO WHAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENGLISH MEANING</strong></td>
<td>What kind of work do you do with the deafblind?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Here, Participant F apologised as he interrupted the conversation that was occurring between D and E. He interrupted to clarify that his work involved a lot of work with the group VUDBC (the Victorian Usher and Deafblind Club). Participant E then asked what kind of work he did with the deafblind group, and F explained that it included arranging and attending outings, such as rockclimbing, guiding, and support work. The use of the question WHAT #DO? was not noticed and was not reacted to by either of the participants, suggesting that the transfer is no longer recognised as such and it has become part of the core lexicon of Auslan. It is also another example of the more frequent use of the fingerspelled #DO where it functions as a main verb. (Johnston & Schembri 2007: 177). The above uses of WHAT #DO provide further examples of “contact-induced change” (Thomason & Kaufman, 1988; Backus, 2005) where the structural pattern from English has been used in Auslan so often that it has contributed to a change in the language. (See Chapter 2, Section 2.2.1 for a detailed discussion).

Family Setting 1 – In this setting the parent frequently engaged in simultaneous use of Auslan and spoken English. In this token the transfer was the English word it. The mother commented on her son’s friends who sign well and asked if he wanted to talk about it. It was clear from previous comments in the family that they regarded this son’s communication in Auslan as ‘lazy’, and this utterance may have implied that his friends actually signed better than him.

Example 4

G

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VOICE</th>
<th>friend</th>
<th>good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOUTH PATTERN</td>
<td>friend</td>
<td>good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM FEATURES</td>
<td>Eye gaze to camera nod nod Eye gaze to hearing son</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIGN GLOSS</td>
<td>PRO, FRIEND SIGN SOME GOOD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGLISH MEANING</td>
<td>Some of his friends sign quite well.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VOICE</th>
<th>Wanna talk about it</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOUTH PATTERN</td>
<td>Wanna talk about it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM FEATURES</td>
<td>Eye gaze to hearing son Up?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIGN GLOSS</td>
<td>WANT TALK OVER #IT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGLISH MEANING</td>
<td>Do you want to talk about it?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It has not traditionally been used in Auslan in this way, and it could have been signed using other forms of referencing. Instead the signer revealed the amount of convergence that has occurred in her Auslan towards English, as the Auslan signs followed English syntax, rather than the other way around. Whether I-T has become lexicalised generally in the community, or whether it is a familiar form for this participant is still a matter of discussion.

**Family Setting 2** – An example of lexical transference occurs in the use of O-F COURSE:

**Example 5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Researcher</th>
<th>Voice/Sign</th>
<th>When you're angry with them do you shout or just sign?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>VOICE</td>
<td>Shout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MOUTH PATTERN</td>
<td>Nod                Brows up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SIGN GLOSS</td>
<td>YES PRO; ANGRY PRO; SHOUT++ AND SIGN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ENGLISH MEANING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>VOICE</td>
<td>Yes #O-F COURSE(ASL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MOUTH PATTERN</td>
<td>Nod                Smile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SIGN GLOSS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ENGLISH MEANING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The researcher asked if the parents shout or sign at the children when they are angry. Participant I replied that when she was angry, she did shout and sign at the same time, and Participant J responded with ‘O-F COURSE’. This phrase is a semantic transference from English (of course) into Auslan, as well as a partial lexical transference from ASL (COURSE – RH Full-hand ‘C’ blade touched twice down L palm) into Auslan (Johnston, 1998: 400). When borrowing from other sign languages, “the meaning of the borrowed item is often modified. The borrowed item may come to have either a more general or a more specific meaning in Auslan.” (Johnston & Schembri, 2007: 177). In this instance, the item has taken on the wider meaning from spoken English, rather than the way the single sign COURSE was used in ASL.

### 6.3 Simultaneous Use of Spoken English and Auslan

The examples of simultaneous use of both languages demonstrate one of the unique outcomes of contact between a sign language and a spoken language, that is, the ability of bilinguals to express both languages simultaneously. Unlike switching between two spoken languages where bilinguals may say something partly in one language and partly in the other, sign/spoken language bilinguals can say it twice but at the same time! In addition, with sign/spoken language bilingualism it is possible to converse with speakers of each of the two languages (signed and spoken) at the same time. A speaker can include monolingual Auslan signers and English speakers in the same conversation by signing and speaking at the same
Simultaneous use of a sign language and a spoken language is anecdotally reported as being used frequently by hearing speakers, whether they are first or second language learners of the sign language. However, from the examples of simultaneous use of Auslan and English as discussed in this chapter, one can see that the phenomenon also occurs with deaf signers, regardless of whether they are first or second language learners of Auslan, and that the context of the utterance is one of the factors that influences whether or not simultaneous use occurs.

In Workplace Setting 1 the three participants discussed their early learning experiences and Participant B, who attended a mainstream school, explained how she dealt with the expectations of a hearing classroom, in which she understood little of what was happening. She simultaneously used English and Auslan nouns:

**Example 6**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C</th>
<th>VOICE</th>
<th>MOUTH PATTERN</th>
<th>NM FEATURES</th>
<th>Up?</th>
<th>SIGN GLOSS</th>
<th>ENGLISH MEANING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2H-LOOK-AROUND LOOK-AROUND LOOK-AROUND</td>
<td>You mean you just gazed around the room all the time?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B</th>
<th>VOICE</th>
<th>MOUTH PATTERN</th>
<th>NM FEATURES</th>
<th>Up?</th>
<th>SIGN GLOSS</th>
<th>ENGLISH MEANING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nod Nod</td>
<td></td>
<td>2H-LOOK-AROUND LOOK-AROUND WHY BECAUSE BORED PRO$_1$</td>
<td>Yes I just gazed around but you know why? Because I was bored</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>VOICE</th>
<th>MOUTH PATTERN</th>
<th>NM FEATURES</th>
<th>read book</th>
<th>SIGN GLOSS</th>
<th>ENGLISH MEANING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eye gaze to C</td>
<td>WHY READ BOOK</td>
<td></td>
<td>That's why I read books</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>VOICE</th>
<th>MOUTH PATTERN</th>
<th>NM FEATURES</th>
<th>why</th>
<th>SIGN GLOSS</th>
<th>ENGLISH MEANING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eye gaze to C</td>
<td>Eye gaze to B LH tap B knee</td>
<td>(LH) PRO$_2$ (RH) WHY WHY READ READ PRO$_1$ READ WHEN</td>
<td>That's why she read so much when [she was at school]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C</th>
<th>VOICE</th>
<th>MOUTH PATTERN</th>
<th>NM FEATURES</th>
<th>Eye gaze to A Head tilt back Brows up.</th>
<th>SIGN GLOSS</th>
<th>ENGLISH MEANING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RH-OPEN-PALM-UP</td>
<td>Of course</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Participant C began this exchange with a question about sitting and gazing around all day in the classroom. B answered in the affirmative and explained that she believed this was why she read books so much, because of boredom and the isolation. Participant A engaged C with her eye gaze, and they agreed that was the reason for so much reading. B then continued to explain that she read books as she walked to school and home again, as well as reading books in the bath and in bed. She asserted that books were her best friends at that time. The simultaneous use seemed to be for emphasis, and may correspond to Gumperz’s suggested ‘reiteration’ function. (See Chapter 2, Section 2.2.3). As stated above, in spoken languages this can take the form of a repetition of part of the message in the other language, but in this instance both languages were used simultaneously, with bath/BATH; bed/BED; and book/BOOK. It could also be from habit that some English words were added as this participant spent all her education years in mainstream schools and conducted her conversations in English with all interlocutors. Auslan was not acquired until her adult years, and therefore it is possible that the use of English simultaneously with Auslan was unconscious.

Note that in the above examples of simultaneous use, the syntax continued to conform to that of Auslan. In the following example the syntax of the spoken English is again compromised and the syntax of Auslan, the more activated language (as defined by Grosjean, 1998) is adhered to.
In Workplace Setting 2, Participant F engaged in simultaneous use when describing his experiences with speech and auditory training:

**Example 7**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F</th>
<th>VOICE</th>
<th>MOUTH PATTERN</th>
<th>Open and shut mouth</th>
<th>Sss Sss Pah Pah</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NM FEATURES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIGN GLOSS</td>
<td>LEARN</td>
<td>WITH PAPER RH-WAVE-PAPER</td>
<td>S P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGLISH MEANING</td>
<td>We learnt speech making the paper move</td>
<td>sss for S and pp for P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOICE</td>
<td>But</td>
<td>Hear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOUTH PATTERN</td>
<td>Word</td>
<td>Learn</td>
<td>But</td>
<td>Hear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM FEATURES</td>
<td>Head shake</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIGN GLOSS</td>
<td>WORD LEARN ++</td>
<td>#BUT HEAR NOT DEAF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGLISH MEANING</td>
<td>we had to learn many words this way but I couldn't hear, I'm deaf.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOICE</td>
<td>Hard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOUTH PATTERN</td>
<td>Hard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM FEATURES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIGN GLOSS</td>
<td>ONLY THREE-YEAR-OLD MAYBE FOUR-YEAR-OLD. HARD.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGLISH MEANING</td>
<td>I was only 3 or 4 years old.</td>
<td>It was very hard!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOICE</td>
<td>Puh Puh Puh Puh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOUTH PATTERN</td>
<td>Puh Puh Puh Puh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM FEATURES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIGN GLOSS</td>
<td>P P P P TWO-YEAR-OLD THREE-YEAR-OLD CL:ROLL-OVER-HANDS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGLISH MEANING</td>
<td>Pppp</td>
<td>We did it again and again from two, three years old, again and again.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>VOICE</td>
<td>Laughing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOUTH PATTERN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM FEATURES</td>
<td>Head forward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIGN GLOSS</td>
<td>OH-REALLY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGLISH MEANING</td>
<td>Oh really</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participant F explained how some of his speech lessons were conducted involving the use of paper held in front of his lips, where the aim was to make the paper move as he expelled air in the production of the consonants S and P. At age three or four, and being profoundly deaf he could not hear anything, yet these tasks were repeated regularly, supposedly to reinforce his speech skills. While recalling these lessons, Participant F revealed the amount of effort he had to put into this kind of learning by the use of simultaneous use of Auslan and English. In this instance, the participant probably knew that neither of his interlocutors could hear his spoken words, but this was irrelevant. The use of spoken English with the sign HARD was partly due to the story being recalled from memory and involved vocalisation in his past. It is possible that this falls into the category of reiteration, where the repetition for emphasis was replaced by simultaneous use in a sign/spoken language context. The spoken English was inserted for intensity, emphasizing how difficult it was to participate in speech and hearing activities when he could hear nothing, and had no idea how to succeed in the task asked of
him. Immediately before the sign HARD, the participant used spoken English simultaneously with Auslan, with the two concepts B-U-T and HEAR. The use of spoken English but, and fingerspelled form of B-U-T were for intensity as the participant emphasised feelings of hopelessness in the situation, being able to hear nothing. The vocalization of ‘puh puh puh puh’ was probably because the task was immediately following the spoken English words but hear and hard.

Another perspective on this simultaneous use of Auslan and spoken English is that it could be attributed to habitual use during years of schooling that encouraged the use of vocalization skills in preference to signing. It may have been from habit that participants continued to express discreet terms of both languages simultaneously. It may on the other hand fall into the category referred to by Franceschini (1998: 60) when she stated that “we even have to allow for the case in which CS has no function at all in the local conversational context”. It is possible that this simultaneous use had no function in the above conversations, but simply revealed the level of intensity felt by the signer at the time of remembering.

In each of the samples cited above, the simultaneous use of Auslan and English occurred with single word/sign terms both in Auslan and English: bath/BATH and bed/BED and but/BUT, hear/HEAR, and hard/HARD. The next examples of simultaneous use in Family Setting 1 reveal longer phrases that were spoken and signed simultaneously.

**In Family Setting 1**, Participant G, the mother, asked the hearing child a question about school to initiate the conversation.

**Example 8**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G</th>
<th>VOICE</th>
<th>School good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOUTH PATTERN</td>
<td>School good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM FEATURES</td>
<td>up?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIGN GLOSS</td>
<td>SCHOOL GOOD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGLISH MEANING</td>
<td>Is school good for you?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Son</th>
<th>VOICE</th>
<th>MOUTH PATTERN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NM FEATURES</td>
<td>NOD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIGN GLOSS</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGLISH MEANING</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G</th>
<th>VOICE</th>
<th>Different between</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOUTH PATTERN</td>
<td>Different between</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM FEATURES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIGN GLOSS</td>
<td>DIFFERENT BETWEEN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGLISH MEANING</td>
<td>What’s the difference between</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VOICE</th>
<th>Sit up see you</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOUTH PATTERN</td>
<td>Sit up see you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM FEATURES</td>
<td>grimace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIGN GLOSS</td>
<td>RH open palm up LOC2 – LOC1 POINT-TO-CAMERA SEE PRO2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In answer to her query about school, Participant G received a single word response, and asked a further question about the difference between her son’s old school and his current school. The son’s response was signed in Auslan, but Participant G repeated his signed BIGGER in spoken English *bigger*. This was the first example of a complete change into the other language elicited in this study. It seems clear that the simultaneous use has facilitated this switch by Participant G, but after repeating the response from her son, she immediately reverted to Auslan, with YES THINK WHAT. This is one instance in the data collection for this study that is consistent with Muysken’s definition of the process of ‘alternational code-mixing’, where Participant G has alternated from simultaneous English and Auslan, to English *bigger* and back to Auslan again. The whole outcome was probably facilitated by the simultaneous use, where both languages were equally activated. It seems as though Auslan was the base language (as defined by Grosjean 1998: 137) because the structure followed the Auslan syntax throughout the utterance.

In line four, the English was *sit up*…..*see you* whereas the Auslan was COME-ON POINT-TO CAMERA SEE PRO₂. The Auslan was a complete utterance and syntactically appropriate, but the English words did not form a complete phrase or sentence. This again suggested that the Auslan was the base language as described by Grosjean (1998: 136).
A second example of a switch into the other language could seen in this example by the same Participant G:

**Example 30**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Daughter</th>
<th>VOICE</th>
<th>MOUTH PATTERN</th>
<th>Ask him</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NM FEATURES</td>
<td>brows up!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SIGN GLOSS</td>
<td>ASK PRO(_3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ENGLISH MEANING</td>
<td>Ask him</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| G | VOICE  | Answer the question |
|   | MOUTH PATTERN | Answer the question |
|   | NM FEATURES | Eye gaze to son smile |
|   | SIGN GLOSS | ANSWER QUESTION PRO\(_3\) |
|   | ENGLISH MEANING | Answer her question! |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Son 1</th>
<th>VOICE</th>
<th>MOUTH PATTERN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NM FEATURES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SIGN GLOSS</td>
<td>SPEAK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ENGLISH MEANING</td>
<td>We speak.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| G | VOICE  | Speak |
|   | MOUTH PATTERN | Speak |
|   | NM FEATURES | laugh |
|   | SIGN GLOSS | They speak. |
|   | ENGLISH MEANING |             |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Daughter</th>
<th>VOICE</th>
<th>MOUTH PATTERN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NM FEATURES</td>
<td>nod smile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SIGN GLOSS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ENGLISH MEANING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The initial response from the daughter was to *ask him* meaning her brother. Participant G (mother) prompted the hearing son to answer the question, and he used Auslan *SPEAK* as his response, indicating that they spoke English when communicating with each other. The Participant mother then re-stated his answer, but she used spoken English - *speak*. This switch into spoken English is another example of Participant G moving from simultaneous use of Auslan and English to spoken English alone *speak* and then back to Auslan again. The outcome is again facilitated by the simultaneous use of the signed and the spoken language that occurred immediately before it.

Another occurrence of simultaneous use, from the same family, can be seen in the following example, where the first question was from the researcher:

**Example 9**

\[R-\] **VOICE AND SIGN**  At home do you all sign, all the time?

\[
\begin{array}{lllll}
\text{No} & \text{Talk sign only I'm angry}
\end{array}
\]
In response to the researcher’s question that was signed and spoken simultaneously, Participant G said that she talked to this hearing son most of the time using spoken English, and only used Auslan if she was really angry. This Participant mother often simultaneously used Auslan and English in her conversation, and when it occurred, as in this example, there was direct correlation between the English words and the Auslan signs (sign/SIGN; right/RIGHT; talk/TALK; only/ONLY; angry/ANGRY). In most cases, even though the use of the two languages appeared to be simultaneous, the structure of the spoken English did not appear to follow usual English syntax rules. It was produced in a way that followed the syntax of the Auslan, including the mouthing that accompanied the signing. In only one instance did the more usual Auslan form of mouthing give way to the dominant English lip pattern, in the syntactic transfer of about it, accompanied by the Auslan sign OVER I-T (See section 6.2 for this transcription).

In Family Setting 2, it was also a parent who used spoken English and Auslan simultaneously to engage a hearing child in the family conversation. After discussion with all the other hearing and deaf children in Auslan, the mother used simultaneous English and Auslan to ask what this daughter could remember of her early school days:

Example 10
When the daughter said she could not remember, Participant I signed WHY simultaneously with a spoken English why not. After the daughter’s next response, Participant I then continued in Auslan. The simultaneous use of Auslan and English was directed at the hearing daughter, probably to engage her in the conversation and make her comfortable by using what the mother perceived to be the child’s preferred language. (See Section 7.1 for a discussion of this from a sociolinguistic perspective).

In the next example, one parent used an English phrase to explain how often the hearing children spoke and how often they signed. It followed an instance of simultaneous use from two of the hearing children in answer to the researcher’s question:

**Example 11**

Researcher  **VOICE**  I'm interested to know do you all sign to each other or do you all speak to each other sometimes here in the house?

HD 1 & 2  **VOICE**  hearing talk deaf sign
**MOUTH PATTERN**  hearing talk deaf sign
**NM FEATURES**  Eye gaze to each other
**SIGN GLOSS**  HEARING TALK DEAF SIGN
**ENGLISH MEANING**  The hearing talk and the deaf sign

I  **VOICE**  Most no
**MOUTH PATTERN**  Most no most of time without
**NM FEATURES**  Eye gaze to HD1 & 2
**SIGN GLOSS**  MOST NO MOST O-F TIME PRO$_2$ TALK WITH NOT SIGN
**ENGLISH MEANING**  Most, No! Most of the time you all talk without signing.
### VOICE

#### MOUTH PATTERN

| NM FEATURES | PRO, REMIND REMIND WHAT SAY WHAT SAY WHAT SAY |
| ENGLISH MEANING | I have to remind you, what are you saying, what are you saying, what are you saying |

#### VOICE

#### MOUTH PATTERN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>head shake</th>
<th>nod nod</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| SIGN GLOSS | ALL SIGN NO TALK YES |
| ENGLISH MEANING | You do not all sign, you talk. |

Participant I again engaged in simultaneous use of both languages as she contradicted the assertion that the hearing talked and the deaf signed. She was quite strong in her response that all the children (including both deaf and hearing) mainly talked to each other without signing. Participant I used spoken English with MOST and NO to gain the attention of the two hearing daughters as they spoke and signed simultaneously to each other. Once she had eye contact with them, there was no need for her to use the spoken language, although English lip patterns followed the rest of the utterance. The phrase *most of the time* is commonly used in spoken English but has not traditionally had a formulaic Auslan expression in this form, with the use of the sign MOST and the fingerspelt O-F. Analysis of this transfer using Gumperz’s criteria suggests a function of reiteration again, for the purpose of emphasizing the participant’s opinion. Spoken English, not Auslan, was often used by the hearing members, and consequently the deaf members of the family felt isolated. The transference of the English expression *most of the time* into her Auslan may have triggered the simultaneous use. Once again it supports Backus’ position (2005) of change induced in Auslan by the structural pattern from English being constantly transferred into Auslan.

The simultaneous use of Auslan and spoken English that can be seen in the instances presented above reveal two things about the use of the two languages by these participants. Firstly the majority of occurrences involved discreet single word/sign items that were signed and spoken simultaneously. Secondly, when a whole phrase was signed and spoken simultaneously, the grammar of the spoken English was more often subordinate to the grammar of Auslan, indicating that Auslan was the more active base language (Grosjean 1998). See Section 8.2 for a full discussion of this concept and the data from this research.

Of interest from a conversational perspective is that the patterns of the simultaneous language use and the instances of transference were quite unlike the patterns as found by Auer (1995: 125). See Chapter 2, Section 2.2.3 for this discussion. The patterns in this study appear as A1 A2 A1 A2/((A+B)1 A2 A1, or A1 B1 A1 B1/ (A+B)1 B1 A2 A1 where language A (Auslan) was used by both signers 1 and 2, and when signer 1 used both A and B (Auslan and spoken English) at the same time, signer 2 continued in Auslan, as did signer 1 subsequently. This use of (A+B) did not and could not appear in a pattern as posed by Auer.
because his patterns were of sequential language use, and could not account for simultaneous language use.

6.4 Facilitation of transference and simultaneous use of both languages.

In Chapter 2, I summarised the literature on constraints on code-switching. Authors such as Poplack and Meechan (1998), Muysken (2000) and Myers-Scotton (2003) proposed their theories on the constraints that prevented code-switching in certain situations. As stated in Chapter 2, I have focussed on Clyne’s 2003 notion of ‘facilitation’ as a better alternative than the use of the concept of ‘constraints’. Data from this study supports the position that convergence of the two languages, as well as sociolinguistic factors, facilitated some of the transference and simultaneous use in this study.

Fingerspelling occurred as an unintegrated transference, when an orthographic representation of an English proper name was required in conversation, or when a clarification of meaning was called for by the sociolinguistic factor of the interlocutor or the topic. Some of the fingerspelling involved the use of lexicalized patterns which have become signs. The need for reiteration and emphasis also seemed to facilitate the use of fingerspelling in the communication.

Transference of syntactic and semantic features of English into Auslan was facilitated by the syntactic overlap between the two languages. In section 6.2, Examples 1-5 showed instances of transference that revealed the influence of English structures on the structure of Auslan used by these participants.

The samples of simultaneous use that were discussed (Examples 6-11 and Example 30) were instances where the amount of syntactic overlap between English and Auslan (as well as the sociolinguistic setting) facilitated the simultaneous use of words and signs. The grammar of the simultaneous utterances seemed to be that of Auslan, indicating that Auslan was the more activated base language (Grosjean, 1998). They lend weight to the idea of a bilingual using both grammars at times, and to the proposal of simultaneous planning in both languages. (Lucas & Valli, 1989).

Lastly, the instances of code-switching to spoken English that did occur could be seen to be facilitated by the simultaneous use that immediately preceded the switch. Examples 4, 8 and 30 provided an opportunity to analyse the interaction from a sociolinguistic perspective. See Chapter 7 for further discussion.
6.5 Summary

In this chapter I have presented transcribed examples of conversations which included fingerspelling, syntactic transference of English words into Auslan, and simultaneous use of both English and Auslan. The results showed that the grammar of the participants’ spoken English conformed to the grammar of Auslan in most cases. The function of the simultaneous use of Auslan and English was in some cases reiteration, and in other cases emphasis, but it may also have been unconscious, revealing the habitual oral speech training undergone at schools in the past. The phenomenon of simultaneous use of Auslan and spoken English did occur in the data from deaf signers, although not as often as other outcomes. The context of the utterance is one of the factors that influences whether or not simultaneous use occurs.

Most instances of transference from English into Auslan occurred repeatedly throughout the data. On four occasions, features of other sign languages or Signed English were transferred. (See Chapters 7 and 8 for transcriptions of some of these examples.) The instances of transference from English to Auslan highlight the amount of influence on Auslan from spoken or written English for these participants.

It is evident from the data that the participants (a) often chose to use full fingerspelling when they could have used a sign (b) signed whole phrases in English-like structures; and (c) used English-like lip patterns simultaneously with Auslan signs that usually have a specific Auslan mouth pattern associated with them. These examples contribute to our understanding of speakers’ desire for clear communication, as well as to our awareness of their enjoyment of language use with other bilinguals. Many of the language choices were not even noticed by the other participants in the conversations as there was no other contact outcome immediately following these choices. The results showed examples of transference or simultaneous use, even in conversations between deaf speakers, and these instances can be motivated by emphasis or clarification.

The influence of English on Auslan was demonstrated to different degrees in workplace and family settings. This could be seen particularly in the examples of simultaneous use which result from the convergence from Auslan to English. This convergence will be discussed in Chapters 7 and 8 from sociolinguistic and psycholinguistic perspectives.

From the data analysed in this chapter, one conclusion that can be drawn from a linguistic perspective is that there is already a great deal of convergence between English and Auslan in the language use of the participants in this study, which leads to semantic and syntactic transference. Despite the different educational backgrounds of the participants and their early or late acquisition of Auslan, they used similar strategies to communicate with each other. More instances of transference and simultaneous use emerged in the family settings where
hearing children were present as interlocutors with the deaf parents. The setting of the conversation is a significant factor in the language contact phenomena that can be seen, and suggests that future research in other settings that involve mixed deaf and hearing interlocutors would be a logical consequence from this current research.
Chapter 7 - Analysis of Results – Sociolinguistic Perspective

From examples in Chapter 6, it was clear that transference from English to Auslan, frequent fingerspelling and also simultaneous use of both languages were amongst the prominent language contact outcomes in the conversations of the participant deaf signers, when conversing with each other, or with their deaf and hearing children. This chapter will look more closely at these language contact outcomes from a sociolinguistic perspective.

The analysis will focus on the patterns of language use in this small cohort of signers, the preferences of the individual signers, and the particular speech events in which the participants were involved. The sociolinguistic variables that promote code-switching, as listed by Clyne (1991: 191-193) will be used as a basis for discussion of the language contact outcomes by participants in each setting. These variables include interlocutors, the role relationship between interlocutors, the domain of the conversations, the topic under discussion, the venue, and the type of interaction. No comparison is made of the participants between the setting, but rather a presentation of the interesting outcomes from each data set.

7.1 The Workplace and Family Venue

Increasingly in Australia, deaf people are employed in workplaces where their language and communication needs have led to the development of protocols for staff interaction. In particular the workplaces in which the data was collected for this study have developed quite formal protocols for communication in meetings and in common areas of work and recreation. An example is the Victorian Deaf Society in Melbourne, in which the Staff Policy Manual refers to “good working relationships”, and “Vicdeaf expects you will be able to…use Auslan with signing staff”. This expectation has led to Auslan classes for hearing staff being offered during work time, and a further expectation that all hearing staff will be able to communicate at a reasonably fluent level with the deaf staff. Protocols at Vicdeaf and other similar organisations can include an expectation that any conversation in English will immediately switch to Auslan if a deaf person approaches. However, it is interesting to note that there is no similar expectation that deaf staff should speak English when hearing people are present. Hearing staff would be perceived to be rude if the conversation did not include deaf staff by changing to Auslan, but deaf staff are not seen as rude if they continue their conversation in Auslan. All staff are able to have a side conversation in Auslan without interrupting a meeting or activity. Several conversations can be held in close proximity without causing any conflict or confusion. The workplaces where the data for this study was gathered have similar protocols for workplace conversation.

Similarly, in the mixed hearing and deaf families in this study, the deaf members expressed their preference to see Auslan signed when they are present. (See examples 11, 30 and 31 in
this chapter). However, the data from this study also confirms that the hearing members of a family will, at times, converse between themselves using spoken English, even when the deaf parents or siblings are within proximity of the conversation. Sometimes this is done deliberately to avoid the deaf parents knowing what is being discussed, and sometimes it is just convenient, with no thought given to the fact that the deaf members are excluded from the conversation.

The deaf adults’ language use in this study revealed interesting information about their shared language and identity with other deaf people, as well as their shared identity with their family. Some of this information is revealed in the use of name signs (personal and place names). These multiple identity issues are discussed in later sections of this chapter.

7.2 Interlocutor

The data collection for this study in both the family settings revealed the role of the interlocutor in the simultaneous use that resulted, as well as the other language contact outcomes that occurred. In each sample, the role of the interlocutors was apparent in the way the language was used with each speech partner, and the way the conversation was conducted. Other factors may influence these participants in other settings not in the scope of this study, but interlocutor can be seen to be an influence in the following examples.

In Family setting 1, the participant mother simultaneously used both languages twice, in her responses to the hearing researcher and her hearing child. The first sample was her response to her hearing son as he slouched on the couch:

**Example 8:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G</th>
<th>VOICE</th>
<th>School good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MOUTH PATTERN</td>
<td>School good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NM FEATURES</td>
<td>up?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SIGN GLOSS</td>
<td>SCHOOL GOOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ENGLISH MEANING</td>
<td>Is school good for you?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Son</td>
<td>VOICE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MOUTH PATTERN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NM FEATURES</td>
<td>NOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SIGN GLOSS</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ENGLISH MEANING</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>VOICE</td>
<td>Different between</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MOUTH PATTERN</td>
<td>Different between</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NM FEATURES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SIGN GLOSS</td>
<td>DIFFERENT BETWEEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ENGLISH MEANING</td>
<td>What’s the difference between</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VOICE</td>
<td>Sit up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MOUTH PATTERN</td>
<td>Sit up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>see you</td>
<td>see you</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This instance of simultaneous use seemed to be facilitated by the participant’s eye contact with the hearing son, and her wish to engage him in conversation, using what she may have perceived to be his preferred language. In addition the participant’s relationship as mediator between the hearing and deaf members of the family encouraged the simultaneous use in this instance.

The second time this same participant used both languages simultaneously was in response to a question from the hearing researcher:

**Example 9**

**R- VOICE AND SIGN** At home do you all sign, all the time?

**G-**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VOICE</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Talk</th>
<th>sign</th>
<th>only</th>
<th>I’m</th>
<th>angry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOUTH PATTERN</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Talk</td>
<td>sign</td>
<td>only</td>
<td>I’m</td>
<td>angry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| NM FEATURES | Eye gaze to researcher, then to son | grin | laugh | head shake |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIGN GLOSS</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>BOTH-OF-US TALK</th>
<th>SIGN RARE ONLY PRO</th>
<th>ANGRY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENGLISH MEANING</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>we talk to each other</td>
<td>I only sign if I’m angry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| G | I sign | right | right |
| LIP PATTERN | I sign | right | right |

| NM FEATURES | up? | up? |

| GLOSS | PRO1 SIGN RIGHT ME | RIGHT | YES |
The researcher used Auslan and spoken English, and this may have influenced the choice of communication by the Participant, as she continued in the same manner even after she turned to face her hearing son. Once again the variable promoting the simultaneous use was the interlocutor. In this instance, the communication and eye contact was with the hearing interlocutors.

In Family setting 2, the Participant Mother I also used spoken English and Auslan simultaneously to engage her youngest hearing daughter (who had been a silent observer up to this point) in the conversation. As each of the other children conversed, the mother had responded using Auslan, but then came the turn of this hearing child. She asked what/WHAT you/YOU? The mother used both languages again as she turned to face this hearing interlocutor. When the daughter responded with CAN+NOT REMEMBER PRO₁ the participant mother continued to use English and Auslan simultaneously with her question why/WHY:

**Example 10**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I</th>
<th>VOICE</th>
<th>what</th>
<th>you</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOUTH PATTERN</td>
<td>what</td>
<td>you</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM FEATURES</td>
<td>Eye gaze to Hearing Daughter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIGN GLOSS</td>
<td>WHAT</td>
<td>PRO₂</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGLISH MEANING</td>
<td>What about you?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Daughter</th>
<th>VOICE</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOUTH PATTERN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM FEATURES</td>
<td>CAN+NOT REMEMBER PRO₁</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIGN GLOSS</td>
<td>I can't remember</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGLISH MEANING</td>
<td>I can't remember</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I</th>
<th>VOICE</th>
<th>why</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOUTH PATTERN</td>
<td>why</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM FEATURES</td>
<td>Head tilt left</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIGN GLOSS</td>
<td>WHY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGLISH MEANING</td>
<td>Why not?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Daughter</th>
<th>VOICE</th>
<th>Hampton Park</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOUTH PATTERN</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hampton Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM FEATURES</td>
<td>shrug</td>
<td>Smile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIGN GLOSS</td>
<td>NOT-KNOW</td>
<td>H-P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGLISH MEANING</td>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>only Hampton Park</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The participant mother had eye contact with her hearing daughter, and it was her eye contact that in all likelihood initiated the simultaneous use in this instance. In both family settings it can be said that the parents responded to their interlocutor, and this prompted their use of Auslan and English simultaneously as a result.

However, in the workplace settings, interlocutor was not the only reason for any simultaneous use of both languages. In fact following a change of interlocutor or a question asked by a hearing interlocutor using the both languages simultaneously, these participants continued to use Auslan and did not change their language use at all. This can be seen in the next examples, where all participants were adults, (including a hearing colleague in Workplace Setting 1, and the researcher in both settings),

**In Workplace setting 1**, as the three deaf participants conducted their conversation, a hearing colleague interrupted the discussion with a question about their experiences with auditory training. In the following transcription, no effect of this interruption can be observed on the language use in the conversation even though the interlocutor had changed and was hearing:

**Example 12**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hearing colleague</th>
<th>VOICE</th>
<th>MOUTH PATTERN</th>
<th>NM FEATURES</th>
<th>SIGN GLOSS</th>
<th>ENGLISH MEANING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eye gaze at A and C; brows up?</td>
<td>ASK-PRO, QUESTION</td>
<td>Can I ask you all a question?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>VOICE</th>
<th>MOUTH PATTERN</th>
<th>NM FEATURES</th>
<th>SIGN GLOSS</th>
<th>ENGLISH MEANING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tell</td>
<td>audiology</td>
<td>how</td>
<td>TELL-PRO, OVER AUDIOLOGY YOUNG TRAIN YOUR H-O-W HAPPEN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hearing colleague</th>
<th>VOICE</th>
<th>MOUTH PATTERN</th>
<th>NM FEATURES</th>
<th>SIGN GLOSS</th>
<th>ENGLISH MEANING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eye gaze to all participants, brows up?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tell me about your early auditory training, what happened?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>VOICE</th>
<th>MOUTH PATTERN</th>
<th>NM FEATURES</th>
<th>SIGN GLOSS</th>
<th>ENGLISH MEANING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>yuk</td>
<td>yuk</td>
<td></td>
<td>2H-SICK+</td>
<td>Yuk, disgusting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>VOICE</td>
<td>MOUTH PATTERN</td>
<td>yuk yuk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NM FEATURES</td>
<td>Head tilt back</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SIGN GLOSS</td>
<td>2H-SICK+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ENGLISH MEANING</td>
<td>Yuk, disgusting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| A | VOICE | MOUTH PATTERN | Eye gaze at hearing colleague; Role shift->head back and away from trainer |
|   | NM FEATURES | Role shift->head back and away from trainer |
|   | SIGN GLOSS | PATIENT+++ |
|   | ENGLISH MEANING | It was hard to put up with. |

When the hearing colleague asked the question about auditory training using Auslan, the immediate response from both Participants A and C was similar - negative and only using Auslan signs. Although this interlocutor was hearing, her intervention caused no change in the language use of the deaf participants. The conversation continued in Auslan between all three participants, with the hearing colleague as a participant observer for the rest of the discussion. No simultaneous use was evident after the intervention, and no switch of language occurred as a result of the interlocutor. No attempt was made to identify with the hearing speaker by a change of language. This result is quite different to that described by Clyne (1991: 140) about community languages in the workplace in Australia. As community languages in the workplace are usually spoken in dyads, "code-switching occurs when additional speech partners come onto the scene". However, as already stated, in the sample above no change or any language contact outcome was evident, and the new speech partner was accepted as an observer in the conversation.

**In Workplace setting 2**, the researcher several times intervened in the conversation with a question that was signed and spoken at the same time, but once again no other language contact outcome was evident after the questions. The following is an example of a question about the kind of work involved with deafblind clients:

**Example 13**

Researcher | VOICE | Addressing Participant D – You’ve worked with deafblind before?

| D | VOICE | MOUTH PATTERN | nod |
|   | NM FEATURES |   |
|   | SIGN GLOSS | YES +++ WORK D-B-A LONG-AGO |
Participant D responded at length with a description of her work. Despite the fact that the researcher used English and Auslan simultaneously, there appeared to be no difference in the subsequent conversation of the two participants, D and E. Both continued to use Auslan with no change to English structure and no addition of spoken English in their conversation.

7.3 Role relationship

As this data collection involved participants in only two settings (workplace and family), there was no evidence available about any language contact phenomena that could be observed by participants in an alternate role. Each setting involved a different group of participants, the relationships in each setting were different, and the same participants were not observed in more than one setting. In the family settings the participants used Auslan and English simultaneously with hearing children in their home, and also used the two languages simultaneously with other deaf adults although this seemed to occur less often and for different reasons. This is an area open to further research.

7.4 Venue

The domains studied in this research were mixed as the venues were home/family, and the workplace, and the topic of the conversations was school. Clyne (1991: 192) referred to the demands of these domains as requiring “[at home] a switch to a community language and [in
the] work and school domains a switch to English”. The results from this study showed that changes in language use occurred in both domains, but not necessarily for the same reasons as spoken languages in the Australian community (as described by Clyne). In each domain, some transference to incorporate features of the dominant spoken language could be seen (also see Chapter Six), and also some simultaneous use of both languages, most noticeably in response to the hearing children involved in the conversation. The simultaneous use of both languages in the family settings was also for different reasons than when it occurred in the workplace settings. The deaf parents made use of transference of features of English and simultaneous use in their strategy of full communication with all their children, and in their role as mediator in a mixed hearing and deaf family. Examples 4, 8, 10, 11 and 30 show some of these contact phenomena. (See also Section 7.1 above).

Deaf people in the workplace may converse with each other in a more monolingual mode than when they are at home with the family. The need to mediate in the communication in a group may not be as strong in the workplace, or other factors may have had an influence on the participants’ language choice in this data collection. One such factor may have been the positive attitude to the use of Auslan with deaf colleagues for the time of this recording, when the usual reality at the workplace was contact signing (Johnston & Schembri 2007) and simultaneous use of both languages, with hearing colleagues who could not sign at all. (See Section 2.2.4.1 for a discussion of ‘contact signing’). No data collection was conducted in either workplace setting with more than one hearing person intervening in the conversation. Consequently no results are available on the incidence of spoken or written English that may be used by the participants using a wider variety of communication methods with other hearing colleagues.

7.5 Topic

In each setting some transference could be attributed to the topic that was under discussion. In Workplace setting 1, in the following example, Participant A recalled an incident from her days at school, when they played the game called ‘I Spy with My Little Eye’. The complete name of the game was transferred into Auslan and produced in the same structure as the spoken English. This semantic transference was based on the name of the game played at school.

**Example 14**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>VOICE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOUTH PATTERN</td>
<td>Eye gaze to B and C, head tilt back, head down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM FEATURES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIGN GLOSS</td>
<td>MUM HAVE REPORT SAY B-O-S-S-Y PRO, SAY PRO, B-O-S-S-Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGLISH MEANING</td>
<td>Mum had my report and she said I was bossy!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| VOICE |
| MOUTH PATTERN | head forward |
| NM FEATURES | |

150
Participant A was upset when her school report labelled her as bossy. During the game of ‘I Spy’ she felt she was just helping her fellow students as she told them to say what she said. In this transference (see Chapter 2) the participant changed the structure of the name to fit Auslan signs, and in doing so the English title was altered. It was no longer completely English in structure but also was not Auslan in structure either, as the first part of the name closely followed the original English title. Johnston & Schembri (2007: 177) refer to this process as ‘lexical borrowing’ where the item from English, bossy, has been “restructured (or phonologically nativised) to make it more closely resemble the phonological form of words in the language”.

Polysemous

In Workplace Setting 2, Participant D employed Auslan but the syntax converged towards English syntax in the name of the story. She was referring to fairy tales that were read in her classroom during her school years, and which she failed to understand. The name of the story ‘Snow White and the Seven Dwarves’ was constructed as SNOW WHITE SEVEN CHILDREN. There is no specific Auslan sign equivalent for the English word dwarf. The sign CHILDREN can also mean SHORT or SHORT PEOPLE, so there is a semantic extension of the sign to include the meaning of dwarf.

Example 15
At 23 years of age participant D finally saw the filmed version of the stories that were read to the class during her childhood, and which she had completely failed to understand. In this example the English name of the story has been changed and produced in Auslan signs which did not convey the same meaning as the English words. The item snow white was an English term referring to the pristine whiteness of white, but in Auslan the signs SNOW WHITE would communicate simply that ‘The snow is white’. The use of the signs SNOW WHITE as the name of a heroine in a story was a semantic transfer from English. Similarly, the signs SEVEN CHILDREN used for the seven dwarfs was a semantic extension of the meaning of CHILDREN, as the sign CHILDREN can also mean SHORT PEOPLE. The two interlocutors both nodded at this use of signs to indicate their understanding that CHILDREN meant DWARFS. This shared understanding probably is the reason that this participant did not fingerspell the word DWARFS for clarity.
In Family Setting 1 there was also an example of semantic transference that was influenced by the topic under discussion. The Participant G (mother) and son were discussing his stronger football opponents and her suggested solution to this dilemma.

Example 16

**Son**

**VOICE**

**MOUTH PATTERN**

**NM FEATURES**

**SIGN GLOSS**

Y-C-C-W STRONG TEAM STRONG++

**ENGLISH MEANING**

YCCW is a strong team, very strong

**G**

**VOICE**

**MOUTH PATTERN**

**NM FEATURES**

Eye gaze to Son  Smile

**SIGN GLOSS**

PRO₂ BH-MUSCLE-ON-UPPER-ARM CHEST-OUT-HANDS-HEL'D-IN-FRONT

**ENGLISH MEANING**

You need muscles,

**VOICE**

**MOUTH PATTERN**

**NM FEATURES**

Eye gaze to Son  Smile

**SIGN GLOSS**

PRO₂ EAT GREEN FOOD

**ENGLISH MEANING**

you should eat the green food,

**Daughter**

**VOICE**

**MOUTH PATTERN**

**NM FEATURES**

Eye Gaze to G  Brows up?  Head shake

**SIGN GLOSS**

S-T-E-A-K

**ENGLISH MEANING**

You mean steak?  Oh.

**G**

**VOICE**

**MOUTH PATTERN**

**NM FEATURES**

Eye gaze to Son

**SIGN GLOSS**

BH-MUSCLE-ON-UPPER-ARM PRO₂ KNOW P-O-P-E-Y-E STRONG MAN

**ENGLISH MEANING**

Build your muscles. You know like Popeye the strong man.

**Son**

**VOICE**

**MOUTH PATTERN**

**NM FEATURES**

Frown, mouth turned down, Eye gaze at G

**SIGN GLOSS**


**ENGLISH MEANING**


**G**

**VOICE**

**MOUTH PATTERN**

**NM FEATURES**

Eye gaze to Son

**SIGN GLOSS**

PRO2 KNOW CARTOON STRONG P-O-P-E-Y-E FUNNY

**ENGLISH MEANING**

You know, the cartoon of Popeye the funny strong man.

**Son**

**VOICE**

**MOUTH PATTERN**

**NM FEATURES**

Eye gaze to G  Nod

**SIGN GLOSS**


Participant G suggested that her son needed to develop muscles such as those of Popeye the cartoon character. Participant G used a visual caricature of the Popeye cartoon by focusing on the muscles, in addition to using the English name which she fingerspelled. The use of the signs EAT GREEN FOOD included one sign used twice for a different function, as the same Auslan sign, with modification for the verb, can mean eat and food. This seemed to stem from the participant's inability to recall the name spinach. The topic and the need to describe the cartoon character and the food which helped develop muscles led to the semantic transference from English.

Another example, (in Family Setting 2) of topic as a variable that can promote language contact outcomes is in Example 33, where the subject of discussion was whether the two adults could remember learning English and Auslan:

**Example 33**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I</th>
<th>VOICE</th>
<th>MOUTH PATTERN</th>
<th>NM FEATURES</th>
<th>SIGN GLOSS</th>
<th>ENGLISH MEANING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AUSLAN REMEMBER PRO₂ LEARN AUSLAN PRO₁ REMEMBER</td>
<td>I remember you learning Auslan and I remember</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I</th>
<th>VOICE</th>
<th>MOUTH PATTERN</th>
<th>NM FEATURES</th>
<th>SIGN GLOSS</th>
<th>ENGLISH MEANING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PRO₂ INVOLVE ENGLISH LEARN</td>
<td>you were also learning English</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>J</th>
<th>VOICE</th>
<th>MOUTH PATTERN</th>
<th>NM FEATURES</th>
<th>SIGN GLOSS</th>
<th>ENGLISH MEANING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nod nod       head shake    shrug</td>
<td>CAN'T REMEMBER</td>
<td>I can't remember at all</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HD1</th>
<th>VOICE</th>
<th>MOUTH PATTERN</th>
<th>NM FEATURES</th>
<th>SIGN GLOSS</th>
<th>ENGLISH MEANING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PRO₂ LEARN ENGLISH SPELLING ENGLISH WORD</td>
<td>You learnt English with the right spelling for English words</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I</th>
<th>VOICE</th>
<th>MOUTH PATTERN</th>
<th>NM FEATURES</th>
<th>SIGN GLOSS</th>
<th>ENGLISH MEANING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yes sign is the your of yes</td>
<td>nod</td>
<td>YES AND SIGN IS(SE) THE YOUR OF YES LEARN ENGLISH</td>
<td>yes and the English signs for 'is', 'the', 'your', 'of' yes I learnt English.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participant I remembered that her partner, Participant J had learned Auslan as well as English, although Participant J had no real memory of how the learning had occurred.
Participant I responded to her daughter’s comment about learning English spelling, in a way that revealed the influence of both topic and interlocutor on her next utterance. The signs (including Signed English signs for *is* and *of*), were produced simultaneously with clear mouth patterns for each English word. No voice was used in this example, but the mouth patterns were clearly part of English, and the signs were produced in a stilted non-fluent way, demonstrating a kind of ‘parrotting’ of the English terms. The transference of English patterns into the Auslan was another example of how the topic influenced the language of discussion between these participants.

### 7.6 Type of Interaction

The instructions to all participants in this study included references to ‘casual conversation’, ‘sharing memories of school days’, and ‘discussing changes in education for deaf students in segregated or integrated settings’. No mention was made of formality or informality, but all participants enthusiastically embarked on their conversations in the workplaces and the family homes, with seemingly no doubt in their minds that the conversation was informal. Thus no data were available for this research on possible consequences of a change of interaction on the language use of these deaf participants.

### 7.7 Fingerspelling

Research on fingerspelling has not yet led to a definitive answer as to whether fingerspelling is part of sign language or an orthographic representation of the written majority language. It is clear that fingerspelling is part of the language of the deaf community (Johnston & Schembri (2007: 34). The behaviour of the participants seemed to indicate an acceptance of fingerspelling as it did not lead to any switching into the other language nor to any simultaneous use of English and Auslan.

The examples of fingerspelling shown in Chapter 6 were mostly names and titles that would be difficult to express in any other way than by fingerspelling. This transference of the graphic features of English into Auslan is frequently used to express proper nouns, although some people and places acquire signs associated with some identifying feature that all local signers know and understand. Most capital cities of Australia have a name sign that is understood by all in the community, and some places may even have a choice of name sign. Some of the fingerspelling in the data are examples of this kind of naming, such as the sign for SYDNEY or S-Y fingerspelled. States of Australia can be spelled in full, or abbreviated to initials, for example V-I-C-T-O-R-I-A or V-I-C. Shortened forms of the full fingerspelled names can become patterns so well recognized that they become ‘lexicalised signs’ as mentioned in the literature (Schembri, 1996; Valli & Lucas, 2000). (See Section 4.1.4 for a discussion of ‘lexicalised signs’). People in the deaf community may also acquire name signs related to some identifying feature, although many are known by their fingerspelled initials. These initialized patterns can also become lexicalised signs as a part of Auslan, rather than having a relationship to the English orthography from which they originated. The fingerspelled names
or the lexicalised patterns they become can cause confusion between two signers, but this did not seem to cause any other change in language use of the participants, either in the form of further transference or simultaneous use. (See Example 18 below).

Schools for the deaf sometimes had name signs that identified them as an alternative to the name being represented in full by fingerspelling. Thus St Gabriel’s School for the Deaf in Sydney could be represented by fingerspelling the name in full, S-T-G-A-B-R-I-E-L-S-C-H-O-O-L, or using the initialized sign based on the Irish fingerspelling alphabet ‘G’ moved in small circles near the signer’s cheek. The information contained in that small sign included the fact that it was a Roman Catholic school for the deaf, as the students used the Irish alphabet in that educational system. Similarly, the name sign for St Mary’s Delgany School for the Deaf in Portsea was based on the Irish alphabet ‘P’, moved in small circles near the signer’s cheek. From these small examples it can be seen that the culture and history of the deaf community in Australia is closely linked to the way language is used by signers in the community, and the assumptions they make when using particular name signs. An example of the confusion that can arise when two signers do not share the same knowledge of place names and signs can be seen in this Example (18) from Workplace Setting 2. Note that the confusion caused a repair but no other language contact outcome (including transference or simultaneous use of both languages).

**Example 18**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E</th>
<th>VOICE</th>
<th>MOUTH PATTERN</th>
<th>You</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NM FEATURES</td>
<td>brows up?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SIGN GLOSS</td>
<td>PRO₁</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ENGLISH MEANING</td>
<td>What about you?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F</th>
<th>VOICE</th>
<th>MOUTH PATTERN</th>
<th>School half</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NM FEATURES</td>
<td>Brows up? Head tilt down; brows up?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SIGN GLOSS</td>
<td>PRO₁; START SCHOOL P-O-R-T-S-E-A; TWO-HALF AGE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ENGLISH MEANING</td>
<td>Me? Start school? Portsea at two and a half years old.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>VOICE</th>
<th>MOUTH PATTERN</th>
<th>Deaf School Board</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NM FEATURES</td>
<td>Frown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SIGN GLOSS</td>
<td>DEAF SMALL YOUNG KNOW NOTHING PUT SCHOOL B-O-A-R-D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ENGLISH MEANING</td>
<td>I was deaf, small, young, innocent. I was put there as a boarder.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E</th>
<th>VOICE</th>
<th>MOUTH PATTERN</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NM FEATURES</td>
<td>brows up?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SIGN GLOSS</td>
<td>AREA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ENGLISH MEANING</td>
<td>Where is that?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F</th>
<th>VOICE</th>
<th>MOUTH PATTERN</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
NM FEATURES
SIGN GLOSS NEAR P-O-R
ENGLISH MEANING Near Por.....

E VOICE
MOUTH PATTERN brows up?
NM FEATURES brows up?
SIGN GLOSS MELBOURNE
ENGLISH MEANING In Melbourne?

F VOICE
MOUTH PATTERN Opp
NM FEATURES Nod Nod Nod
SIGN GLOSS YES SORRY MELBOURNE OPPOSITE Q-U-E-E-N-S-C-L-I-F-F
ENGLISH MEANING yes sorry Melbourne opposite Queenscliff

VOICE
MOUTH PATTERN School Boy Girl
NM FEATURES Brows up? Head tilt down
SIGN GLOSS QUEEN C-L-I-F-F OPPOSITE POINT=SCHOOL P-O-R WITH BOY GIRL
ENGLISH MEANING Queenscliff? Opposite there was the school at Portsea for boys and girls.

In line 2 of the above example, Participant F referred to the school he attended by fingerspelling the name the school was known by, P-O-R-T-S-E-A. In Line 4, Participant E asked where that was, because he was a relative newcomer from Britain, and not very familiar with (the history or geography of) outer Melbourne suburbs. Participant F continued to refer to P-O-R, but Participant E specified the question as to whether it was in Melbourne or not. In his reply, Participant F apologised and fingerspelled Q-U-E-E-N-S-C-L-I-F-F, but then used a common sign for the place, QUEEN, and added the fingerspelled C-L-I-F-F. He then checked the comprehension of his interlocutor E with his questioning facial expression. (This use of the sign QUEEN with C-L-I-F-F fingerspelled is similar to the way speakers of English replace words with numbers in instances such as ‘4 sale’, although in this instance the –s morpheme is omitted). Sutton-Spence & Woll (1999: 233) commented that “It is important to remember that even if a signer knows a sign for the name of a place, the name will often be fingerspelled at least once in full, if there is any doubt about the name, or if the place is being mentioned for the first time and is not local”. This is exactly what Participant F attempted to do as he fingerspelled the name of Queenscliff, although there was still confusion between the interlocutors.

Other reasons for fingerspelling include recollections of a teacher or parent who used the words within spoken English expressions, and these included examples like B-O-S-S-Y, M-I-S-S OUT, U-S-E YOUR VOICE PLEASE, and PRO$_1$ S-P-Y WITH PRO$_1$ LITTLE EYE START WITH in Workplace Setting 1. The following example shows the term B-O-S-S-Y:

Example 14
A VOICE
The Participant A was reported to be *bossy* as she tried to help other students in the game of ‘I Spy’.

Another example was:

**Example 19**

A

**VOICE**

**MOUTH PATTERN**

brows up

**NM FEATURES**

**GLOSS**

BUT ONE FAIL POSS₁ DEAF FRIEND ACCOMMODATION WEEKEND

**ENGLISH MEANING**

But one problem was when my deaf friends slept over at the weekends

**VOICE**

**MOUTH PATTERN**

Head forward

**NM FEATURES**

**GLOSS**

MOTHER SAY U-S-E POSS₂ VOICE PLEASE

**ENGLISH MEANING**

Mum would say ‘Use your voice please’

**VOICE**

**MOUTH PATTERN**

voice voice voice

**NM FEATURES**

shrug grimace shrug frown

**GLOSS**

PRO₁ SIGN SIGN SIGN NOT COMFORTABLE

**ENGLISH MEANING**

I had to sign and voice. It was not comfortable!

In this example the participant demonstrated with her shrugs and grimaces how much she disliked using her voice as she signed, and she recalled how her mother asked her to sign and use her voice at the same time, when she communicated with her friends. These were examples of what Gumperz (1982: 78) described as instances of quotations from other speakers as reported by the participants during their conversations. The fingerspelling in these instances was a representation of the English word used by the original English speaker, and so remained linked to the orthography of written English. However, it was incorporated into the Auslan of the participant and led to no change in the language use of
this participant, other than a quotation from the past. No language contact outcomes were seen as a result of the fingerspelling.

A further use of fingerspelling in the data also highlighted the amount of convergence that has occurred between Auslan and spoken English. In their desire to be specific about the choice of term used, participants used fingerspelling when they could have used a sign that conveyed the same meaning, but not necessarily the same English word in the mind of the interlocutors. Examples are T-U-T-O-R, R-E-C-E-S-S, and B-O-S-S-Y in Workplace Setting 1 (see above), and T-O-T-A-L, R-E-L-A-X, O-U-T-I-N-G, C-L-U-B and B-U-L-L-Y in Workplace Setting 2.

Example 20

Participant D repeated the theme from Workplace setting 1, where she spent time reading to avoid the loneliness and isolation she felt in the schoolroom and playground. Having no friends was made worse by the fact that she was ‘bullied’ a lot at school. This use of fingerspelling of B-U-L-Y may have been also a desire to emphasise what was happening, so there could be no doubt in the minds of her interlocutors of how difficult it was in the mainstream school that she attended at that time.

Consider this example of O-U-T-I-N-G:

Example 21

Participant F used the term outing in the sense of an excursion with a group of others. This whole concept of an outing is clearly one identified with the lexical item transferred to Auslan as this participant has replaced other signs for excursion, visit, or going out.

The next example of the use of lexicalised fingerspelling rather than a sign for #CLUB is common and highlights an interesting pattern in the language use of the community:
Here Participant F referred to his work with the Vision Hearing Support Club. He fingerspelled #CLUB as the sign CLUB in Auslan has usually referred to the social and support aspects of the DEAF-CLUB. This compound sign was used to describe the gathering of deaf people for social and peer support issues as well as some welfare support in the past. (The sign seems to relate to the ringing of the bell which was used to call people to the worship service which was always part of the historic gatherings of the deaf community in Australia). The sign CLUB was traditionally not ever used to refer to other kinds of clubs, be they sporting or social. For that wider use of the word ‘club’ the term was always fingerspelled and has become a lexicalised sign for this wider meaning. Recent anecdotal evidence from interpreters in Victoria suggests that the sign CLUB is being used following other nouns such as FOOTBALL, BOWLING, DEAFBLIND and so on. This widening of the use of the term club is probably another instance of the influence of English on Auslan, where the wider semantic connotation of the English expression has been transferred to the Auslan sign.

Other examples are S-E-V-E-R-E, and P-R-O-F-I-U-N-D in Family Setting 1.

Participant G explained that her daughter was severely to profoundly deaf and used the English descriptions by fingerspelling them in full. These terms have replaced the commonly used terms such as full, part, half or little bit deaf, as the English terms have influenced Auslan. The words are fingerspelled for reasons of emphasis, as well as to enable Participant G to explain in detail the difference between the auditory competence of two deaf members of the same family.

Further examples of this kind of fingerspelling are #BUT, #HOW, and OLD #DAYS in Family Setting 2. For each of these terms participants could have used a sign, but as the same sign
could be interpreted in other ways in spoken English, the participants were careful to be specific about which English term they intended. The use of the fingerspelled expression O-L-D#DAYS is interesting to see:

**Example 24**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>J</th>
<th>VOICE</th>
<th>MOUTH PATTERN</th>
<th>NM FEATURES</th>
<th>SIGN GLOSS</th>
<th>ENGLISH MEANING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VOICE</td>
<td>WHEN OLD GROW HIMSELF READ BECAUSE</td>
<td>Later when he grew older, he read for himself because</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOICE</td>
<td>PRO, READ ENGLISH MAYBE AGO O-L-D #DAYS AGO</td>
<td>I don't read English very well, from the old days</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOICE</td>
<td>PRO, BETTER IMPROVE READ HIMSELF READ</td>
<td>He reads better and has improved his reading by himself.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participant J stated that her son began to read by himself as he grew older, implying that her reading skills could not support him because her education from ‘the old days’ did not equip her with strategies for reading higher level English. The expression O-L-D-D-A-Y-S was most probably fingerspelled to clarify that the participant was referring to days in the past, and not any day of the week. As in English conversations, the phrase ‘old days’ was used to recall the past with some affection, even though the result of this education was obviously not as successful as this participant would have liked.

An expression like O#F COURSE (ASL) also highlighted the convergence between Auslan and English:

**Example 5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Researcher</th>
<th>Voice/Sign</th>
<th>Voice/Sign</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voice</td>
<td>When you're angry with them do you shout or just sign?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I</th>
<th>VOICE</th>
<th>MOUTH PATTERN</th>
<th>NM FEATURES</th>
<th>SIGN GLOSS</th>
<th>ENGLISH MEANING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VOICE</td>
<td>Shout</td>
<td>Nod</td>
<td>Brows up</td>
<td>YES PRO, ANGRY PRO, SHOUT++ AND SIGN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>J</th>
<th>VOICE</th>
<th>MOUTH PATTERN</th>
<th>NM FEATURES</th>
<th>SIGN GLOSS</th>
<th>ENGLISH MEANING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VOICE</td>
<td>YES #OF COURSE(ASL)</td>
<td>Yes of course</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Participant J used the expression #OF COURSE to indicate her agreement with the assertion from Participant I that when they were angry they would shout and sign at the same time. A sign that could have conveyed a similar meaning was YES or TRUE, with non-manual features; other gestures such as open hands with palms up; and facial expression conveying the sarcasm, irony, or the intended emphasis. This phrase included a transference from English into Auslan, and a lexical transference from ASL to Auslan (see Johnston, 1998: 400), with COURSE. This sign was more commonly used to refer to a set of subjects undertaken in a particular educational ‘course’, but this is an example of N English meaning transferred to an Auslan sign with partial synonymity.

Fingerspelling can include words that have been spelled the same way so frequently that the pattern of the fingerspelt letters has become a sign. i.e. the term has become ‘lexicalised’ as part of the core lexicon of Auslan. (Schembri, 1996; Valli & Lucas, 2000). Examples of this are the initialized days of the week (#MON to #SUN), and #IF in Workplace Setting 1; #HOW, #CLUB, and #ZOO in Workplace Setting 2; #HOW and #KK in Family Setting 2. Alternative signs for these terms are rarely used, as the fingerspelt pattern has developed into a signed movement that fits all the criteria of a sign in the Auslan lexicon. (See Johnston & Schembri 2007).

Finally, the occurrence of full and lexicalised fingerspelling in each of the settings (workplace and family) was between fifty and sixty tokens in each setting of 45 minutes. The reasons for fingerspelling in each setting were similar, even though the settings were entirely different. The interlocutors in the family settings were children, deaf and hearing, so the need for clarification of names of places, schools and teachers, and the leaning towards the children’s dominant language would provide the main motivation for using full fingerspelling. The interlocutors in the workplace settings were adults, both deaf and hearing, and some of the deaf adults were not familiar with local signs (especially name signs). Hence the motivation for full fingerspelling to clarify concepts during the conversations.

### 7.8 Language and Identity Factors

#### 7.8.1 Name Signs

Name signs are at least as much a part of the social communication in the deaf community as nicknames are in some sections of the hearing community. Name signs develop as a visual marker to identify a person in a visual communication system. “The giving of a first name sign usually coincides with a Deaf person’s entry into the child or adult society of other Deaf people, and new name signs often mark junctures in life such as moving to a new school or adult community, moving into a new social group, or undergoing a change in physical appearance.” (McKee & McKee, 2000: 22). The difference between name signs in the deaf
community and nicknames in the hearing community is that a personal name sign can also convey information about the background of the person, such as the deaf school they attended, or the kind of work they did when they first had contact with the deaf community.

“Personal identity in the Deaf community is strongly shaped by (and reflected in) language use and by one’s relationships with peers – information that is encapsulated in a small way in name signs”. (McKee & McKee, 2000: 3). Name signs may be descriptive and may reflect some habit or idiosyncratic feature that all those around the person know to be unique to that person. “The descriptive signs have three different sources: a physical characteristic; a character trait of the person; or something identifiable about the person’s life”. (Sutton-Spence & Woll, 1999: 235). Many past students of the various deaf schools in each state in Australia actually shared the same name sign, particularly if they happened to use the same locker during their time at the school, or if they shared the same initials. Often name signs in Victoria were based on the locker number, and in each generation of students, someone’s name sign would reveal the unique role of lockers in this development of name signs in Victoria. This practice is not continued now, but some senior citizens in the Victorian community are still known by their number. According to McKee & McKee (2000: 8) “Anecdotal evidence is that the bearers of locker numbers may have preferred these seemingly impersonal name signs over the alternative of possibly unflattering descriptive name signs.” Some personal name signs are not always liked by the owner of the sign and can be changed when the person is an adult. Some name signs become inappropriate due to changing circumstances in the community. An example of this is the name sign for people based on the sign CHERRY. This may be the case for people named Cheryl, or Jerry as two examples. The sign CHERRY is similar in location and handshape as the Auslan sign for COCHLEAR IMPLANT, and although the precise location, orientation and movement are different, the device is regarded with some negativity within the community, and so some people have had reason to change their name sign. This particular example is a personal observation based on the self-change by two individuals known to the researcher within the Victorian deaf community.

Place name signs (including schools) are often based on the first initial of the English name of the school, street or place. This is demonstrated by the names for St Gabriel’s School for the deaf in Sydney, and the Portsea School for the deaf in Melbourne. Both these schools have names signs that are based on the first initial from the Irish fingerspelling alphabet, G and P. The city of Perth in WA is known by its name sign that is based on the initial P from the American ASL fingerspelling alphabet. Other place name signs may be related to the meaning of the English word (as in the use of the sign SAINT to refer to the place St Kilda), or where the etymology of the sign is lost in history, such as the signs for MELBOURNE. The sign for the Adelaide in South Australia is based on the name sign of a well known welfare worker who left Melbourne and went to live in Adelaide. He was referred to in his absence often enough as living in Adelaide that the place acquired the sign which had been his.
In this study several name signs for people and places appear in each setting, in most cases referring to people not present during the conversation or to schools attended in the past. However, one of the reasons for the fingerspelling is that in each workplace there was at least one person who did not share the same knowledge of past school or work experience, and in each family the hearing children did not share the knowledge of the older generation. The usual convention (see page 17) is to spell the name of the place in full at least once, before using the name sign (Sutton-Spence & Woll, 1999). In these instances the only way to represent the English name of the person or place was to fingerspell the name or at least a shortening of the name. Thus in Workplace Setting 1, examples such as S-T-K-I-L-D-A, S-T-G-A-B-R-I-E-L, and S-Y-D-N-E-Y were all fingerspelled, even though each one was just as easily identifiable by a name sign. The name sign for St Kilda (the location of a Victorian school for deaf children) is similar to drawing a halo over one's head, the sign for St Gabriel's school is based on the Irish alphabet ‘G’, and the name sign for Sydney is based on the sign for a bridge.

In Workplace setting 2 the names S-U-N-S-H-I-N-E, L-A, L-O-N-D-O-N and P-O-R-T-S-E-A could each have been visually represented with a well known name sign. Sunshine is usually known by the sign for SUN, and London has a sign near the signer’s ear that is known internationally in deaf communities. It is interesting that Participant E used the ASL sign for Los Angeles which is based on the ASL alphabet for L and A. He immediately followed this by fingerspelling L-A using the Auslan alphabet, probably because he felt that the other two participants may not have shared his knowledge of ASL, or the lexicalised name sign for Los Angeles. The school in Portsea in Victoria was commonly known all around Australia by a sign based on the Irish alphabet handshape for ‘P’.

In Family Settings 1 and 2 the participants fingerspelled some of the same school names as above, such as Portsea, and some of the schools in South Australia, but as the name signs may not have been recognized by the children in each family, the parents continued to fingerspell either in full, or a shortened initialized form of the school name. See Sutton-Spence & Woll (1999: 233) for a discussion of this convention.

7.8.2 Deaf/Hearing Identities and Auslan/English Bilingualism
Deaf people in Australia constantly move between their English language experience (as they say ‘in the hearing world’) and their Auslan language experience (‘in the deaf world’). For those few who have deaf family, their family experience is part of their Auslan experience, but for the majority of deaf people, they share English as part of their family identity, and they share Auslan only with their deaf community and friends. They negotiate their identities in much the same way as described by Blackledge & Pavlenko (2001). An individual deaf person has multiple identities, depending on which group he/she is with and which language is used to communicate within that group. Some of these issues are revealed by the
participants in this study in their conversations, and include issues such as missing out on equal access to communication and educational experiences, frustration felt in the classrooms (either from repetitive lessons or from inability to access the activity), and the kind of communication between deaf and hearing members of the family, as well as between the parents and children. Different ways of using their languages are also ways to exhibit their identity to others in each setting. This is revealed particularly in Examples 5 and 9, where parents expressed their own awareness of using both languages, shouting simultaneously with animated signing when they described their anger.

In Workplace Setting 1 the participants discussed learning at school and their experiences with subjects such as music. Participant B stated that she missed out on a lot of what the other children could access easily:

**Example 25**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B</th>
<th>VOICE</th>
<th>MOUTH PATTERN</th>
<th>But information miss out music</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NM FEATURES</td>
<td>Eye gaze to ceiling</td>
<td>Eye gaze to C and A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIGN GLOSS</td>
<td>BUT INFORM LEARN LEARN MISS O-U-T MUSIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGLISH MEANING</td>
<td>But even though I learned some, I missed out on a lot of things, like music,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VOICE</th>
<th>MOUTH PATTERN</th>
<th>Miss out lot but love read</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NM FEATURES</td>
<td>Eye gaze to A, Nod Nod Shrug Eye gaze to C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIGN GLOSS</td>
<td>MISS O-U-T LOT BUT WHAT LOVE READ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGLISH MEANING</td>
<td>I missed out on a lot, but I loved reading</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participant B was critical when she stated that she missed out on a lot of the events in the classroom at school. Participant A and C each gave her full eye contact, returning her gaze, and indicated their empathy with this situation. Being left out of activities is a common experience for deaf and hearing-impaired people, regardless of their physiological hearing loss. The term *missed out* is not usually signed in this way in Auslan, but the meaning was quite clear to each of the other participants. In this example, the fingerspelled O-U-T was redundant, as the sign MISS would indicate the same meaning. This participant was a late second language learner of Auslan even though she grew up as a deaf person. This usage was not marked by the other participants, or they gave no indication that it was marked, and the conversation continued with no change of language use. I believe this reinforces the position regarding the influence of English on Auslan and the convergence of Auslan towards English. The comment also highlighted the dilemma of segregated or integrated forms of education for deaf children, as the message was critical of her experience in an integrated setting. One of the perceived disadvantages of the integrated education setting for deaf
children was that they do *miss out* on full access to communication and learning that hearing children access more easily. This is the opposite perception to that in the following example where the segregated setting was also criticised for the lack of progressive curriculum provided to deaf students. Participant A in *Workplace Setting 1* commented on the unsatisfactory education she received in the segregated setting of a special school for the deaf. Her comment in the following transcription, also critical, referred to the repetition of curriculum that occurred every year at her school. Although it may have seemed that they had better access to communication at the school for the deaf, it was apparent that they did not have access to the full curriculum, but instead to a limited form of the curriculum as, in her opinion, the teachers repeated the same content year after year.

*Example 26*

A 

**VOICE**

MOUTH PATTERN

**NM FEATURES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIGN GLOSS</th>
<th>ENGLISH MEANING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BUT PRO; REMEMBER THAT TIME OLD TEACHER BEFORE J-U-N-E-B-E-R-R-Y</td>
<td>But I remember at that time our old teachers before June Berry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**VOICE**

MOUTH PATTERN

**NM FEATURES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIGN GLOSS</th>
<th>ENGLISH MEANING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SAME M-I-S-C-A-H-I-L OTHER OTHER POINT; POINT POINT TEACH←</td>
<td>like Miss Cahill and the others would teach us</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**VOICE**

MOUTH PATTERN

**NM FEATURES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIGN GLOSS</th>
<th>ENGLISH MEANING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SIX MONTH LATER TEACH← AGAIN FINISH LEARN</td>
<td>Six months later they would teach us the same work again. We protested</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**VOICE**

MOUTH PATTERN

**NM FEATURES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIGN GLOSS</th>
<th>ENGLISH MEANING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MAKE SURE PRO; UNDERSTAND</td>
<td>but the teachers just said they had to make sure we understood the work.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**VOICE**

MOUTH PATTERN

**NM FEATURES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIGN GLOSS</th>
<th>ENGLISH MEANING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REPEAT FINISH DOESN'T MATTER DOESN'T MATTER</td>
<td>We said we've done that work! It didn't make any difference.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**VOICE**

MOUTH PATTERN

**NM FEATURES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIGN GLOSS</th>
<th>ENGLISH MEANING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BH-ROLL-OVER-OVER REPEAT REPEAT</td>
<td>We did the same work over and over again. It was as if the teachers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C **VOICE**

MOUTH PATTERN
The frustration expressed in this conversation was highlighted by Participant B in the second last line, when she queried whether she had understood it correctly to mean the same curriculum was taught every year again and again. This need to confirm the meaning may also have had to do with the sign CALENDAR used by Participant A as this was a “loan sign from ASL” according to Johnston (1998: 400) or a semantic transfer (Clyne, 1991:160) that had marginal use amongst some members of the deaf community. It may be that the sign was unfamiliar to Participant B, enough to require an interruption to confirm her understanding. Participant A confirmed that this was her meaning, that the same curriculum was repeated every six months. This frustration added to the feeling of freedom and relief when the students went out for a recess or lunch break. This was the time of relaxed communication between friends using Auslan. The following example is a continuation by Participant A from above:

**Example 27**

A

**VOICE**

**MOUTH PATTERN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NM FEATURES</th>
<th>Teach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RH Wave Wave</td>
<td>Eye Gaze to A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eye Gaze to A</td>
<td>RH to mouth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eye Gaze to B</td>
<td>Eye Gaze to C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SIGN GLOSS**

RH OVER AND OVER ----- T-I-L-L PRO, W-A-S ABOUT FIFTEEN TWO-OF-

**ENGLISH MEANING**

Over and over until I was about fifteen, we two were in the same class at
Participant A addressed B as she talked about being in the same class as C, then she shifted her gaze to C and reminded her of how they did not understand the way the teachers signed in English word order. The students would all rush out (ESCAPE) to recess where they could communicate in their preferred language. The use of the sign for ESCAPE indicated the sense of relief felt at going outside to free and easy communication with other deaf friends. This was an example of the theme noted in Chapter 5, that of the feeling of relaxation in the communication of the playground. The eye contact between Participant A and C was an expression of their common experience in the same school, and their identity as deaf students who underwent the same education.

In **Workplace Setting 2**, the participants also commented on the amount of communication and learning that was missed during their school days. Participant D preceded her transference (about the title of books that were read at school) by commenting that she had no idea what was being read and in fact it all went over my head. She would sit in the half circle with the other children, hear nothing, and the only feeling she had was that of boredom and missing out on something. The sad fact for most deaf people was that their education did include many lessons that were incomprehensible and therefore un-learnable:

**Example 28**

D

**VOICE**

**MOUTH PATTERN**

**NM FEATURES**

**SIGN GLOSS**

**ENGLISH MEANING**

I remember at hearing school the teacher would read to the class, we would sit in a half circle and she would read books. I had no idea and I was bored.
This statement repeated the idea referred to by Participant B in Workplace 1, as she said (see Example 25, on page 29) that she read books all the time because she was bored. Participant D here has also resorted to books to fill her time, and said that she too was bored at school as she missed most of what was happening in the classroom. Participant A stated that she believed her education was not the same as that in regular schools. Similarly, Participant F (in Workplace Setting 2) stated in the next example that he did not understand the classroom activities, especially the spoken communication:

**Example 29**

F

**VOICE**

**MOUTH PATTERN**

**NM FEATURES**

**SIGN GLOSS** TEN TAKE-PUT S-Y ST-GABRIEL (name sign) S-T-G-A-B-R-I-E-L SCHOOL

**ENGLISH MEANING** At ten I was sent to Sydney, to St Gabriel's school

**VOICE**

**MOUTH PATTERN**

**NM FEATURES**

**SIGN GLOSS** DEAF BOY 2H-MANY-GO-THERE HARD UNDERSTAND ORAL+++ 

**ENGLISH MEANING** many deaf boys went there, it was hard to understand speech and lip-reading

**VOICE**

**MOUTH PATTERN** and abuse if wrong talk

**NM FEATURES** brows up?

**SIGN GLOSS** AND ABUSE IF WRONG TALK HIT-EAR-DUCK-HEAD WHAT

**ENGLISH MEANING** and we were abused. If we said it wrong they boxed our ears, and for what?

E

**VOICE**

**MOUTH PATTERN**

**NM FEATURES** laugh

**SIGN GLOSS** SAME++ PRO2 PRO1 SAME EXPERIENCE SAME

**ENGLISH MEANING** You and I had exactly the same experiences!

The above examples refer to the quandary in deaf education, where deaf children integrated into regular schools with the aim of accessing a better education actually missed out on a lot of the learning as they had no interpreters, and no teachers who could use Auslan with them. The deaf children in schools for the deaf, supposedly with Auslan used by the teachers, were not taught using the same curriculum as in regular schools. The common experience for students in segregated and mainstream integrated education was of missing out on something, whether it was equal access to education, or equal access to communication. The deaf students in schools that did not use Auslan, but relied on speech and lip reading and auditory aids, also struggled to understand anything in the classroom, and were punished when they were wrong! The result was that all these students missed out on access to learning that their hearing peers probably took for granted. The fact that graduates from both systems identified with each other as having ‘missed out’ on education to which their hearing peers had easy access highlighted the strong ties of identity in the deaf community, even when it would seem that their individual educational background was quite different. The
different experiences in schools for the deaf or in integrated schools with hearing children did not seem to divide these deaf participants at all. Instead, they found they could share their common experience of ‘missing out’ and their mutual deaf identity.

All of the above examples did not reveal any simultaneous use of Auslan and spoken English. The conversations about missed access to education and communication were all conducted in Auslan, and it could be suggested that this was the preferred language for discussion of this topic. Further research could shed light on whether the deaf adults may have preferred to express their memories of these experiences in Auslan, recalling their common disappointment, frustration or boredom in the educational settings. The adult participants were all bilingual but in these instances have they used Auslan for the discussion, as they shared their common deaf identity?

7.8.3 Family Identity and Auslan/English Bilingualism

The factors that influenced simultaneous use by the participant parents in this study suggests that the identity issues between generations within families seem to be in contrast to those in the workplace settings. The workplace settings revealed very little simultaneous use and it was mainly used for functions of reiteration, emphasis, or recall of statements made by hearing people in the past. However, within the families there was more simultaneous use of both languages most often in response to remarks from the hearing children or following eye contact with them. See the examples and discussion below.

In addition, the following examples lead to the conclusion that communication differences between generations are similar to those in all families, whether monolingual or bilingual, where children have secrets from parents and language strategies to keep their secrets. In Auslan/English bilingual families, communication between the deaf and hearing members of the family is an identity issue, where the deaf members (whether parents or children) often believe they miss out on some of the communication between the hearing members of the family. In both family settings in this study, the adults confirmed that the hearing children (and sometimes the deaf children) used spoken English to communicate amongst themselves, and often used Auslan only when communicating directly with the deaf parents. This occurred sometimes without the children being aware of it. In Family Setting 1, the discussion followed a question from the researcher about whether the two older children, one hearing and one deaf, actually communicated in Auslan or spoken English sometimes:

Example 30

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Daughter</th>
<th>VOICE</th>
<th>MOUTH PATTERN</th>
<th>NM FEATURES</th>
<th>SIGN GLOSS</th>
<th>ENGLISH MEANING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ask him</td>
<td>brows up!</td>
<td>ASK PRO_{1}</td>
<td>Ask him</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Family Setting 1

Example 30

G VOICE Answer the question
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MOUTH PATTERN</th>
<th>Answer the question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NM FEATURES</td>
<td>Eye gaze to son smile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIGN GLOSS</td>
<td>ANSWER QUESTION PRO₁</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGLISH MEANING</td>
<td>Answer her question!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Son 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VOICE</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOUTH PATTERN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM FEATURES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIGN GLOSS</td>
<td>SPEAK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGLISH MEANING</td>
<td>We speak.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**G**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VOICE</th>
<th>Speak</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOUTH PATTERN</td>
<td>Speak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM FEATURES</td>
<td>laugh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIGN GLOSS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGLISH MEANING</td>
<td>They speak.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Daughter**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VOICE</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOUTH PATTERN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM FEATURES</td>
<td>nod smile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIGN GLOSS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGLISH MEANING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Res**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VOICE &amp; SIGN</th>
<th>Do you speak? (directed to deaf Daughter)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daugher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Daughter**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VOICE</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOUTH PATTERN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM FEATURES</td>
<td>nod smile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIGN GLOSS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGLISH MEANING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**G**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VOICE</th>
<th>Don't want mum dad know what talk about</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOUTH PATTERN</td>
<td>Don't want mum dad know what talk about</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM FEATURES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIGN GLOSS</td>
<td>PRO₃ NOT-WANT MOTHER FATHER KNOW WHAT TALK ABOUT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGLISH MEANING</td>
<td>If they don't want mum or dad to know what they are talking about</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VOICE</th>
<th>Don't want mum dad know right</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOUTH PATTERN</td>
<td>Don't want mum dad know right</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM FEATURES</td>
<td>brows up?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIGN GLOSS</td>
<td>BOTH NOT-WANT MOTHER FATHER KNOW DON'T WANT RIGHT PRO₁</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGLISH MEANING</td>
<td>If you both don't want us to know, am I right?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Son1 & Daughter**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VOICE</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOUTH PATTERN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM FEATURES</td>
<td>nod smile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIGN GLOSS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGLISH MEANING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The initial response from the daughter was to ASK PRO₃, referring to her brother. Her mother prompted (using simultaneous use) the hearing son to answer the question, and he used...
Auslan to respond that the two children used spoken English to communicate with each other. The mother, Participant G, then re-stated her son’s answer, but she used the one-word English utterance she said *speak*. The constant simultaneous use by Participant G, and the subsequent code-switch to spoken English for *speak* seemed to be for emphasis here, and to ensure full communication with both the children. By using both languages simultaneously, she was able to express her dual identity with both of her children. The acquiescence of both children with her statement by simply smiling and nodding perhaps indicated some embarrassment by them, and suggested that the reason posed by G is correct. The English communication between the two children was for privacy from their parents, even though the daughter was deaf and the son was hearing. No explanation was given as to whether the English was spoken or sub-vocalised, or even just mouthed. This supports Rampton’s assertion (1995) that children ‘inherit’ their language from their parents as part of their development, which in turn empowers them to choose which language they will use to communicate with each other. These two children had a choice of their inherited language, Auslan, or the language they have acquired or learned from the hearing community. In making this choice they used spoken English for privacy, and hence their identity with each other rather than as deaf or hearing.

On another occasion, Participant G engaged in simultaneous use in response to the discussion about which language is used by her son to communicate with his parents. In Example 31 the simultaneous use seemed to be facilitated by the topic of discussion and also the fact that the hearing child was the main interlocutor during the discussion, although her remark was directed at the hearing researcher:

**Example 31**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Researcher</th>
<th>VOICE &amp; SIGN</th>
<th>[To Son 1] What about you, when you’re talking to your Dad?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Son 1</td>
<td><strong>VOICE</strong></td>
<td><em>both just signing and talking</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>MOUTH PATTERN</strong></td>
<td><em>both just signing and talking</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>NM FEATURES</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>SIGN GLOSS</strong></td>
<td><em>BOTH</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>ENGLISH MEANING</strong></td>
<td>I use both, signing and talking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td><strong>VOICE &amp; SIGN</strong></td>
<td>Do you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>VOICE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>MOUTH PATTERN</strong></td>
<td>Brows up? Eye gaze from daughter to camera.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>NM FEATURES</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>SIGN GLOSS</strong></td>
<td><em>WHAT</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>ENGLISH MEANING</strong></td>
<td>We’ve talked about football, school and everything.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>VOICE</strong></td>
<td><em>what</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>MOUTH PATTERN</strong></td>
<td>Brows up? Eye gaze from daughter to Son 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>NM FEATURES</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>SIGN GLOSS</strong></td>
<td><em>WHAT</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>ENGLISH MEANING</strong></td>
<td>What did you say?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In this example, Participant G, the mother, simultaneously used both languages, as she recalled her own frustration at her son’s response to Auslan, and the way her son asserted his identity in Auslan and spoken English. In her recollection, Participant G actually reproduces, for the purpose of quotation, the spoken English that her son used when his Auslan fluency was commented on in the past by any of the family. At the same time she still signed Auslan, revealing her dual identity in the family, and her role as mediator of the conversation between both the hearing and the deaf members.

A similar theme was repeated in Family Setting 2. The children at first asserted that all the hearing members of the family spoke and all the deaf members signed, but the parent, Participant I corrected them and was fairly emphatic.

Example 11

Researcher  
VOICE  
I'm interested to know do you all sign to each other or do you all speak to each other sometimes here in the house?

HD 1 & 2  
VOICE  
hearing talk deaf sign

MOUTH PATTERN  
hearing talk deaf sign

NM FEATURES  
Eye gaze to each other

SIGN GLOSS  
HEARING TALK DEAF SIGN

ENGLISH MEANING  
The hearing talk and the deaf sign
In fact Participant I simultaneously used both languages to ensure full attention by all the children as she asserted that they do not all sign to include the deaf members of the family. Her statement that they all speak without signing seemed to include the deaf children, and could be taken to mean that the children, deaf or hearing tended to leave the parents out of their conversations. It would seem that all families have communication breakdowns between generations regardless of the languages used! However, this parent’s main assertion seems to be that the hearing members used spoken English even when the deaf members were present and she had to constantly ask them what it was that they were talking about. The simultaneous use followed English structure for the first half of the utterance (MOST O-F), and then although the spoken English ceased, the mouth patterns continued in English structure most of time and the Auslan was signed in a way that also followed English structure. This is an example of a deaf Auslan signer conforming their Auslan to English structure. It is probable that this kind of simultaneous use was just a way of expressing a ‘double cultural identity’ as described by Alfonzetti (1998: 182).

Participant I again used the languages simultaneously to admit that she did not even try to call out to the deaf children when she wanted them. She simply asked another child or the other parent to attract their attention by touch, and ask them to come to her.

Example 32:

I VOICE Some time
MOUTH PATTERN Some time
NM FEATURES Eye gaze to deaf son 2, head tilt down.
SIGN GLOSS SOME TIME WHEN I SHOUT DEAF POINT$_2$ BOTHER SHOUT
ENGLISH MEANING Some times when I shout I realise he is deaf and don't bother. I call out

I VOICE please get Ravi
MOUTH PATTERN Please get Ravi
NM FEATURES Eye gaze to J
In this instance, Participant I smiled as she showed her resourcefulness in using the hearing members of the family as part of her communication strategy with the deaf members. Her own identity as a deaf member of the family was at odds with her need of the hearing members in her role as a parent. This was indicated by her saying she was ‘bad’. Once again her dual cultural identity was revealed.

This simultaneous use by these participants and its unmarked status in their discourse, in the family settings, recalls Alfonzetti’s discussion of “a type of code-switching which does not necessarily correlate with a negotiation of interpersonal relationships or with other gross changes in the situation. It is the general pattern which has social meaning, in so far as it may be said to express a double cultural identity, shared by most members of the community.” (Alfonzetti, 1998: 182). It is possible that there was no more significant function in the simultaneous use than the natural and habitual expression of the dual cultural identity of being deaf in a mixed hearing/deaf family.

In Family Setting 2 the discussion turned to the way in which they all learnt English reading and writing, alongside their acquisition of Auslan. During the discussion Participant I commented that the younger children were lucky now with modern technology to assist their learning on English. The eldest daughter responded with a comment comparing English and Auslan in education.
When the daughter commented that Auslan "did not use full English", Participant I responded that Auslan did not have a complete grammar. The structure of this last utterance from Participant I was Auslan, including the repetition of the negative NOT, and suggested that the participant was struggling to explain the reason for Auslan being different to English, as well as the difficulties she experienced attempting to learn English. This subject can be emotive for many people in the deaf community as they remember years of schooling that failed to allow them to achieve their potential and career choice. It is also probable that the only language in which they can talk about this topic is Auslan. It is interesting to note that when this family discussed this topic they reverted to terms that have long since been acknowledged as erroneous in sign linguistics – that is the idea that any sign language is a poor cousin of the majority spoken language of the hearing community, and has no grammar or structure of its own. Within the wider community Auslan has become popular to learn as a community language. Both the hearing and deaf communities are in the process of learning about the nature of Auslan and its grammar, syntax, phonology, and morphology. (See Chapter 4 for more explanation). Despite this community education, this family (adults and children) still used forms of signing and expressions (MOST O-F TIME; OF COURSE; AUSLAN NOT FULL GRAM NOT) that revealed the influence of the spoken English used by the hearing children on the language use and attitudes of the deaf family members. This highlights, particularly in this family, the amount of convergence from Auslan towards English.

7.9 Conclusion

This chapter has discussed the sociolinguistic features of the language contact outcomes found in the data from this study. The data revealed that interlocutor may be a factor in language use in families but not in the conversations of deaf adults in this study in their workplace. In both families, the parents did use forms of transference as defined by Clyne (2003) but the same features could not be seen, even after an intervention from an interlocutor, in the data from the workplace settings. However, as there was no comparison of the same adults in the family and in the workplace setting, this variable could not be
controlled, and therefore leads to the conclusion that further research into this area is needed. Topic was the other variable which influenced some contact outcomes in both the workplace and the family setting. It seemed that the topic, especially if it involved a recall from some past speaker, influenced the language use of the signer, and most often motivated transference of some features of English into their Auslan.

The topic of discussion was the main factor influencing the simultaneous use of the two languages in both the workplace settings and the family settings. Recall of comments from hearing adults in the past also influenced the use of simultaneous use in the conversation. Interlocutor as a factor only seemed to be seen in the family settings. Responses from and eye contact with hearing children were the evidence of this. The parents more often engaged in simultaneous use with their hearing children, and with the hearing researcher. However, the participants in the workplace settings did not change their language use following a question or statement from a hearing interlocutor.

The use of personal name signs and place name signs was sometimes followed by full fingerspelling of the names by some of the participants in this study, providing clarification for those participants not familiar with the identity encapsulated in the sign. This strategy occurred several times in both the workplace and family settings, where other participants, including children, were not as familiar with the name signs of the people or the places. This followed the convention as stated by Sutton-Spence & Woll (1999) and McKee & McKee (2000) that fingerspelling the name at least once in full before using the name sign is a common practice. In some instances the participants relied only on fingerspelling the name of the place or person. The degree of familiarity with other participants in the workplace settings may also have been a contributing factor. This whole practice of fingerspelling names is an area requiring much more detailed research.

Some language and identity issues were raised by the samples of code-switching, and revealed two interesting issues: firstly, that deaf people from two very different educational backgrounds (segregated and integrated) came together and identified with their common feeling of disappointment with their education and missed opportunities due to perceived unequal access; secondly that the deaf and hearing children in the bilingual families in this study did use spoken English together to keep their conversation private from their deaf parents. In these cases their common identity as children within the family was sometimes stronger than their need for a deaf or hearing identity. Whether all children in a deaf and hearing family would do this would require more research.

The following chapter will examine from a psycholinguistic perspective the examples of language use of the bilingual deaf adult participants in this study. The instances of
transference and simultaneous use of both languages will be analysed to see what it may reveal about the way the participants process and produce two languages.
Chapter 8 - Analysis of Results – Psycholinguistic Perspective

This chapter will examine the data from this study to consider what it may contribute to the psycholinguistic perspective on language contact phenomena (including transference, simultaneous use of both languages and code-switching) in adult deaf bilinguals. The discussion will include examples from previous chapters that have already been referred to, as well as some new examples that may highlight some of the speech processing that occurs in the mind.

Research into sign languages has been relatively recent in comparison to research into spoken languages, and has been conducted largely on American Sign Language and some other Western sign languages. Zeshan (2004: 8) states “Just as it is inadequate to talk about the nature of ‘spoken language’ on the basis of evidence from English and a few other Indo-European languages, it is inappropriate to infer what ‘signed languages’ as a type are like on the basis of, say, American Sign Language and a few other Western signed languages.” In this study the data reveals what some Auslan signers do, and will be used to review the applicability of models of speech production to the results produced by these informants using Auslan and spoken English. The data will be considered from three starting points: the language modes of bilinguals as defined by Grosjean (1995, 1998), facilitation of code-switching, and lastly and of particular interest, simultaneous use of Auslan and spoken English as it occurs in this study.

8.1 Language Modes of Bilinguals

As discussed in Chapter 4, Grosjean (1995, 1998) proposed that bilinguals function along a continuum which at various times induces a particular language mode. Depending on the fluency of the other bilinguals, the communication may be in Auslan that converges towards English when the interlocutor is not as fluent in Auslan, and has not deactivated English. On the other hand the communication may be in English that includes features of Auslan when the interlocutor has not deactivated the Auslan language. Grosjean (2001) asserted that when a language user is in the bilingual mode, both languages are activated, but the bilingual will ‘choose’ a base language to use with the interlocutor. This choice of language is based on a decision of the speaker or signer to activate one or both languages because the sociolinguistic environment is conducive to the use of only one or both. This is similar in proposition to that of the decision that is made in De Bot’s (2004) interpretation of the function of the conceptualizer, that is, to determine which base language is to be used (provided by the lexicon). In other words, both languages are activated for the bilingual, but the base language is more activated. Section 8.3 contains examples of simultaneous use of both languages which show that both languages are activated, but the following is one example of this:
Example 4

Participant G

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VOICE</th>
<th>friend</th>
<th>good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOUTH PATTERN</td>
<td>friend</td>
<td>good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM FEATURES</td>
<td>Eye gaze to camera nod nod</td>
<td>Eye gaze to hearing son</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| SIGN GLOSS | PRO3 FRIEND SIGN SOME GOOD |
| ENGLISH MEANING | Some of his friends sign quite well. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VOICE</th>
<th>Wanna talk about it</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOUTH PATTERN</td>
<td>Wanna talk about it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM FEATURES</td>
<td>Eye gaze to hearing son Up?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| SIGN GLOSS | WANT TALK OVER I-T |
| ENGLISH MEANING | Do you want to talk about it? |

In this example, the participant spoke the words wanna talk and signed WANT TALK, which demonstrated that two corresponding elements from each of the two languages were activated. The sign used is OVER and the spoken English is about. Based on evidence from consultation with native signers in Melbourne, Victoria, the sign OVER usually has a mouth pattern [∂υv], whereas the sign ABOUT more usually has a mouth pattern [bæυt]. In this example, the mouth patterns have been interchanged, and the more English lip pattern of [bæυt] has been substituted with the sign OVER, suggesting that both languages were activated at this point. The Auslan sign and the English word were not usually produced like this even in when used simultaneously, also suggesting that the participant chose to produce elements of both languages at the same time. In order to do this she had activated both languages.

Further examples in section 8.3 of simultaneous use of both languages add to the body of evidence for the proposition that both languages are activated and the less activated language is never completely deactivated. Clyne (2003: 214) stated that “Facilitation at the lexical [level] and, in a secondary way, through syntax, provides evidence that the less active language is not completely deactivated, and perhaps also of Green’s theory that plans may be made simultaneously in more than one language.” Although in most instances Auslan seemed to be the base activated language, English was also activated, but less so. I would argue that there is an overlapping area of Auslan and spoken English, which allowed this spread of activation in the examples in section 8.3, and this area included the single lexical items that correlated from both languages. This is consistent with the results reported by Page (2004) in her study of Deaf late learner signers when they integrated English mouthing into their discourse. Page (2004) proposed that sign language grammar supports the use of English components, but still has it basis in Auslan.

In Example 30, Participant G demonstrated her ability to switch from simultaneous use of Auslan and English to English only:

Example 30

Daughter VOICE
In her first response, Participant G told her son to answer the question, using Auslan and spoken English simultaneously. The second time that she responded, she used English only, with no Auslan signs. Although both languages were activated, the base language in the first utterance was more than likely to be Auslan, as the syntactic structure was appropriate for this language. However, it was probable that the spoken English (produced simultaneously with Auslan) ‘answer the question’ facilitated the switching to spoken English in the response speak. This adult bilingual chose the base language to use depending on which of her interlocutors she was aligning herself with. She was in the bilingual mode, as described by Grosjean, her languages were both activated, and she switched from simultaneous use of Auslan and English, to English alone.

**8.2 Psycholinguistically conditioned contact outcomes**

The question of whether the language contact features found in this data constitute ‘switching’ or ‘code-switching’ as proposed by spoken language linguists is still to be answered. The following section will discuss the linguistic features in the data from this study, as I believe they are psycholinguistically conditioned, whether or not they constitute a ‘code-switch’. 
Grosjean (1998: 137) described a code-switch as “a complete shift to the other language for a word, phrase or a sentence, whereas a borrowing is a word or short expression taken from the less activated language and adapted morphosyntactically (and sometimes phonologically) into the base language.” This use of the term borrowing only applied to a set expression or a single item, and I have referred to these as syntactic or semantic transfers. (See Examples 8 and 30 below for the examples of code-switching.) Clyne (2003: 76) described ‘transference’ as an umbrella category, which included lexical, syntactic, semantic, phonological, and prosodic transfers (amongst other kinds), and this more comprehensive term is what I have used for this study. The examples of transference included English lexical items that were integrated into the ‘base language’ Auslan, for a variety of reasons, and reproduced in a way that changed the morphology and phonology of the English spoken word to allow it to meet the rules of the visual signed language. (See section 6.2 for these examples and discussion of the transference from a grammatical perspective.)

Features from English were transferred and integrated into the Auslan in this study. (See Chapter 2 for a full discussion of this kind of occurrence.) They were an indication of the amount of influence that English has had on Auslan, so much so that there is convergence at times between the two languages. This convergence will be discussed in detail in section 8.3. Examples of integrated features can be seen in the following two transcriptions:

In **Workplace Setting 1**, Participant C included an English expression and in particular a Signed English sign TO in her utterance. (See Chapter 3 for a description of Signed English). This transference did not cause any shift to spoken English, nor did the rest of her utterance change to forms of signing in English structure:

**Example 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C</th>
<th>VOICE</th>
<th>MOUTH PATTERN</th>
<th>NM FEATURES</th>
<th>SIGN GLOSS</th>
<th>ENGLISH MEANING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HAVE TO(SE) WEAR HEARING-AID POINT TIME</td>
<td>Did you have to wear hearing aids at that time?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This would constitute a syntactic transference of the expression ‘have to’ that has been integrated morphosyntactically into the base language of Auslan, according to Grosjean’s definition (1998: 137).

In **Workplace Setting 2**, Participant E used an expression that included a similar transference of an English lexical item when he asked WHAT #DO?

**Example 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E</th>
<th>VOICE</th>
<th>MOUTH PATTERN</th>
<th>NM FEATURES</th>
<th>SIGN GLOSS</th>
<th>ENGLISH MEANING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DEAFBLIND WORK WHAT #DO WHAT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In **Workplace Setting 1**, Participant C included an English expression and in particular a Signed English sign TO in her utterance. (See Chapter 3 for a description of Signed English). This transference did not cause any shift to spoken English, nor did the rest of her utterance change to forms of signing in English structure:

**Example 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C</th>
<th>VOICE</th>
<th>MOUTH PATTERN</th>
<th>NM FEATURES</th>
<th>SIGN GLOSS</th>
<th>ENGLISH MEANING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HAVE TO(SE) WEAR HEARING-AID POINT TIME</td>
<td>Did you have to wear hearing aids at that time?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This would constitute a syntactic transference of the expression ‘have to’ that has been integrated morphosyntactically into the base language of Auslan, according to Grosjean’s definition (1998: 137).

In **Workplace Setting 2**, Participant E used an expression that included a similar transference of an English lexical item when he asked WHAT #DO?

**Example 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E</th>
<th>VOICE</th>
<th>MOUTH PATTERN</th>
<th>NM FEATURES</th>
<th>SIGN GLOSS</th>
<th>ENGLISH MEANING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DEAFBLIND WORK WHAT #DO WHAT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This feature WHAT #DO appeared in each of the settings of this study, and in one case as WHAT DO (SE) where the Signed English sign for DO was used. This supported anecdotal evidence gathered in conversation with other Australian sign linguists that this use of the verb ‘do’ seems to be frequently used as a main verb (Johnston & Schembri, 2007:177). It supported the contention that there is convergence of Auslan and English and demonstrated again the kind of influence that English has had (and continues to have) on Auslan.

Clyne (1991: 193) referred to psycholinguistically conditioned code-switching which is promoted by ‘trigger words’. These he described as “words at the intersection of two language systems, which, consequently, may cause speakers to lose their linguistic bearings and continue the sentence in the other language”. Muysken (2000: 3) describes ‘congruent lexicalisation’ in such a way that it could be due to two things, either ‘homophonous words, diamorphs, that serve as bridges or triggers for the code-mix’, or the general structural equivalence of the two languages. Other linguists also discuss this phenomenon of shared lexical or syntactic forms (Onysko, 2005; Broersma & De Bot, 2003; Auer, Hinskens & Kerswill, 2005; Alfonzetti, 1998; Kerswill, 1994). In Clyne (2003: 162) this model of ‘triggering’ was subsumed under three types of ‘facilitation’, lexical, prosodic and syntactic (a secondary form of facilitation). This secondary facilitation of code-switching that is due to syntactic overlap was only seen in the data from one participant (G) in this study. It occurred on only two occasions, (see Examples 8 and 30) in response to the hearing child interlocutor, and after simultaneous use of both languages by the participant. Participant G was in a sociolinguistic environment that called for her to act bivocal both languages. Her interlocutor was a hearing bilingual. She signed Auslan and spoke English simultaneously, and this simultaneous use acted as the ‘trigger’, or facilitated the code-switch from Auslan to English for the next part of the utterance. It has been well researched that when two language systems share a common lexical item or where there is a syntactic overlap, speakers will switch into the other language (Alfonzetti, 1998; Clyne, 2003). The simultaneous use of Auslan and English was, for the speaker, the point of convergence of the two languages, and also the reason for the switch. Consideration of the possibility that this was an example of English with a co-speech gesture of emblematic function (Johnston & Schembri, 2007: 25) was given, but as the overall utterance was communicated in Auslan, and the English only accompanied some of the signs, I concluded that this was a sign with and English word simultaneously uttered.

Examples 8 and 30 are shown here:

**Example 8**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G</th>
<th>VOICE</th>
<th>LIP PATTERN</th>
<th>NM FEATURES</th>
<th>SIGN GLOSS</th>
<th>ENGLISH MEANING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eye gaze to hearing son,</td>
<td>ALLRIGHT</td>
<td>Alright</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Smile</td>
<td>LH tap on knee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ALLRIGHT</td>
<td>Alright</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples 8 and 30 are shown here:
In this example the English *bigger* followed a lengthy phrase spoken and signed simultaneously. The facilitation of the switch into English was at the point of convergence of the languages when both were used, and also the place where the speaker had activated both languages in response to the interlocutor and the setting that was ‘friendly’ to the use of both languages.

*Example 30*
In this example, the spoken English word *speak* followed the simultaneous use of both languages for *answer the question*/ANSWER THE QUESTION, and the point of convergence was the syntactic overlap of both systems. The switch was facilitated by the overlap as both languages were activated and I would argue that the selection of lexical forms and grammatical encoding was made from both languages.

### 8.3 Simultaneous Use of Both Languages

Switching completely from one language to the other was seen in only two examples in this study (Examples 8 and 30), and in both cases the direction of the switch was from Auslan to English via simultaneous use of both languages. Both instances were from only one of the adult deaf participants (a parent) who was signing and speaking simultaneously, stopped, and switched to a word in the spoken language. These two examples were the exceptions for the speech behaviour of the informants in this study. In every other instance, English occurred only during simultaneous use of both languages. One participant in each of the workplace settings used spoken English with Auslan simultaneously, but the other participants in the workplace settings did not employ spoken English alone. This facility with Auslan and English that enables a signer to produce two languages simultaneously, must be considered unique...
to sign-spoken language bilingualism, as it simply cannot be done with two spoken modalities. (See section 6.3 for a complete discussion of examples of simultaneous production). It raises the question of whether this was facilitated simply because the speech and signs could physically be produced at the same time, or whether this was due to the choice of language made in the planning stages of the utterance. The models of speech production for spoken language bilinguals are used in this section to see if they apply to sign-spoken language contact outcomes in this study. Levelt's model of speech production for monolinguals (see Chapter 2.2.5), and subsequent adaptations of this model by De Bot (1992) for bilinguals and (2004) for multilinguals, and Clyne (2003) for plurilinguals (of which bilinguals and trilinguals are considered subsets), were used to examine the examples of simultaneous production. (See section 2.2.5 for a discussion of this model and subsequent adaptations).

De Bot (1992) adapted Levelt's model to meet the requirements for a bilingual version, and specifically to address the question of how a bilingual's two languages are stored in the brain. According to Clyne (2003: 196) this adaptation from De Bot explained many of the features of bilinguals' language use, but it did “not provide us with answers concerning grammatical convergence, and the relation between lexicon and syntax and between grammatical convergence and other language contact phenomena.” In particular, it did not assist in explaining facilitation of code-switching. Another language contact phenomenon found in the current study is simultaneous use of a sign language and a spoken language. Clyne (2003: 213) described a model encompassing all previous attempts, to explain plurilingual processing of languages, and it is to this model that I refer to explain the simultaneous use of both languages from these participants. This model attempts to address feedback from the articulator back to the formulator, and goes further to explaining the facilitation of code-switching from one language to the other as speakers consciously or unconsciously move between their languages. Facilitation implies that there must be feedback both upwards and downwards, and I contend that this model can encompass the simultaneous activation of Auslan and English as it was used in the data from these particular participants.

Based on this description of the process, consider the following examples of simultaneous use:

**Example 7**

**Workplace 2, Participant F:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VOICE</th>
<th>MOUTH PATTERN</th>
<th>NM FEATURES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>But</td>
<td>Hear</td>
<td>Head shake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGLISH MEANING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORD LEARN ++</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-U-T HEAR NOT DEAF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>we had to learn many words this way but I couldn't hear, I'm deaf.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

186
In example 7, while recalling this kind of learning, Participant F revealed the amount of effort he had to put into this kind of learning by the simultaneous use of Auslan and English. In this instance, the participant probably knew that neither of his interlocutors could hear his voice, but this was irrelevant. The emphasis was indicative of his emotions as he recalled the difficulty of the task when he could hear nothing as he was DEAF/deaf! The participant uttered the lexical items BUT HEAR/but hear in both spoken English and Auslan, whereas DEAF/deaf was signed and sub-vocalised with a mouth pattern. The three words but hear deaf made no sense when interpreted in the spoken English context, as they did not follow English syntactic structure. These items were selected from the lexicon in both languages and when the message was formulated into a 'speech plan', the articulator produced both languages. However, the syntactic base language was Auslan. When analysed separately, the Auslan signs carried a complete message as they followed Auslan syntactic structure, with all the non-manual features and mouth patterns that were attached to the signs. Even the sub-vocalised deaf that was signed simultaneously with the corresponding Auslan mouth pattern was within the structure of the Auslan, and supported Paradis’ (1987) contention that the elements of one language (in this case Auslan) were strongly linked together but the elements between the languages also had strong links. The above example also supports Grosjean’s position that bilinguals have two language networks, in which sometimes “The activation of a unit in a network and of its ‘counterpart’ in the other depends on their degree of similarity.” (Grosjean, 1995: 271). This ‘degree of similarity’ compares with Clyne’s facilitation, which is due to syntactic overlap, and reveals the amount of convergence between the two languages.

**Example 4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant G</th>
<th>VOICE</th>
<th>friend</th>
<th>good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOUTH</td>
<td>friend</td>
<td>good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM</td>
<td>Eye gaze to camera nod nod Eye gaze to hearing son</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEATURES</td>
<td>SIGN</td>
<td>PRO3 FRIEND SIGN SOME GOOD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ENGLISH</td>
<td>Some of his friends sign quite well</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLOSS</td>
<td>VOICE</td>
<td>Wanna talk about it</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MOUTH</td>
<td>Wanna talk about it</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>Eye gaze to hearing son Up?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEATURES</td>
<td>SIGN</td>
<td>WANT TALK OVER I-T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ENGLISH</td>
<td>Do you want to talk about it</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the above example, the participant spoke the words wanna talk and signed WANT TALK, which demonstrated that two corresponding elements from each of the two languages had...
been activated. These two elements corresponded very closely and it was possible to see that they may be stored together in the same lexicon, and may have been formulated simultaneously. The speech plan was converted into speech and signs by the articulator, which was not language specific, and allowed selections to be taken from the stored words and signs of both languages. However, the next two elements of the phrase are even more interesting. The sign used is OVER and the spoken English is about. The sign OVER was usually accompanied by a mouth pattern that looks like [ðuv] (in other words only the first syllable of the English word), whereas the sign ABOUT was more usually accompanied by an English mouth pattern [bæut]. As the mouth patterns have been interchanged, and the more English mouth pattern of [bæut] has been substituted with the sign OVER, I would contend that both languages were activated at this point. The Auslan sign and the English word are not usually used like this even simultaneously, suggesting that the participant produced separate elements of both languages at the same time. It is an example of the participant attaching the alternate language information to the Auslan sign in the choice of encoding the phonology. The complete spoken English phrase was quite comprehensible when interpreted in the English context, but the Auslan signs were also structurally correct and comprehensible from the Auslan perspective. The final term 'it' revealed more information. The fingerspelling of I-T was the graphic representation of the English word it. Infrequently used in Auslan, it has not been considered part of the usual sentence structure or vocabulary of Auslan. It was an example of transference from English. This then suggested that the more activated base language in this instance was English, as it was supported by the base syntactic structure.

This same Participant G provided two examples (Examples 30 and 8) in this corpus, of simultaneous use of Auslan and English, that involved code-switching completely from Auslan/English simultaneous use to spoken English alone. Examine the following example:

**Example 8**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G</th>
<th>VOICE</th>
<th>Different between</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOUTH PATTERN</td>
<td>Different between</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM FEATURES</td>
<td>Eye gaze to hearing son</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIGN GLOSS</td>
<td>DIFFERENT BETWEEN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGLISH MEANING</td>
<td>What's the difference between</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| VOICE | Sit up see you |
| MOUTH PATTERN | Sit up see you |
| NM FEATURES | Grimace Eye gaze to hearing son |
| SIGN GLOSS | RH open palm up LOC 3 – LOC 2 POINT-TO-CAMERA SEE PRO 2 |
| ENGLISH MEANING | Come on sit up so the camera can see you. |

| VOICE | Different between Mt Erin and Vermont school |
| MOUTH PATTERN | Different between Mt Erin and Vermont school |
| NM FEATURES | Eye gaze to hearing son up? |
| SIGN GLOSS | DIFFERENT BETWEEN M-T-E-R-I-N LOC 1 AND V-E-R-M-O-N-T LOC 2 SCHOOL DIFFERENT WHAT? |
| ENGLISH MEANING | What's the difference between Mt Erin and Vermont schools? |
Son  
**VOICE**

|MOUTH PATTERN| Eye gaze LOCx.
|---|---
|NM FEATURES| 
|SIGN GLOSS| BETTER SIZE(SE)
|ENGLISH MEANING| Vermont is a better size.

G  
**VOICE**  
**bigger**

|MOUTH PATTERN| bigger
|---|---
|NM FEATURES|  
|SIGN GLOSS| Yes THINK WHAT
|ENGLISH MEANING| Yes it is, what else can you think of?

In the second line Participant G signed COME-ON and said sit up in English. Again this highlighted the activation of both languages. However, the English phrase sit up …see you was not grammatical, nor complete here, suggesting that the base language was Auslan, which provided the syntactic structure. In the last line Participant G said bigger in English, and then switched back to Auslan alone when she signed YES THINK WHAT. I would argue that both languages were activated and the simultaneous use of both languages in the utterance immediately before facilitated this code-switch from Auslan/English to English and back to Auslan. The second example of this use of Auslan and English can be seen in Example 30, which was discussed in more detail in Section 8.1.

The following are further examples of simultaneous use of Auslan and English:

**Example 6**

**Workplace Setting 1:**

B  
**VOICE**

|MOUTH PATTERN| remember walk
|---|---
|NM FEATURES|  
|SIGN GLOSS| WALK REMEMBER WALK
|ENGLISH MEANING| I remember walking

|VOICE| bath bed
|---|---
|NM FEATURES|  
|SIGN GLOSS| SCHOOL BOOK OPEN CLOSE HOME BOOK BATH BOOK BED BOOK
|ENGLISH MEANING| to school reading books and home again and in the bath and in bed.

B explained that she read books as she walked to school and home again, as well as reading books in the bath and in bed. The visual image of a child with her eyes constantly in a book regardless of what other activities she was engaged in produced the amusement and laughter. The additional emphasis was engendered by the use of both languages to reinforce the places where reading occurred, including the BATH/bath, and BED/bed.

**Example 10**

**Family Setting 2:**
In the example above, the mother used simultaneous English and Auslan to ask this daughter what she could remember of her early school days. For Participant I, the mother, the engagement of the child in the conversation was successful and the child answered in Auslan. The mother had used two languages simultaneously, revealing the way the lexical elements of each language (stored together) were selected, formulated into a speech plan and the articulator converted the corresponding lexical items into the appropriate signs and words. The syntactic transference reveals the convergence of Auslan towards English in this phrase WHAT—PRO₂? An alternative way to ask this question in Auslan is sometimes PRO₂--WHAT? The fact that this phrase follows the English word order in this instance may indicate a transference of the English syntactic features to the Auslan signs, or it may be coincidence. Question forms are another complex structure that needs further research in light of this simultaneous use.

In each of the above examples of simultaneous use it can be seen that each of the two languages was activated, and each example is consistent with de Bot's adaptation of Levelt's model. The decision was made in the conceptualizer to use Auslan as the base language, but spoken English was also activated. This seems evident from the way the signs were uttered as well as the spoken words. The formulator has then converted the plan of utterance by selecting from the lexicon of both languages and applying the grammatical rules of Auslan to both. Each lexicon has had the language-appropriate phonological rules applied to produce both signs and spoken words simultaneously. Example 4 of OVER and about may support the theory that plans can be made in both languages simultaneously. It would also support Grosjean's proposition with spoken languages that both languages are activated in the planning stage if the speaker is in a bilingual mode.
Most of the examples discussed above involve discreet word/signs used simultaneously, but Example 8 from Family Setting 1 included a whole phrase that could be either Auslan or English. The utterance is a question, but the spoken English did not include any markers of the question or even the final words of the question. The Auslan phrase does express the question, with appropriate grammatical markers for sign language (facial expression) and from this I concluded that Auslan was the language for which the syntactical structure for the question was encoded.

The following example contains phrases of Auslan and spoken English by the same Participant G in Family Setting 1, and it is interesting to see that the simultaneous use of signed Auslan and spoken English by the researcher obviously influenced the response by the son, but the parents did not seem to be influenced in the same way as they attended to the conversation. They did not simultaneously use spoken English with Auslan, in lines 4, 5 and 8, instead both continuing to converse in Auslan.

Example 31

1. Researcher  VOICE & SIGN  [To Son 1] What about you, when you're talking to your Dad?

   2. Son 1  VOICE  both just signing and talking
              MOUTH PATTERN  both just signing and talking
              NM FEATURES  

                SIGN GLOSS  BOTH
                ENGLISH MEANING  I use both, signing and talking.

3. Researcher  VOICE & SIGN  Do you.

4. H  VOICE  up? Eye gaze from daughter to camera.
        MOUTH PATTERN  
        NM FEATURES  

                SIGN GLOSS  WHAT  FINISH TALK FOOTBALL SCHOOL BH-open-palm-up
                ENGLISH MEANING  What did you say? We've talked about football, school and everything.

5. G  VOICE  what
        MOUTH PATTERN  up? Eye gaze from daughter to Son 1
        NM FEATURES  

                SIGN GLOSS  WHAT
                ENGLISH MEANING  What did you say?

6. Son 1  VOICE  TALK DAD
              MOUTH PATTERN  Eye gaze to Mother
              NM FEATURES  

                SIGN GLOSS  ASK PRO1 ABOUT TALK FATHER
                ENGLISH MEANING  She asked me about how I talk to dad.

7. Researcher  VOICE & SIGN  Yeah but voice?

8. H  VOICE  half half both speak sign
Participant G, the mother, simultaneously used Auslan and spoken English as she recalled her own frustration at her son’s response to Auslan, and the way her son asserted his identity in Auslan and spoken English. The formulator converted the plan of utterance by selecting from the lexicon of both languages and applying the grammatical rules of Auslan to both. Once again, although the voiced component and the mouth patterns followed some of the discreet signs, the grammatically complete phrase was expressed in Auslan, indicating this was the base language, although English was also activated.

All of the examples of simultaneous use of Auslan and spoken English above are, I believe, consistent with the findings of other researchers that the components of both languages are active simultaneously (not sequentially), access to words and signs is non-selective, and the surface manifestation of convergence is in fact evidence of actual convergence of the languages in the conceptualisation, formulation as well as the articulation stages of production. (Lee, 1983; Messing, 1998; Muysken, 2000). There seems to be nothing in the data from this study to suggest that there is any difference between spoken language bilinguals and sign/spoken language bilinguals in the production process.

8.4 Summary

The discussion in this chapter has focussed on the way that transference, simultaneous use of both languages and code-switching (that involved a complete change from one language to the other) occurred in the conversations of the ten adult deaf bilinguals, from a psycholinguistic perspective. It is apparent that transference of syntactic and semantic features of spoken English into Auslan did occur, and the items were morphosyntactically integrated into the base language, Auslan. This highlighted the amount of convergence that has occurred between the two languages, and the influence that English has had and continues to have on Auslan. As in spoken language pairs, when one language converges towards another, the areas of overlap of common features increase, and this overlapping
tends to facilitate code-switching. In this data, the prevalence of expressions such as HAVE T-O and WHAT D-O indicated areas of overlap between English and Auslan, and reasons for the lexical and other kinds of transference that occurred. Lexical transference of some items from other sign languages (ASL and BSL) also occurred.

The simultaneous use that occurred revealed that the base language, Auslan, in deaf bilinguals is the more activated. Examples from the data also revealed that both languages were sometimes activated equally, so that stretches of discourse included simultaneous use of both languages. One or two examples from Participant G (a parent) highlighted the ability of adult deaf bilinguals to switch base language at times throughout the conversation, while having both languages activated.

If both languages were activated (in a bilingual mode according to Grosjean’s model), I would argue that adult deaf bilinguals were almost always in a bilingual mode, even when conversing with other deaf people. Even if the deaf interlocutor was considered to be monolingual by peers, their sign language would be such a mixture of Auslan, contrived signs and English features, that the interlocutor would activate both English and Auslan to achieve the communication outcome.

The value of simultaneous use of a sign language and a spoken language for an understanding of bilingualism was apparent from this corpus. I would argue that these languages were not simply articulated simultaneously, but rather that both languages were selected in the conceptualiser and produced in the processing stages. The language planning decision (to activate and formulate in both languages) was made long before lexical/syntactic selection or articulation occurred. I believe simultaneous use of the two languages assists our understanding of the applicability of the speech production models, as well as our understanding of the activation of two or more languages. The deaf signers did not sign and speak simultaneously ‘just because they could’, but rather they chose a bilingual mode to engage their interlocutor, and they then began the message planning in both languages.

Chapter 9 will summarise all the findings from previous three chapters and draw some conclusions that may lead to recommendations for future research and language planning for Auslan users in Australia.
Chapter 9 - Conclusions

This study is the first targeted analysis in Australia of a corpus of bilingual speech involving a sign language and a spoken language. This corpus was derived from adult deaf bilinguals in the workplace and home settings. It is an attempt to describe Australian Sign Language employing frameworks of contact linguistics. The study has added valuable data to research into sign language in Australia as it has documented and described the language contact outcomes from two specific settings. Research on Auslan in Australia until now has been focused on the linguistic description of Australian Sign Language and on regional variation patterns of Auslan used by deaf people across Australia. The data obtained from this study provides additional insights into the use of Auslan and spoken English by adult deaf bilinguals, in two quite specific settings.

This chapter will revisit the research questions first proposed in Chapter One, in light of the data analysis, and summarise the main findings. Some recommendations for further research will be included.

9.1 Research Questions

The research study began with three questions: (1) What are the language contact outcomes resulting from Auslan/English bilingualism? (2) What linguistic, sociolinguistic and psycholinguistic factors influence the outcomes? and (3) In what ways is signed/spoken language bilingualism different from spoken language bilingualism as described in the literature? The next three sections will address each of these questions.

9.2 Language Contact Outcomes in Auslan/English bilingualism

The three most significant language contact phenomena in this study were transference from English into Auslan, fingerspelling, and simultaneous use of Auslan and spoken English. Some of the transference from spoken English included mouth patterns, which were discussed in Chapter 8. Semantic and syntactic transference from English into Auslan were found to occur much more frequently than lexical transference (Clyne 2003) or alternational code-switching (Muysken 2000) as described in spoken language situations. This finding is significant, as it confirms the influence that English has on Auslan as used by the participants in this study. Lexical transference tends to be more indicative of surface contact between languages. Semantics and syntax are part of the conceptualisation and formulation stages
language production and transference at this level of structure and meaning indicates a deeper level of influence from one language (English) to the other (Auslan).

A fourth outcome (which was the motivation for my research) was code-switching involving a complete change of language from Auslan to spoken English. This phenomenon occurred only on two occasions in one participant in a family setting. The interlocutor was a hearing child, and the switching was from Auslan, via simultaneous use of both languages to spoken English. The fact that deaf people were always present and may have avoided the use of spoken English was considered during the analysis of the data. However, as hearing children were present in the family situations, and hearing staff intervened in the workplace settings, there was opportunity for the adult deaf participants to use spoken English if the interlocutor or other factors (as described in spoken language contact data (Clyne, 1987 & 2003; Poplack 1980; Myers-Scotton, 1993; Muysken, 2000) had been a strong enough influence. It seemed clear that even with these interventions by hearing interlocutors, there was no need or motivation to change language use (except in the case of the mother in Family setting 1), and they continued to use Auslan.

9.3 Factors influencing language contact outcomes.

The factors influencing the contact outcomes between Auslan and Australian English were investigated from three perspectives: linguistic, sociolinguistic, and psycholinguistic. There was no aim to compare the two settings, family or workplace, other than to note and describe the outcomes as they occurred in each setting. The two data sets are presented with the outcomes of interest.

9.3.1 Linguistic Perspective

The first outcome of significance was the transference from English into Auslan by the deaf participants. Most of the transference was syntactic or semantic, where the English vocabulary was changed into a visual form to comply with the requirements of the signed mode. Lexical transfers occurred from other sign languages (BSL and ASL) into Auslan. Single transfers (proper nouns) and multiple transfers (set expressions from English) also occurred. The findings confirmed the reality that because English is the major language of communication and information in Australia, and is used predominantly in education and the workplace, it is inevitable that English will have had a major influence on Auslan of these participants, regardless of the difference in channel (spoken or signed). As previously noted deaf people in Australia constantly move between their English language experience (as they say ‘in the hearing world’) and their Auslan language experience (‘in the deaf world’). Their ability to move between these two worlds is enhanced by their ability to move between the two languages.
The instances of syntactic and semantic transference, and the lack of attention paid to them by the participants, points to the conclusion that the transference is no longer noticed in the conversation of the Auslan signers in this study.

The second most frequent outcome of language contact in this study from a linguistic perspective was the use of fingerspelling in the conversation of the participants. The results of the use of fingerspelling in this study were consistent with previous research into the reasons for its use. A large number of the examples of fingerspelling were lexicalised forms in Auslan that are now signs. The motivation for full fingerspelling as used in this study was: (1) to introduce an English word which has no sign equivalent – see Example 21; (2) to accompany a new concept expressed in Auslan – see Example 3; (3) to explain a regional sign that may not be well-known to a signer from another region – see Example 18; (4) to produce euphemisms – see Section 6.1.2; (5) for convenience and time-saving – as explained in Section 6.1.2; (6) to use as part of the core lexicon of Auslan – see Section 6.1.2. (Sutton Spence & Woll, 1999). Sutton Spence and Woll also found another reason for fingerspelling in BSL was to render English idioms. A few idioms were fingerspelled by the participants in this study, and these were noted in Table 9 (page 124).

The study confirmed that the fingerspelling was not just a representation of the orthographic form of the spoken language. If this were the case and the fingerspelling were perceived to be English by the interlocutors, one could expect the fingerspelling to be noticed in some way, commented on by the participants, or that it would facilitate some other language change following its use in the discourse. The role of fingerspelling in Auslan/English bilingualism was evidenced by the complete lack of code-switching from Auslan to English, or transference from English into Auslan immediately following the fingerspelling. The pivotal role of fingerspelling was in the part it played in the overlap of the two languages, providing the means to represent written English in a visual form, thereby filling the gap left by the non-existence of a written form of Auslan. The results supported the conclusion from other research as described in Chapter 3, that fingerspelling was perceived by these adult deaf bilinguals to be unequivocally part of Auslan. This finding agrees with the conclusion of Schembri and Johnston (2007) that fingerspelling is an “important linguistically and socially conditioned variable in Auslan” and the reasons for its use are not always apparent even to the signers themselves. The results of this small study confirm the need for a detailed study of the use of name signs and fingerspelling, whether lexicalized or full, in conversations of deaf bilinguals.

The third and probably the most interesting and unique outcome from the sign/spoken language contact situation was the simultaneous use of both languages. The simultaneous use of both languages found in the data from this study has been described in other literature as ‘contact signing’ (Lee, 1983; Lucas, 2000 & 2001; Tompkins, 2000; Johnston & Schembri,
2007) or ‘bimodal communication’ (Lee, 1983; Tompkins, 2000). Single lexical items were produced simultaneously in both Auslan and English, and some participants also simultaneously used whole phrases of signs with English words. In all cases but one, the grammar of Auslan influenced the word order of the spoken English. The overlap of the two languages (or congruent lexicalisation as described by Muysken, 2000) was not always the factor which led to the simultaneous use. Often the English words that were spoken did not follow any of the grammatical rules of English, but rather they conformed to the syntax of Auslan.

The factors most likely influencing this contact outcome from these participants from a linguistic perspective were the need for clarification and emphasis as well as the most common factor, that of recall of a statement or declaration from a hearing adult from the past.

### 9.3.2 Sociolinguistic Perspective

The factors that appeared to exert the most influence on the language contact outcomes in Auslan/English bilingualism in this study were **interlocutor**, **venue** and **topic**. This resulted in instances of transference, fingerspelling and simultaneous use of Auslan and English. As stated above, the motivation for the outcomes was mainly clarification and emphasis, but also in some cases a recall of language use by an interlocutor from the past. However, it must be noted that interlocutor played a stronger role in language choice in families but not in the workplace conversations of deaf adults. As in other bilingual families using two spoken languages, the role of interlocutor in the families in this study was apparent in the way the parents responded to the hearing children in both family settings. This is because their simultaneous use of Auslan and English occurred in every case as a response to their deaf children. However in the workplace settings, even when the participants were interrupted by a hearing colleague or by the hearing researcher, both of whom used simultaneous use of English and Auslan, none of the participants in this study followed suit with simultaneous expression or with spoken English. As stated above, no comparison of data from each setting could be made, so the outcomes from each data set are presented for their interest alone. Further research is needed in this area, across a wide range of settings.

The **venue** of each setting influenced the language use in the data in that more clear instances of transference, and simultaneous use of both languages were found in the family settings at home, than in the workplace settings. Although **school experience** was actually the context of the conversations in all settings there was a difference between the venues in the language contact phenomena in the data. Memories of previous days at school and examples of current practices of the education system in different schools created opportunities for recall of language use from that contextual sphere. In both families language contact outcomes were seen in the language use of the parents (transference of features of English, simultaneous use and three instances of code-switching), but the same features could not be
seen, even after an intervention from a hearing interlocutor, in the data from the workplace settings. (See Examples 4, 8, 10, 11, and 30). Transfers from English into Auslan were more often present in the communication of the mothers as they conversed with their hearing children, than when they conversed with the other deaf parent. It can be concluded that the interaction between the deaf parents (particularly mothers) and their children was paramount, and the communication event took precedence over the choice of language in this study. The parents’ priority was the communication event rather than the choice of language.

Topic was a factor influencing the outcomes in both the family settings and the workplace settings. This confirmed previously reported anecdotal evidence that topic and domain of the discourse can cause changes in the language use of bilingual deaf adults. Those instances of semantic and syntactic transference from English into Auslan all occurred in the context of discussion of topics such as the wearing of hearing-aids, the reading of English books and stories, and the acquisition of spoken English through auditory training and speech lessons. Such discussion also generated instances of simultaneous production. (See Section 7.5).

9.3.2.1 Language and Identity
The data analysis revealed that Auslan was used to express shared deaf identity in the workplace settings in several instances, in a way that included only fingerspelling and some transfers unnoticed by the interlocutors. These included: (i) assertions about the strong bond formed when using sign language with other deaf children in the school setting (Examples 27, 12, 14); (ii) expressions of feelings of isolation when obliged to communicate and socialise with hearing teachers or children who did not sign or understand deafness (Examples 1, 20, 25, 28); (iii) expressions of dissatisfaction with the access to education regardless of whether the experience was in an integrated setting with mainstream teachers or a segregated setting with teachers of the deaf (Examples 6, 7, 12, 22, 26). None of these instances included any code-switching (as I defined it, involving a complete change of language to spoken English) at all.

However, identity was expressed in a completely different way by parents and children in the family settings. In these instances, the need for privacy influenced the language choices of both deaf and hearing children. They deliberately asserted their choice to use either spoken English or Auslan amongst each other in order to keep their conversations private from adult teachers or parents. The parents engaged in simultaneous use of both languages when expressing their feelings especially with the hearing children. (Examples 4, 8, 9, 10, 11 and 30).

9.3.3 Psycholinguistic Perspective
Analysis of the instances of simultaneous use in light of speech production models provided some support for simultaneous processing of the bilingual speech plan in the formulator, and
the equal level of activation of both languages. The use of two languages in the different channels (signed and spoken) suggested that the message was not only articulated, but encoded simultaneously. The deaf bilinguals in this study demonstrated how they engaged their interlocutors in their language of choice, and the data revealed how both languages had to be activated during the interaction. In all cases of simultaneous use, the base language of the utterance (Grosjean, 2001) was Auslan (See Section 8.1). The instances of syntactic transference from English to Auslan highlighted the converging of the grammar of Auslan to English. Although it was obvious that both languages were activated, Auslan was the more activated language or the grammar of Auslan has converged to English. In only one case did the data from this study reveal an example of simultaneous use where the more activated base language could be open to question. (See Example 4). The change of mouthing by that participant pointed to the conclusion that the base or more activated language in that instance was English, and the Auslan conformed to English grammar.

The examples of transference revealed the way some items of English have become integrated into Auslan for these participants. Several devices were used by the participants to change the spoken English lexical items into a visual form that conformed to the parameters of Auslan. These devices included fingerspelling, which allowed the written form of the English word to be reproduced in a visual form; contrived artificial signs from Signed English which narrowed the semantic message of the visual sign to a specific English meaning; and lip patterns accompanying the Auslan signs which ensured that the sign conveyed the same meaning as the English word with the same lip pattern. At the same time these examples also provided evidence of the influence that English has had on Auslan as used by the participants in this study.

9.4 Ways in which Signed/Spoken Language Bilingualism is different.

Like Lee (1983), Lucas (2000 & 2001), and Tompkins (2000) this study found that the outcomes of contact between a sign language and a spoken language are different from those in a spoken language contact situation. The first and most significant difference found in this research between sign/spoken language bilingualism and spoken language bilingualism was the simultaneous use of Auslan and English. It occurred in both the workplace settings and the family settings.

A further significant contact phenomenon found in this study was fingerspelling, and this has also been reported by other researchers as a significant feature of contact between a signed language and a spoken language. (Lee, 1983; Sutton-Spence & Woll, 1999; Lucas, 2000 & 2001; Tompkins, 2000, Johnston & Schembri 2007). See Section 2.2.2.2 for a description of fingerspelling and Section 4.1.4 for a discussion of the place of fingerspelling in the language contact between Auslan and English.
9.5 Implications for Further Research

Further research needs to be undertaken to ascertain how typical the data from the participants in this study are. In both the workplace and family settings, simultaneous use of Auslan and English and transference from English into Auslan occurred. Code-switching was only observed three times. A larger study into the language use of deaf (and hearing) Auslan-English bilinguals beyond the two settings is warranted, to gather further evidence of other language contact phenomena (for example, turntaking); to ascertain whether other sociolinguistic factors influence simultaneous use by deaf bilinguals; to compare the language contact outcomes of a constant group of participants in each of several settings; and to determine what might be the motivations for some deaf bilinguals not engaging in simultaneous use of both languages. These motivations would shed light on the way deaf signers begins the message planning process with activation of both languages, and the lexical choices made during the encoding stages of the speech production models.

There is some evidence in this study of the relationship between the level of activation of each language and the choice of pattern on the lips/mouth and the signs which it accompanies. It would therefore be worthwhile to do further research into the variation of Auslan mouth patterns and English lip patterns which can accompany Auslan signs. Further psycholinguistic experimentation in a range of social settings could shed further light on the function of mouthing in sign language communication. The choices made about mouth patterns (whether conscious or unconscious) are related to the sociolinguistic and psycholinguistic factors that influence language choice, and further research will contribute to our knowledge of language contact phenomena between a sign language and a spoken language.

The transference, fingerspelling and simultaneous use of both languages that occurred in the discourse of adult deaf interlocutors in this research is comparable the same features reported anecdotally in settings with mixed groups of hearing and deaf adult interlocutors. Wider research in settings with mixed groups was outside the scope of this study but would be useful, including the contact phenomena seen in conversations of hearing bilinguals.

As this data collection involved participants in only two settings (workplace and family), there was no evidence available about any language contact phenomena that could be observed when participants function in other roles. Each setting involved a different group of participants, the relationships in each setting were different, and the same participants were not observed in more than one setting. In the family settings the participants used Auslan and English simultaneously with hearing children in their home, and also sometimes used the two languages simultaneously with other deaf adults. This too is an area open to further research.
Discourse studies in Auslan may lead to additional research linking language and identity for Auslan signers and the way in which this link has been disrupted through the treatment of sign language in the education system.

Finally it is hoped that this study has contributed to the bank of information about Australian Sign Language and the way in which deaf bilinguals use Auslan and English in their everyday lives.
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### Appendix A – Table of transcription examples.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Description of Transcription</th>
<th>Chapter 6</th>
<th>Chapter 7</th>
<th>Chapter 8</th>
<th>Participant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>HAVE TO</td>
<td>X 2</td>
<td>X 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>WHAT D-O</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>WHAT D-O</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>About/OVER</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>O-F COURSE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>J</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>BATH/BED/BOOK</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>BUT/HEAR/DEAF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>X 2</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>BIGGER</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>TALK SIGN ONLY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ANGRY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>WHAT - YOU</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>MOST O-F TIME</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Auditory training</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Deafblind work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>D/E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>B-O-S-S-Y/ I SPY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>SNOW WHITE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>P-O-P-E-Y-E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>AUSLAN NOT FULL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G-R-A-M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>PORTSEA/QUEENSCLIFF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>E/F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>U-S-E YOUR VOICE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>B-U-L-L-Y</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>O-U-T-I-N-G</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>C-L-U-B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>S-E-V-E-R-E/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-R-O-F-O-U-N-D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>OLD D-A-Y-S</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>J</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>MISS O-U-T</td>
<td>X 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>CURRICULUM REPEAT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>A/B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>RECESS ESCAPE CHAT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>TEACHER READ CLASS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>ABUSE BOX EARS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>SPEAK</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>I'M NOT DEAF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>H P PRIMARY SCHOOL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>YOU LEARN ENGLISH</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>