THE PECULIAR NEEDS OF DEAF PEOPLE:

A STUDY OF

SELECTED MEMBERS OF THE

LINCOLNSHIRE DEAF SOCIAL GROUP

by K.Jones

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE

UNIVERSITY OF NOTTINGHAM FOR THE

DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY,

OCTOBER, 1989

CONTENTS

ABSTRACT

In spite of the fact that services for deaf people
have been provided since Victorian times, there is
no "philosophy of deafness" and services are based
upon the subjective observation of deaf people by
"hearing" people. This study seeks to formulate
such a philosophy, for those unable to hear spoken
communication from birth or early childhood, based
upon acceptance of the social limitations of being
unable to hear in a society where the ready use of
that sense is taken for granted.

In order to base this philosophy upon the
objective assessment of deaf people's needs, deaf
respondents were interviewed and observed and their
referrals to specialist agencies for deaf people
and the work of a group of social workers with deaf
people were examined.

The study re-defines deaf "community" and
deaf "culture" as the deaf social group and the deaf
way of life, arguing that the former concepts
marginalise deaf people and stressing that although
deaf people need to make sub-cultural adaptations
in order primarily to satisfy their
social-psychological needs and for fellowship, the
deaf sub-culture is an extension of "hearing" culture
and deaf people would benefit by becoming effectually

bi-cultural. It is suggested that "deafness" rather than membership of the deaf "community" is ascribed to deaf people. The study sees the uniqueness of the deaf sub-culture in the means of inter-personal communication, Sign Language, and in its members' self-identification as "deaf".

The idea of individual autonomy is developed and it is used as a framework within which to formulate a philosophy of deafness which recognises the need for sub-cultural adaptations by deaf people, because of the inevitability of impediments to fluent inter-personal communication between deaf and "hearing" people. The philosophy also recognises the need for "hearing" people to accommodate to deafness in order to reduce deaf people's marginal status in society, principally through the use of Sign Language, either directly, or through interpreters.

Finally, implications for policies of service provision are considered, in particular the need for deaf people to be involved with planning and provision of services for deaf people based upon a social rather than a social work/pathological model.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

the model for autonomy. I also want to thank Dr.
Jim Kyle and Gloria Pullen, who discussed with me
my early ideas for the study.

The Secretary of the National Council of
Social Workers with Deaf People at the time of the
postal survey to the members of that organisation
was Frances McHugh; her help and advice were
invaluable. At the same time I must record my
appreciation of the application given to the postal
questionnaire by the seventy three members who
replied. Their lengthy answers to the final open
ended question were specially valuable, not least
because they showed social workers with deaf people
to be more liberal in their views on the autonomy
of deaf people, than they are sometimes given credit
for.

To those deaf people who were interviewed,
and to the many more who discussed their deafness
with me, I am specially grateful. The philosophy
of deafness contained in this study is not mine,
it is theirs. The evenings at the deaf clubs,
holidays at Butlins, the deaf children's camps,
outings, and Christmas and New Year parties in deaf
people's homes, are all memorable for the warmth
of companionship and the friendships made. Outsider
though I am, deaf people made me welcome to their
"community" and I am aware that this was a privilege.

A lasting impression will be deaf people's joy in the fellowship of the deaf "community".

Finally I thank Professor Arthur Willcocks for his wise and patient guidance. I can do no more than aspire to his standards of exactness, clarity of expression and academic rigour. I am only one amongst many part-time research students who, now that he has left the University, will miss not only his intellectual stimulus, but his kindness as well.

INTRODUCTION

Chapter 1   'The Need For Research'

Chapter 2   'Method'

Chapter 3   'General Considerations'

Chapter 4   'Salient Features Of The Deaf
Respondents'

CHAPTER 1   'The Need For Research'

The starting point of this piece of research
is that the peculiar needs of deaf people are still
not properly understood, despite earlier studies,
which were few in number. It is suggested later
(p:433) that research into the concepts of deaf
"community" and deaf "culture" is incomplete. This
is not a criticism so much as a statement of fact;
research is a developmental process and in the case
of the deaf "community" it is at an early stage,
with each examination throwing up new questions.

Jones (1982:p:11), on completion of research
into the social effects of deafness from birth or
early childhood, writes 'there is a particular need
for research into deaf-"hearing" inter-personal
communication and relationships. Lipreading, or
speechreading as it is sometimes described, is the
main channel of reception of inter-personal
communication for the profoundly deaf person, from
the onset of deafness onwards, regardless of the
age of onset..........The ability to understand the
words spoken, is only part of the process of
understanding what one person has to communicate
to another. A relationship is built upon
attitudes and emotions mutually exchanged in numerous
non-verbal, as well as verbal ways. It is possible

the person deaf from infancy has had such different communication experiences, that however good his lipreading, he will gain only the words'.

Although a considerable amount of attention has been given over the years to policies directed at alleviating what have been thought to be the difficulties encountered by deaf people in their everyday lives (p:113f), these have been based more upon the observations of "hearing" people than systematic analysis, and direct questioning of deaf people. Thus a "hearing" perception of deafness has grown up, in which deaf people have become the cared-for, lacking independence and autonomy, and forced into the role of client rather than citizen.

At the present time there is a considerable movement, led by deaf people, to end this situation. The recognition of Sign Languages as languages in their own right, the acknowledgement that the deaf "community" and deaf "culture" are credible entities, and the rise of the professional Sign Language interpreter in the 1970s and 1980s, have been the bases for change. However, these developments are taking place in a piecemeal manner and policies are being suggested without the formulation of a philosophy upon which they can be based, and without face to face research with deaf people upon which to base the philosophy.

The Peculiar Needs Of Deaf People Not Understood

Parratt (1987:p:11) writes 'generally much of our knowledge is nothing more than passed down "perceived wisdom". A lot of practice has no proper knowledge base....in this country (the United Kingdom), no study has been done asking, what are the needs of deaf people and how can they best be met?....such effective research has got to be based on a dialogue with deaf people.... we need to work out with deaf people how social science can help them, as it is not there to help us control them for professional reasons'.

However, as Furth (1966:p:7) points out, there are difficulties in approaching the subject of deafness: 'because deafness is an invisible disability manifesting itself mainly in failure to communicate, hearing people cannot readily understand the effects of this handicap, and even scientific investigators are faced with a serious and unfamiliar obstacle'. So serious and unfamiliar, in fact, that the majority of social scientists have ignored deafness, according to Parratt (1987:p:11), who writes 'the greatest possibility is that deafness, unlike homosexuality, mental illness and ethnic minorities, has not aroused the interest of social scientists. In this country (the United Kingdom) or even internationally, no more than three or four names

come to mind....deafness research in this country

is a series of discrete research projects, mainly

carried out by research students, full or part-time,

rather than formulated research programmes with a

well-defined goal or problem'.

Because of the lack of understanding of

the social effects of deafness from childhood,

"hearing" people, particularly parents of deaf

children, are naturally attracted to ideas, usually

educational ideas, which suggest that deaf people

can be totally assimilated into "hearing" society

through the use of hearing aids and by using

lipreading to receive spoken communication. Thus

it has come about that membership of what has become

known as the deaf "community" is an achieved status.

This concept of integration is based upon an

inadequate understanding of the communication

conditions which deaf people encounter in their

everyday lives; it is a "hearing" perception of

deafness and ignores the deaf experience.

Kyle and Allsop (1982:p:114) write, 'the

main feature which deaf people feel aggrieved about

is the lack of understanding of deafness, and the

lack of acceptance of their language as a way of

giving and receiving communication'. Yet this lack

of understanding is to some extent understandable.

There is little in the way of popular literature

to inform the parents of deaf children and the general
public about deafness and Sign Language, and the
one organisation which could influence the parents
of deaf children, the National Deaf Children's
Society, is ambivalent about Sign Language and the
deaf "community".

The present study suggests that this
situation has come about due to a lack of research
into the problems faced by deaf people, and the ways
in which they deal with them; the situation has
deteriorated to the level of a debate about the
relative merits of "methods", whereas what is needed
is a dialectic, in which all parties come together
to test the truth by discussion. There is little
logical disputation of the subject of deafness.

Deaf people have complained about the
effects of the educational dogma of 'oralism' upon
their lives, but the present study suggests that
those who support Sign Language and the deaf way
of life might be in danger of becoming equally
dogmatic about the deaf "community" and deaf
"culture". Although work on the deaf "community",
particularly the innovative work of Kyle and his
team of researchers (some of them deaf people) at
Bristol University, has been of great value in
revealing the existence of a deaf "community" and
"culture" based upon British Sign Language, there

11

is now apparent a disposition to dogmatise about
these subjects, when the study of them is by no means
complete. The effect of this dogmatisation has led
to deaf people being accorded marginal status in
society, with the deaf community being seen as
something separate from the mainstream. Without
doubt, deaf people are peripheral members of society
because of a lack of inter-personal communication,
but it is not their lack of communication - "hearing"
people lack communication with deaf people every
bit as much as deaf people lack communication with
"hearing" people; the danger of a too simple
acceptance of the concept of deaf "community" is that
deaf people are consigned to it, and thus effectively
marginalised. A less dogmatic approach to the concept
of deaf "community" would ensure that "deafness"
would be an ascribed status, incorporating "hearing"
people's communication responsibility to deaf people,
so that any failure in this respect is theirs rather
than deaf people's, whilst at the same time accepting
that deaf people need the deaf "community" as part
of their adaptation to life in "hearing" society.

Argyle (1978:p:24), writing about social
behaviour, states 'we would like to argue that
theorising in the field of social behaviour is
premature: theories have been constructed before
the basic empirical phenomena in the field were

discovered. In an attempt to provide a systematic way of describing the phenomena, they in fact say less than what everybody knows already. What is needed first is a working picture of what is going on in social situations'. In relation to deaf people, there is no "working picture" of what is going on, in particular in communication situations between deaf and "hearing" people, and it is the purpose of the present study to initiate this.

Deaf People's Lack Of Autonomy

Another reason for the study is that the need for deaf people's autonomy is still not recognised by the policy makers. There is no doubt that deaf people are aware of this situation and are gradually gaining power, through political activity, by campaigning for what they consider to be their rights; and pragmatically, by organising training for deaf people so that they can actually deliver services such as youth leadership and Sign Language teaching. However, new policies are being formulated for services to deaf people which, although they incorporate the idea of Sign Language interpreting as a separate service and suggest consultation with deaf people, have not moved far enough away from the social work/pathological model. "Consultation" with deaf people in the formulation of policies infers that "hearing" people are still

the policy makers. Clearly, there is not, as yet,
a philosophy of deafness upon which to base these
policies. If there was such a philosophy, based
upon the autonomous deaf person, deaf people would
be planning the policies and be involved with their
implementation, and greater emphasis would be placed
upon training deaf people in all aspects of social
welfare, from planning to delivery.

Because deaf people experience difficulty
in communicating with "hearing" people, they find
it necessary to use communication interemediaries
in some of their dealings with them. Thus, the paid
worker has been very much part of the deaf scene
from Victorian times, when the Missions to the deaf
began their development. It is evident that at an
early stage they assumed a dominant role in the lives
of deaf people, denying them autonomy and creating
deaf "clients" rather than encouraging independence.
Jones (1985:p:4) writes, 'the deaf community at large
were very much under the control of patriarchal
figures like the old missioners of the deaf. They
exerted father-like influence and treated the deaf
like their own children. In other words, the deaf
were placed under their wings like a mother hen
covering her baby chicks. Their attitude towards
the deaf was a patronising one; "Oh poor deaf, the
deaf cannot do things for themselves. I will speak

to the outside world on their behalf to the extent
of not even consulting the deaf's own viewpoint"'.

Jones (1985:p:4), a psychology graduate
and researcher, who is deaf himself, having likened
deaf people to the feudal population who eventually
started to liberate themselves from the total control
of the landlords, the gentry and the church, through
the achievement of literacy, poses the question 'were
the deaf UNABLE (Jones' emphasis) to contribute due
to low literacy levels?' He asks if deaf people
are making real contributions to the running of their
own affairs at all levels within the deaf "community",
and questions whether they are involved at the top
level of management, especially in the societies
of the deaf. 'Very often, one finds only one if
any at all at this top level. Also, is that
particular one really making a real contribution?
Is that deaf person placed there to make it look
good? In other words, is this deaf person a puppet?
I think it is extremely important not only to look
at the kind of contribution that a deaf person is
making, but to look also at the quality (Jones'
emphasis) of the contribution. Very often with
management meetings, the business side is carried
out at a very fast rate, using forms of language
(together with a much higher level of literacy) that
are beyond the comprehension of the average deaf

person even if he has an interpreter. What I am trying to get at is that do these deaf people have a REAL (Jones' emphasis) chance to make a contribution at all??? (sic). Of course deaf people in general have normal non-verbal intelligence, but unfortunately the majority do have lower-than-average literacy levels'.

Another deaf person, Alker (1985:p:2), speaking to social workers about the Deaf Tribune Group, states 'I think it is important to start by saying that the Tribune Group is not (Alkers's emphasis) anti-hearing. In fact, we need you and your help - all we ask is that you approach us with a creative attitude and open mind'. Alker (1985:p:2) states that how much social workers with deaf people can help will depend upon their attitudes: 'much will depend on your aims and ideals as far as deaf people are concerned. If you believe in dominating and pushing them around, then we will fight you. On the other hand, if you feel that deaf people ought to be encouraged to stand on their own feet and you believe in their trying to strive for equality of opportunity in society, then you are more than welcome. He (Alker:1985:p:3) goes on to give an example of deaf people being dominated by "hearing" people, and states that this is why the Deaf Tribune Group was formed.

The dominance of the "hearing" person over deaf people is a recurring theme throughout the development of services to deaf people and is clearly resented by them, particularly at the present time (p:14). Yet in many areas of their lives deaf people have to deal with the "hearing" world through a third party, because lipreading is an inadequate means of receiving spoken communication (p:221f). In the past the paid worker, usually a welfare or social worker, has spoken for deaf people, often without consulting them (Jones:1985:p:4). In order that deaf people can exercise their right to act as independent citizens, even though it might be through a third party, considerable emphasis is now laid upon the role of sign language interpreters.

Unfortunately, although deaf people are more aware of the problems facing them in gaining equality of opportunity and thus autonomy in "hearing" society, there is no clear plan for achieving this. The present study suggests that attempts to do this through new policies currently being proposed (p:506f) are unlikely to be successful, because there does not exist at present a philosophy of deafness upon which they could be based. Further, it is not possible to formulate a philosophy until the peculiar needs of deaf people are known, and as has already been pointed out (p:8), these needs are not known

because little face to face research with deaf people
has been carried out.

The purpose of the present study is to
reveal the needs of deaf people, so far as this is
possible; to formulate a philosophy of deafness which
allows autonomy for deaf people; and to consider
the implications of such a philosophy on policies
for service provision.

Summary

There is linguistic research into Sign
Languages and some descriptive work on the deaf
community, but little face to face research with
deaf people. Parratt and Tipping (1987:p:11) state
'we need to look again at what the needs of deaf
people are - not what we as social workers think
they are - through research and dialogue with deaf
people'. The research on deaf "community", the
present study suggests, is to some extent counter-
productive, in that "hearing" society has had
presented to it a "community" of deaf people, using
an alien form of communication, apparently outside
the community at large. Whilst this does describe
the deaf experience up to a point, to ask "hearing"
people to ascribe membership of this "community"
to deaf people, is to marginalise them further than
they are inevitably marginalised by the lack of fluent

inter-personal communication between deaf and "hearing" people. With more knowledge of deaf people's social and communication needs, the present study suggests that "hearing" people should be asked to ascribe "deafness" to deaf people, as part of a philosophy of deafness which accepts the deaf "community" as a sub-cultural adaptation, and also expects "hearing" people to accommodate to deafness by learning to use Sign Language to communicate with individual deaf people on a one to one basis, or through interpreters, in order to reduce their marginal status in society.

Deaf people's lack of autonomy is a cause for concern and is another reason for the present study. Whilst deaf people inevitably experience impediments to inter-personal communication with "hearing" people, and therefore have to depend upon Sign Language interpreters to some extent, it is evident that services to meet their peculiar needs do not allow deaf people's personal autonomy.

References

Jones, K.   The Social Effects of Deafness
                               from Birth or Early Childhood.
                               A Study of the Adult Deaf
                               Community of South Humberside

    Typewritten. M.Phil. Thesis, unpublished, 1982

Parratt, David   'Towards a Social Scientific
                               Approach to Deafness'
                               The Journal of the National
                               Council of Social Workers
                               with Deaf People
                               April/May/June 1987
                               Vol.3(1) p:11

Furth   Hans G..   Thinking Without Language

    The Free Press New York, 1966

Kyle, J.G.   Deaf People and the Community.
&   Final Report to the Nuffield
Allsop, L.   Foundation

    Bristol University. Typewritten.
    Unpublished, 1982

Argyle, Michael   Social Interaction

    Tavistock Publications, 1978

Jones, Christopher   'Have Deaf People a
                               Contribution to Make?'
                               The Journal of the National
                               Council of Social Workers
                               with the Deaf
                               January/February 1985
                               Vol.1(2) pp:4-5

Alker, Doug.   'The Deaf Tribune Group'
                               The Journal of the National
                               Council of Social Workers
                               with the Deaf
                               January/February
                               1985 Vol.1(2) p:2

Parratt, David
&
Tipping, Brenda

'The State, Social Work and Deafness'
The Journal of the National Council of Social Workers with Deaf People
October/November/December 1986 Vol.2(4) pp:8-11

CHAPTER 2   'Method'

        The intention of the present study was
to discover the peculiar needs of deaf people and
to formulate a philosophy of deafness in which these
needs are embodied. It has been suggested that
services to deaf people are based upon the subjective
observation of deaf people by "hearing" people
(p:8) resulting in a "hearing" perspective of the
social effects of deafness. It is also suggested
that there is a lack of face to face research amongst
deaf people (p:8). Therefore in the present study
an attempt is made to create a "deaf" perspective
of deafness.

        This does not mean a "deaf person's"
perspective, but an objective view which takes into
account the experience of deaf people. It is not
the intention of the present study to suggest that
deaf people "per se" know all about deafness, or
are necessarily the best people to counsel other
deaf people, or the parents of deaf children; though
it is possible that if appropriately qualified and
trained they bring a certain authority and a greater
empathy to counselling relationships. It is
significant that it is suggested that deaf people
might prefer paid welfare workers who are deaf,
because they say that they will not be patronised

by a deaf person acting in this capacity (p:97).

However, the lives of deaf people contain the experience of deafness and diligent research into this experience will give insights into what might be their peculiar needs, which individual deaf people might not be consciously aware of, or cannot express. Therefore, the basis of the present study is the questioning and observation of deaf people, through guided interviews (appendixes:7,8 & 9 p:716f) by spending time with them in their social/recreational lives (appendix:2p:645f) and by surveying their referrals to social workers with deaf people (p:313f).

The guided interview method of questioning deaf people was chosen because, although it might have been possible to attain a much larger sample through a postal questionnaire, it is unlikely that the respondents would have been able to reply in any detail, without help, due to their unfamiliarity with English language. It is noted (table:5:p:62) that respondents have low academic attainments and the work of Conrad (1979) suggests that deaf children leave school handicapped by lack of reading and writing skills. Russo (1974:p:1), who conducted research amongst deaf people, writes, 'those unfamiliar with deaf people tend to restrict the handicap to a loss of physical hearing, nothing more. Yet deafness makes a profound impact on other areas,

one of which is language comprehension'. He states
(1974:p:18) that linguistic difficulties make written
answers difficult for deaf people and there can be
uncertainty about them understanding the questions;
therefore he chose the interview method. Russo
continues 'this technique frees the investigator
to clear up immediately any interpretations, to reject
stock answers, to ask follow up questions when
necessary, and to use the total communication
approach. It has the further advantage of permitting
the investigator to build a friendly rapport with
the one tested, thereby helping the investigator
to invoke interest and insure honesty'.

In order to give background to this research
an examination was made of the historical development
of present services to deaf people, followed by a
consideration of the main features of those services.
Reports of agencies providing services to deaf people
were surveyed and Government reports and those
produced by such organisations as the Royal National
Institute for the Deaf were examined. Social workers
with deaf people were asked about the work they do and
and are expected to do, as well as their attitudes to
certain key issues related to deaf people, through a
postal questionnaire. Finally, the literature was
considered and is described, topic by topic, in the
text.

The subject of communication with "hearing" people was discussed with leading members of the Lincoln and Spalding deaf clubs informally, before the questionnaires were devised. It was also at the suggestion of these deaf people that it was decided to interview members of the Lincoln deaf club committee.

Respondents were interviewed either at home or at the deaf club, whichever suited them best, between mid-1986 and the end of 1987. Each respondent was seen at the deaf club and asked if he or she would be willing to be interviewed; no-one refused. The purpose of the interview was explained and an appointment was made. It should be explained that the present author is well known to deaf people in the Lincolnshire area and when told of the interviews several said 'Oh yes, I know, same as Grimsby, questions, questions', alluding to the South Humberside study (Jones:1982).

The means of communication used during the interviews was Sign Language, generally British Sign Language, as this was most commonly used by respondents. If there was any limitation to the communication inter-action during the interviews, it was due to the communication ability of the present writer. As with all workers with deaf people starting

work in the 1950s, he had no formal training in Sign Language, learning by mixing with deaf people in their social/recreational activities, including playing for deaf football and cricket teams and being invited to deaf peoples' homes. Whilst this means of learning to communicate meant that the finer points of British Sign Language grammar were not known by name to the present writer (neither were they to the deaf people), they were learned and used by him in a Sign Language environment. Although not a native signer (that is, someone deaf or "hearing" brought up to use Sign Language from an early age), and acknowledging that his Sign Language ability could not bear comparison with that of such a person, it is likely that his ability to make himself understood and to comprehend what is communicated to him in Sign language is reliable in the sort of situation in which requests can be made to repeat, or explain particular signs used. It is also suggested that because the present writer is well known to the respondents, and his interest in the social effects of their deafness is also known, because he has discussed it with informal groups and individuals over the years, this was a help in establishing an immediate rapport at the interviews.

There were three questionnaires upon which the guided interviews were based, for three groups

of deaf people. There were three groups, in order to question at different levels and to extend the range of questions. The first was composed of forty-six members of the Lincoln deaf club who were known to attend at least once a month. They were asked questions of a general nature about communication with "hearing" people (p:734f).

The second group, chosen from the first because they were all past or present members of the Lincoln deaf club committee, were asked fewer questions but at greater depth, about their relations with "hearing" society (p:723f). Being committee members, it was considered that they might be thoughtful and responsible people. As they had already been questioned in the larger group and had agreed to be interviewed again, it was expected that they would have given some prior thought to the matter of communication with "hearing" people, though they did not know in detail what they would be asked. Greater space was given in these interviews for comments by respondents.

The third group was composed of the nine deaf people who lived in Spalding; matching the Lincoln deaf club members in such things as marriage to other deaf people, use of Sign Language and attendance at a deaf club, they were asked questions about their attendance at "hearing" organisations,

but in particular they were asked about the exchange of home visits with "hearing" friends (p:716f). Again, there was time allowed for comment.

The use of three groups allowed for the first set of interviews to range over a relatively wide number of topics to do with communication with "hearing" people. This gave an opportunity to ask fewer questions at greater depth in the other two interviews. The reason for using two smaller groups rather than just one meant that the interviews could ask for comments on a wider range of different,but complementary, topics, without an unduly long interview.

The Use Of Respondents' Comments

The use of respondents' comments was thought to be a useful addition to the answers to the set questions, presenting insights into their thoughts and feelings about the experience of deafness. The unanimity of expression can be noted in each topic, which in itself is significant in that it denotes similarity of experience (p:686f). In particular, the comments in answer to question 45 to the Lincoln deaf club members (p:693f), show that those who feel their deafness makes life difficult for them, see those difficulties almost exclusively in terms of communication.

Communication Assessment

Most of the questions demanded a "yes" or "no" answer, or a particular piece of information such as who the respondent would go to for help with a personal problem. However, in relation to inter-personal communication respondents were asked how much they could hear, and an assessment was made of their speech intelligibility and the Sign Language communication (Sign Supported English or British Sign Language) they were most comfortable with.

In each case the communication assessment was based upon the subjective judgement of the interviewer (the present writer); Jones (1982:p:41) justifies this method when he states 'using considerably different methods, Conrad, Drewry and Denmark come to similar conclusions, and it is interesting that this survey (Jones:1982) shares these conclusions, which to some extent validates the method, bearing in mind the difficulties involved and especially as Drewry and Denmark both used similarly subjective assessments'.

As with Jones (1982:pp:40-43), the present study could do no more than establish whether the respondents' speech could be understood by the interviewer and the extent to which the respondents could hear the interviewer's voice. A simple test was used to test the interviewer's consistency

(Jones:1982:p:44); in speech ability assessment the first and last ten interviews were examined for discrepancy and the two social workers with deaf people who knew the respondents were asked to check the speech and hearing assessments. The same was done with Sign Language assessments. No obvious discrepancy was found.

Hearing

In the case of hearing it was necessary to establish whether respondents could hear one to one conversational speech. A simple scale constructed by Jones (1982:pp:40-41) for use in similar circumstances was thought to be suitable. Respondents were asked if they could hear, with or without a hearing aid, the voice of the interviewer, part of that speech, the voice but not the words, noises only, or nothing. As Jones (1982:p:41) states, 'to hear even parts of words is important in that it can help in lipreading'; those able to do so could be said to have some useful hearing. Those who could hear the sound of the voice, but could not distinguish the words, might also be judged to have useful hearing in that the sound of the voice can help a little in orientation (Jones:1982:p:41).

Speech Ability

As with Jones (1982:p:42-43), it was simply a matter of establishing whether the respondents' speech could

be understood by the interviewer. Jones (1982:p:43) writes 'this is not to say, of course, that some respondents assessed as being without intelligible speech, might not be able to make themselves understood to strangers, in certain simple communication situations. They probably could; certainly, most respondents claimed to communicate with 'hearing' people with speech and lipreading, though it is difficult to envisage any of these transactions being at all complicated'. The same could be said of the respondents of the present study.

Sign Language Ability

Sign Language ability was also assessed by the interviewer. Although respondents were divided into Sign Supported English and British Sign Language users, there was considerable variation in communication ability, as there might be amongst "hearing" people using English. One factor which was noticed, about which nothing is written, but deserves attention, is that some respondents were poor signers, even though they had been deaf from childhood. One man in particular, in his seventies, was observed at a Christmas party in a deaf person's home; he was unable to take part in the games, most of which required Sign Language, because his was not sufficiently fluent. Some time later, on being questioned about this by the present writer, he

explained that his parents had not allowed him to use Sign Language at home and had disapproved of him mixing with other deaf people. He did not attend the Lincoln deaf club until they had both died and he was in his early forties.

Parental disapproval of Sign Language and mixing with other deaf people was noted when the present writer attended a workshop for deaf voluntary workers. The workshop was led by a deaf person who decided to start the session by asking the participants about their childhood experiences at home. The six deaf couples there were all critical of the sort of counselling their parents had been given by the staff of the school for the deaf, about communication at home. This attitude is still prevalent. The present writer, asked by a parent for advice about her 12 year old son, was informed that she had been told by the peripatetic teacher of the deaf that he would not recommend that the boy should meet other deaf children (he attended a "hearing" school, although he had a considerable hearing loss) out of school 'Because he has to learn to live in a hearing world'. This boy was observed at a later date at the Lincoln deaf youth club. He was unable to communicate with the other deaf children there, but could not communicate fluently with the "hearing" helpers either. In another case

a deaf boy who was seen to communicate fluently in
Sign Language with his deaf peers, would not use
it when communicating with the present writer, in
spite of the fact that he was addressed in Sign
Language and had poor speech. It was suggested by
a helper at the youth club that some deaf young
people, forbidden by adults to use Sign Language
at school or at home, were inhibited about using
it with any adults. This was so common an experience
that it is suggested it would make a fruitful topic
of research and is certainly of relevance in the
area of parent counselling.

Survey Of Referrals

The survey of referrals (appendix:3p:673f)
was conducted solely to establish the sorts of
problems deaf people referred to social workers with
deaf people. The frequency of referrals, or the
process of how they were dealt with were not relevant
to the survey.

Three agencies were surveyed; the Birmingham
Institute for the Deaf, which is a voluntary
organisation providing services to deaf people in
the City of Birmingham, under an agency agreement
with the council; Derby social services department,
social work with deaf people team, covering Derby;
and Lincolnshire social services department, deaf
services section, covering Lincoln and north

Lincolnshire.

The surveys took place at the end of 1986, for three months in Birmingham, four months in Derby and 3 months in Lincoln and north Lincolnshire.

In Birmingham the duty officer, through whom all new referrals came, completed the forms. In Derby and Lincoln and north Lincolnshire the social workers to whom the individual referrals were made completed the forms. The survey form, notes for guidance of those completing them, and details of the referrals recorded are given in appendix 3 (p:673f).

Referrals were divided into Sign Language interpreting, general help and casework. These were defined as follows:

Sign Language interpreting; a situation in which a deaf person (or persons) uses a "hearing" person to help them communicate with a "hearing" person or persons through Sign Language.

general help; a situation in which a deaf person asks for advice or information which does not require Sign Language interpreting, but usually requires some communication, either by telephone, letter, or official form.

casework; a situation in which a deaf person requires counselling for problems of a personal nature, usually involving inter-personal relationships.

Observation Of And Participation in Lincoln Deaf Club Social/Recreational Activities

During the course of the study the present writer attended Lincoln deaf club and took part in a number of social activities, such as parties and other special events. He also accompanied members of the deaf club to a Butlins holiday and attended a week long deaf children's camp. During the same period of time deaf people invited him to their homes and freely discussed their deafness and its effect upon their lives. With hindsight it is thought that this part of the study might have been developed further, in view of the valuable insights gained from observation and participation. The knowledge gained from this part of the research adds a quality which could not have been obtained in any other way. It is suggested by the present study that there is a need for research of an ethnographic nature, based upon and rooted in the deaf social group. A description of Lincoln deaf club, and some of the activities in which the present writer was involved, are described in appendix 2 (p:645f).

Survey Of Reports Of Agencies Providing Specialist Services For Deaf People

Letters were sent to ninety agencies listed in the Royal National Institute for the Deaf 1987 directory as providing services to deaf people, asking

for annual reports or other documents describing
the services they provided for deaf people. There
were 30 replies of one sort or another, but it was
only possible to use 15 of them, due to lack of data.
These were examined and are described in appendix 3
(p:680f).

Other Reports

Other reports, produced by the Royal National
Institute for the Deaf, the British Deaf Association,
the National Council of Social Workers with Deaf
People and other organisation, were consulted and
some of them are described in the text. Together
with the reports from agencies, they were useful
in that they threw light upon how "hearing" people
viewed deaf people. They also showed that there
is no face to face research into the lives of deaf
people and that policies are based upon the
observations of the "hearing" people who wrote these
reports.

Postal Questionnaire To Members Of The National
Council Of Social Workers With Deaf People.

During 1986 a questionnaire was posted
to the one hundred and twenty four members of the
National Council of Social Workers with Deaf People,
together with a letter seeking their co-operation.
They were posted by the secretary of the National
Council, to ensure confidentiality of the addresses.

There were 73 (58.9%) replies, of whom 66 were social workers (one social work assistant is included in this category). The other seven were clergymen, community workers, or domiciliary workers. These latter seven were not used in the information contained in the tables.

The National Council of Social Workers with Deaf People was chosen for the survey because although it was known that there were other social workers working with deaf people, it was thought that those joining this organisation formed the backbone of the profession of workers with deaf people. Most, it was thought, would be qualified social workers anxious to maintain their professional identity by joining the national organisation that was likely to keep them up to date with matters concerning their everyday work, and safeguard their interests as professionals. It was thought there would be a unanimity of purpose amongst members of one professional organisation, which would give the survey greater integrity.

The questionnaire (appendix:10p:751f) was composed of questions requiring "yes" or "no" answers, or particular information, except for the last question which asked respondents to give their views on the deaf "community", training for social workers with deaf people, interpreting as a separate service,

and the involvement of deaf people.

The questionnaire was devised in order
to discover what social workers were expected to do
at work with deaf people, as well as what they did and
how much time they gave to particular duties. It was
anticipated that this information would be a
complement to the referrals survey, as well as giving
another dimension to the information contained in
the reports.

It was gratifying that so many respondents
were willing to spend time on the last, open ended
question, with its four parts; their comments are
recorded in full in appendix 6 (p:696f), and make more
powerful the argument that there is a climate of
change at the present time. The tenor of these
comments also goes a long way to recoup the reputation
of social workers with deaf people, who, it has been
suggested in some quarters (p:401), have not allowed
deaf people the independence that is their right.

Summary

It can be seen that the research for the
present study was planned so that the situation of
deaf people in "hearing" society could be viewed from
as many angles as possible, in order to obtain as
objective an assessment of deaf people's peculiar
needs as could be expected under the circumstances

of a study such as the present one. The main thrust
of the research was contained in the examination
of the communication of respondents with "hearing"
people, their views on the services they need and
the survey of their referrals. However, the study
would have been incomplete without the examination
of the work of the social workers with deaf people
and the reports of agencies and other organisations.
These other examinations give the "hearing" dimension
to the lives of deaf people and without them it would
not have been apparent that "hearing" people have
been superficial and overbearing in their application
to the welfare of deaf people. Given this
information, it is possible to understand the strong
feelings deaf people have recently expressed about
the relation of "hearing" people to the provision
of services to meet their needs (p:415) and the
attitudes of deaf people to their language,
"community" and "culture".

By taking this all-round view it has been
possible to formulate the philosophy of deafness
(p:542f), which takes into account all the issues
which are raised in the research and examinations.

References

Conrad, R

The Deaf School Child

    Harper & Row, 1979

Russo, Rev. Anthony

The God of the Deaf
Adolescent. An Inside View

    Paulist Press, 1974

Jones, K

The Social Effects of Deafness
from Birth or Early Childhood.
A Study of the Adult Deaf
Population of South Humberside

    Typewritten. M.Phil. Thesis, Unpublished, 1982

CHAPTER 3   'Other Considerations Relevant To The
              Study'

The first matter considered is the fact
that stereotyping is a danger which is always present
when dealing with a group of people with one
outstanding characteristic in common. This means
'that you judge people not on the basis of what you
know of them specifically and personally, but what
you know of the category they belong to' (Meyers
and Meyers:1980:p:132). Stereotyping in this way
is particularly likely when, as with deaf people,
they share a distinctive means of communication,
as well as being drawn together as a social group.
Whilst it is evident, upon close examination, that
deaf people are unique individuals, this fact is
sometimes overlooked because of their shared
characteristics, all related to their deafness.

That the majority of deaf respondents of
the present study did not make use of electronic
aids to conversation with "hearing" people needs
to be pointed out; even when a personal hearing aid
is helpful in one to one conversation, group
conversation sometimes remains a problem.

An attempt is made to define deafness in
the context of the deaf respondents of the present
study; it is noted that definitions from other sources
mention both the lack of hearing for speech and the

early onset of deafness. Regarding numbers, there
are no reliable statistics available, though it is
known that Sign Language using deaf people form a
small minority nationally, the figure being generally
accepted as no more than 50,000.

The deaf respondents live in Lincolnshire,
a sparsely populated and rather isolated county.
The effect of this upon respondents is discussed.

The Danger Of Stereotyping

When examining a group of people and drawing
conclusions from that examination, it is necessary
to point out the danger of creating a stereotype;
in the case of deaf people, that of the person totally
isolated from "hearing" society, who does not mix
with "hearing" people and does not use any means
of communication other than Sign Language. By being
erroneously depicted in this way deaf people are
in danger of being socially isolated - marginalised
is the word sometimes used to describe deaf people's
peripheral membership of society.

The deaf respondents from Lincoln and
Spalding match the characteristics of members of
the deaf social groups in the general literature
and in the two studies of the deaf "community" in
the United Kingdom (Kyle and Allsop: 1982 and
Jones:1982). Whilst it is also true that there is
no escaping the fact of respondents' deafness, or

the unreliability of lipreading and the fact that
these factors lead to deaf people having social lives
mainly amongst other deaf people who use Sign
Language, it must be remarked upon that within the
limits imposed by their deafness they mix readily
with "hearing" people, though this is on a continuum
of communication ability (p:377f).

Kyle and Woll (1985:p:19) write that deaf
people 'do not avoid contact with hearing people,
even though they do acknowledge communication
problems....since at work deaf people use and accept
the use of speech and lipreading'; and Kyle and Allsop
(1982:p:157) demonstrate that deaf people value the
use of speech in helping them to negotiate the
"hearing" world. It was noted when observing deaf
adults on their holiday at Butlins (appendix:2p:658f)
and deaf children at their annual camp (appendix:2
p:661f), that they did not hesitate to mix with or
approach "hearing" people.

Respondents in the present study made some positive
comments about "hearing" friends (appendix:5 pp:688f
& 691f) and Vernon (1965:p:553) writes 'although
most close social contacts are with other deaf people,
the deaf adult usually has some close hearing friends
at work and amongst his neighbours at home'.

It has been established that deaf
respondents in the present study have difficulties

following conversation in groups with "hearing" people
(p:221f), but they nevertheless wish to establish
contact with those around them, so they choose a
particular individual, most likely one known to take
trouble when attempting communication (p:309) For
example, a deaf person commented that he 'always
backed off' with "hearing" people, but added 'have
a special friend - can lipread' (appendix:5:
pp:688f); another said that there was one "hearing"
person in the social club he could lipread (appendix:5
p:688). A young deaf woman said that she had one
"hearing" friend and they could converse, but as
soon as another "hearing" friend joined them she
was "lost". So, within the limits of their social
disability deaf people mix with "hearing" people.

Deaf people work with "hearing" people,
have "hearing" neighbours and "hearing" children
and their parental families are usually "hearing";
what is more, they do not spend all that much time
at the deaf club, once, perhaps twice a week at the
most (table:12p:64) and in Spalding only once a
fortnight (table:14p:65). It should be pointed out
that even the deaf clubs are not totally cut off,
as they usually have games teams in the "hearing"
leagues (appendix:2p:647 and Kyle and
Allsop:1982:p:12). Lysons (1965:pp:284-285) makes

the point that 'deaf people do achieve some sort
of integration' in that they mix with "hearing" people
in their everyday lives.

Therefore, whilst it is necessary for deaf
people to make certain sub-cultural adaptations in
order to cope with life in a society which is geared
to the ability to hear (chapters 15 & 16:p:276f),
by using a visual language of signs and engaging
in social/recreational activities mainly with others
who also use this language, this does not render
them any less members of society at large. It is
true that deaf people are living, working members
of society, despite the obstacles to communication.
'One can therefore dismiss the view that deaf people
form a community separated and isolated from the
world' (Kyle and Woll:1985:p:19).

Electronic Aids To Hearing

It is important to note that electronic
aids do not help the majority of respondents to hear
conversational speech (table:9p:63), particularly
in a group (p:221f). Although there are electronic
aids to help in everyday life such as flashing
doorbells, flashing and vibrating alarm clocks and
so on, there is no means of turning speech into a
visual symbol. According to Martin (1986:p:7) it
will be at least ten years before devices to do this
will be of practical use to deaf people.

Speech can be transcribed into writing through the Palantype system (Martin:1986:p:7), which employs a phonetic keyboard and upon which a skilled operator can transcribe two hundred words a minute. This can be used at committee meetings and conferences, but at the moment does not help the deaf person in everyday social intercourse with "hearing" people.

There are small keyboard and screen devices available, such as the Cannon printer, which can be strapped to the wrist and a written message displayed on the screen. Such devices were not evident amongst deaf people in the present study. As one deaf person said, 'What's wrong with paper and pencil if I get stuck with the "hearing".

Whilst these devices certainly have their uses (it is clear that deaf people regard modern communication technology as important (p:435)), and are likely to become more prominent in the future, they should not be seen as a substitute for Sign Language as a means of inter-personal communication. In particular, Sign Language is a natural language (p:428f) which not only transmits exact meaning, but conveys subtleties of emotion far beyond the capability of electronic substitutes.

<u>Definition</u>

The deaf subjects of the present study
are members of what has become known as the deaf
"community" and the characteristics of members of
that "community" are discussed in chapter 18 (p:323f).
Amongst other characteristics they use Sign Language,
attend deaf clubs, marry other deaf people, and share
a common experience of life as deaf people.
However, it is not easy to define "deafness" as it
relates to these people, without a clear understanding
of their sub-cultural adaptations (p:347f); and it
would be wrong to suggest that such people are defined
by reason of their membership of the deaf "community"
because,as is explained later (p:383f), the concept
of community in relation to deaf people is not
sufficiently precise and is misleading.

Furtey and Harte (1964:p:2) state '"the
deaf" were defined as those without usable hearing
in the speech range even when assisted by a hearing
aid'. Vernon (1965:p:542) suggests the following
definition; 'a person is educationally and socially
deaf when he cannot understand conversational speech
in most situations and when the onset of hearing
loss was pre-lingual or early in life'. The
description "prevocationally deaf" is used by Schein
and Delk (1974:p:2) in their definition; 'while

hearing impairment of all degrees and type deserve
attention, The National Census of the Deaf Population
focused on the extreme end of the impairment
continuum. The population of interest consists of
those persons who could not hear and understand speech
and who had lost (or never had) that ability prior
to nineteen years. For purposes of easy
identification we have labelled this group
prevocationally deaf'. Jones (1982:p:27) quotes
Lunde (Stokoe:1978:p:17) as suggesting that 'by and
large the deaf group as a whole never used hearing
for speech'.

It can be seen that all these definitions
might be correctly applied to deaf respondents in
the present study (pp:61 & 63). In particular it
should be noted that they mention the use of hearing
for speech, or for conversation, as well as the early
age of onset of deafness. This is important, as
Vernon (1965:p:542) points out; 'the distinction
between this (his definition, quoted above) and some
audiological deafness is crucial. A failure to grasp
fully the difference leads to much of the confusion,
misunderstanding and denial of deafness which has
proven so destructive over the years'. Therefore,
a person might have some useful hearing, which will
help with lipreading and conversational
orientation, but still be deaf to conversation;

audiologically they might have some hearing, socially
they would be deaf. These definitions of deafness
are also explicit about age of onset and it is
interesting to note that all the respondents in the
present study attended schools for the deaf (tables:
3 & 4p:61).

Jones (1982:pp:26-27) suggests that 'deaf
people should be categorised (if this is necessary
at all - perhaps the word 'deaf' might reasonably
describe them all) broadly by the service they
require, and their most fluent means of communication.
This would provide two categories, the 'deaf', or
those who belong to the deaf group, most of whom,
if the evidence of this study is correct, will have
become deaf in early life and use sign language as
their most fluent means of communication, and the
'adult deafened'. This latter group, having become
deaf after acquiring speech and language normal to
their place of up-bringing, will have different needs,
and will not normally be able to use sign language'.

It is suggested in the present study that
respondents, whether they have useful hearing or
not, are deaf to spoken conversation. Therefore
they do not enjoy fluent inter-personal communication
with "hearing" people who do not use Sign Language.
They are also deaf from childhood (table:2p:61) and
therefore are "deaf" in the sense that they are likely
to belong to the deaf social group.

Numbers

The exact numbers of deaf people are not
relevant to the present study. However, it is
important to note that deaf people as defined above
are a small minority of the general population;
indeed, they are a minority of the overall population
of those who cannot hear. The Royal National
Institute for the Deaf (1988:p:1) quote Wilkins (1949)
as stating that in 1947, out of 1,765,000 people
in the population of England, Scotland and Wales
with hearing problems, 15,000 were "deaf mutes".
At the present time the British Deaf Association
suggests (1987:p:7) that up to 50,000 deaf people
use Sign Language.

Wilkins (1948:p:13), also writes, 'rate
for deaf is subject to large sampling error, but
may be stated as about 0.037% of the population'.
According to Jones (1982:pp:25-26) the statistics
will depend upon the definition of deafness and
he makes this point by stating that the figure for
his Grimsby population of deaf people without speech
could be 0.22 per thousand or 0.17 per thousand and
the Scunthorpe population either 0.31 per thousand
or 0.15 per thousand. The Advisory Committee on
Services for Hearing Impaired People (1977:p:5) gives
a figure of 0.31 per thousand of the population for
those deaf without speech. Until there is an

organisation such as the American National Census of the Deaf Population, the exact figure will not be known. It is suggested for the purpose of the present study that it is accepted that the number of deaf people in the deaf social group category, using Sign Language, is in the region of 50,000, as stated by the British Deaf Association.

The Area

The county of Lincolnshire had a population of 552,000 at the 1981 census, which had risen to an estimated 584,600 by 1989 (information supplied by Lincolnshire County Council planning department). This population is spread over an area of 591,450 hectares in 620 settlements, the largest of which is Lincoln with an estimated 84,000 inhbitants in 1989 (information from Lincolnshire County Council planning department). The deaf Sign Language using population is thought to be in the region of 300, but there is no exact figure available.

The relatively small population of Lincolnshire is considerably isolated from the surrounding population. Lincoln, for example, is 50 miles from Peterborough in the south,38 miles from Nottingham in the west, 38 miles from Grimsby in the north and 45 miles (and a return toll of £3) over the Humber bridge to Hull.

The present study examines the peculiar

needs of deaf people and suggests that these are
not particularly affected by the nature of the area
in which they live. A useful study would be amongst
those deaf people who live in isolated areas and
have few opportunties for meeting other deaf people.
The experience of the present writer, who has met
such people, is that they are considerably socially
deprived; such adaptations as they make to living
amongst "hearing" people and without other deaf
people, do not appear to adequately meet their needs
for fellowship.

Jones (1982:p:326), in his study of the
deaf population of South Humberside, suggests that
'it might even be true to say that to be deaf and
to live in South Humberside comprise a double
handicap'. He bases this observation upon the fact
that the two deaf clubs in that area (Grimsby and
Scunthorpe) are not large enough to allow opportunity
for the sort of deaf group activity which is available
in the larger centres of deaf population, that is,
in the more densely populated parts of the country.
The same might be said of Lincolnshire.

Exact figures are not known, but it is
thought that no more than fifty deaf adults live
in Lincoln and the surrounding villages. Compared
with, say, Birmingham, Nottingham, Coventry, Derby
and other West Midlands towns and cities, which not

only have deaf clubs with large memberships, but
also easy access between them by train and road,
allowing opportunity for choice, Lincoln and
Lincolnshire deaf people are likely to lack social
opportunity.

This is a matter of degree, however, because
if Lincoln deaf club members are deprived of
opportunity for individual and group relationships
with other deaf people compared to those living in
the West Midlands, those nine deaf people living
in Spalding, with an estimated population in 1989
of 18,000 (information from Lincolnshire County
Council planning department), which is forty-four
miles from Lincoln and over fifty from Nottingham
and Derby, are deprived by comparison with those
living in Lincoln. However, although no direct
comparisons were made, there did not appear to be
any obvious discrepancy in behaviour between the
nine respondents living in Spalding and the forty-six
who attended the Lincoln deaf club. They used Sign
Language, attended the deaf club, valued their deaf
friends and married other deaf people. Although
there might be some degree of difference in their
relations with the "hearing" people amongst whom
they live and work, this was not evident to the
present writer, who conducted the interviews.

It is possible, though there is no research

available on the subject, that what deaf people cannot
get from other deaf people in the way of social
intercourse, cannot, due to lack of fluent inter-
personal communication, be compensated for by social
intercourse with "hearing" people. For example,
one respondent in Spalding was known to be an actress
of ability, who had recently won the Midlands British
Deaf Association signed poetry competition. There
is no deaf drama group nearer than Lincoln, and this
person is unable to travel there for rehearsals.
Because of her deafness and lack of intellgible speech
she is unlikely to be able to take part in drama
near to where she lives, so in this area of her life
she is handicapped not only by her deafness, but
by where she lives as well.

Thus it can be said that Lincoln and
Spalding respondents are limited in their social
opportunities in comparison with deaf people living
in areas with larger populations. However, this
is unlikely to affect their peculiar needs as deaf
people (even though those needs might not be
adequately met because of where they live). Indeed,
it might be argued that these needs are highlighted
and the **inevitability** of impediments to fluent inter-
personal communication between deaf and "hearing"
people is emphasised.

Summary

The danger of stereotyping deaf people
is considered and it is noted that they live and
work amongst "hearing" people. Although they
mostly choose deaf friends and marriage partners,
deaf people do not sacrifice their individuality
to their deafness. The idea of the deaf social group
being outside "hearing" society is a mistaken
"hearing" perception of deafness. It is seen that
respondents could not hear conversation (p:) and
there are no electronic devices which can help them
to communicate with "hearing" people by turning speech
into visible form. Even if this was possible, it
would not be an adequate substitute for the natural
language of signs.

It can be seen that the deaf respondents
in the present study share the characteristics of
deaf people described in the literature, and they
conform to the generally accepted definitions, all
of which highlight childhood acquired deafness, and
the fact that deaf people do not use hearing for
speech. It is also evident that those deaf people
who use Sign Language are a very small minority of
the population at large, but that they are also a
minority of the total population of deaf people.

It is evident that living in a sparsely
populated and relatively isolated part of the country,

respondents have not only to content with the everyday
difficulties of their disability, but also with the
fact that their peculiar needs as deaf people cannot
always be met to the extent that they can be in other,
more densely populated areas. However, in spite
of this it is clear that they do adapt to being deaf
and are able to make group and individual
relationships in the deaf social group, restricted
as this might be because of the nature of the area.

References

Meyers, Gail E.
&
Meyers, Michele Toleda

The Dynamics of Human
Communication

McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1980

Kyle, J. G.
&
Allsop, L.

Deaf People and the Community.
Final Report to the Nuffield
Foundation

Bristol University. Typewritten.
Unpublished, 1982

Jones, K.

The Social Effects of Deafness
from Birth or Early Childhood.
A Study of the Adult Deaf
Population of South Humberside

Typewritten. M.Phil. Thesis. Unpublished, 1982

Kyle, J.G.
&
Woll, B.

Sign Language. The Study
of Deaf People and Their
Language

Cambridge University Press, 1985

Vernon, McCay

'Sociological and
Psychological Factors
Associated with Hearing Loss'
Journal of Speech and Hearing
Loss 1969, pp:541-563

Lysons, Clifford
Kenneth

Some Aspects of the Historical
Development and Present
Organisation of Voluntary
Welfare Societies for Adult
Deaf Persons in England
1840-1963

Typewritten. M.A. Thesis. Unpublished, 1965

Martin, M.C.

Communication Aids for the
Hearing Impaired

Typewritten. Lecture given to the 1st South
East Asian Conference on audiology, Hong Kong,
1986

Furtey, P.H.   Interaction of Deaf and
&   Hearing in Frederick County,
Harte, T.J.   Maryland

    The Catholic University of America Press, 1964

Schein, Jerome D.   The Deaf Population of the
&   United States
Delk, Marcus T. Jnr.

    National Association of the Deaf, 1974

Lunde, Dr. Anders   Chapter 2 in Stokoe, William
                         C. Sign Language Structure

    Linstock Press inc., 1978, pp:16-24

Royal National   The Prevalence of Hearing
Institute for   Impairment in the UK:
the Deaf   National Studies

    Pamphlet. RNID Library, 1988

Wilkins, Leslie T.   Survey of the Prevalence
                         of Deafness in the Population
                         of England, Scotland and
                         Wales

    Central Office of Information, 1948

The British Deaf   BSL - Britain's Fourth
Association   Language. The Case for
                         Official Recognition for
                         British Sign Language

    Pamphlet. The British Deaf Association, 1987

Advisory Committee   Report of a Sub-Committee
on Services for   Appointed to Consider the
Hearing Impaired   Role of Social Services in
People   the Care of the Deaf of all
                         Ages

    Department of Health and Social Security, 1977

CHAPTER 4   'Salient Features Of The Deaf Respondents'

Forty-six members of Lincoln Deaf Club,
chosen because it was known that they attended the
club at least once a month, and the nine deaf people
living in Spalding who attended the Spalding deaf
club regularly, were interviewed. The larger
questionnaire was used with Lincoln respondents
(appendix:9p:734). Subsequently, 17 of these Lincoln
deaf people, who revealed they were past or present
members of the deaf club committee, were interviewed
and questioned in greater depth (appendix:8p:723).

In this chapter the main features of these
groups of people are shown in tabular form. Attention
must again be drawn to the danger of stereotyping
(p:42f). Jones (1982:p:28) puts it like this: 'the
obvious point must be made, that people are affected
by a variety of factors in their personal development;
the social status of their parents; their order of
birth; the school they attend; the people they meet
and inter-act with, and those people's influence
on them, and, of course, their innate personal
characteristics, which will inter-act with all the
influences mentioned, to produce a unique individual'.

The deaf "community" is not a homogeneous
group, though it is evident that it's members share

several characteristics. Deaf people live active
lives in "hearing" society, though the fellowship
and social structure of the deaf "community" are
important to them.

The present study formulates a philosophy
of deafness(pp:542f) which denies the stereotype
and suggests a formula for reducing deaf people's
marginal status in society, whilst accepting that
their deafness necessitates certain sub-cultural
adaptations.

NOTE: Because of rounding, in the tables below and
all subsequent tables, percentages do not necessarily
add to 100.

table 1
Members of Lincoln Deaf Club: their age groups at the time of interview, by their sex

Age Group	Sex			
	Male	(%)	Female	(%)
16-20 years	4	(16.7)	1	(4.5)
21-30 years	5	(20.8)	6	(27.3)
31-40 years	2	(8.3)	1	(4.5)
41-50 years	3	(12.5)	3	(13.6)
51-60 years	5	(20.8)	4	(18.2)
61-65 years	1	(4.2)	1	(4.5)
65 years and over	4	(16.7)	6	(27.3)
	24	(100)	22	(100)

table 2

Members of Lincoln Deaf Club: the age of onset of
their deafness

	%	
27	(58.7)	born deaf
8	(17.4)	became deaf 0-3 years
7	(15.2)	became deaf 4-6 years
3	(6.5)	became deaf 7-9 years
1	(2.2)	became deaf about 16 years
46	(100)	

table 3

Members of Lincoln Deaf Club: where they started
their school education

	%	
29	(63.0)	Residential school for the deaf
2	(4.3)	Day school for the deaf
3	(6.5)	Partially hearing unit
12	(26.1)	Hearing school
46	(100)	

table 4

Members of Lincoln Deaf Club: where they finished
their school education

	%	
44	(95.7)	Residential school for the deaf
2	(4.3)	Day school for the deaf
46	(100)	

table 5
5embers of Lincoln Deaf Club: their final formal educational attainments at all levels

	%	
35	(76.1)	None
11	(23.9)	One or more C.S.E.
46	(100)	

table 6
Members of Lincoln Deaf Club: their further education experience

	%	
35	(76.1)	None
4	(8.7)	General work preparation
3	(6.5)	Building and associated trades
2	(4.3)	Catering
1	(2.2)	Typing
1	(2.2)	Metal work
46	(100)	

table 7
Members of Lincoln Deaf Club: whether they are married or not, and whether they are married to deaf or "hearing" people

	%	
21	(45.7)	Married to deaf person
2	(4.3)	Engaged to deaf person
23	(50.0)	Not married (including those divorced and widowed)
46	(100)	

Note: no respondents were married to "hearing" people at the time of interview.

table 8

Members of Lincoln Deaf Club: their most fluent means of communication

	%	
30	(65.2)	British Sign Language
8	(17.4)	Sign Supported English
8	(17.4)	Can do either of the above
46	(100)	

table 9

Members of Lincoln Deaf Club: their ability to hear speech with or without a hearing aid

	%	
3	(6.5)	Can hear normal speech
6	(13.0)	Can hear parts of normal speech
6	(13.0)	Can hear voices only
17	(37.0)	Can hear noises only
14	(30.4)	Cannot hear anything
46	(100)	

table 10

Members of Lincoln Deaf Club: their ability to speak

	%	
10	(21.7)	Intelligible and fluent
6	(13.0)	Intelligible not fluent
30	(65.2)	Unintelligible
46	(100)	

table 11

Male Members of Lincoln Deaf Club: their social class

	%	
1	(4.2)	Professional and managerial (II)
9	(37.5)	Skilled manual (IIIM)
6	(25.0)	Semi-skilled manual (IV)
5	(20.8)	Unskilled manual (V)
3	(12.5)	Unemployed
24	(100)	

table 12

Members of Lincoln Deaf Club: their frequency of
attendance at Lincoln deaf club

	%	
22	(47.8)	Weekly
13	(28.3)	Less than weekly, but at least once every two weeks
11	(23.9)	Less than once every two weeks, but at least once a month
46	(100)	

table 13

Members of Lincoln Deaf Club: whether their deafness
makes life difficult for them

	%	
30	(69.8)	No
10	(23.3)	Yes: because of communication
3	(7.0)	Yes: because of isolation
43	(100)	

3 did not answer

table 14

Spalding Respondents: their frequency of attendance at Spalding deaf club

	%	
9	(100)	Attend fortnightly

table 15

Spalding Respondents: their sex

	%	
4	(44.4)	Male
5	(55.5)	Female
9	(100)	

table 16

Spalding Respondents: whether they are married or not, and whether they are married to deaf or "hearing" people

	%	
6	(66.7)	Married to deaf person
2	(22.2)	Widowed (deceased spouse deaf)
1	(11.1)	Married to "hearing" person
9	(100)	

table 17

Spalding Respondents: their ability to speak

	%	
2	(22.2)	Not intelligible
5	(55.6)	Intelligible: not fluent
2	(22.2)	Intelligible and fluent
9	(100)	

table 18

Spalding Respondents: their most fluent means of communication

	%	
2	(22.2)	Sign Supported English
6	(66.7)	British Sign Language
1	(11.1)	Can do S.S.E. and B.S.L.
9	(100)	

table 19

Spalding Respondents: their ability to hear speech with or without a hearing aid

	%	
1	(11.1)	Can hear normal speech
1	(11.1)	Can hear parts of normal speech
1	(11.1)	Can hear voices only
3	(33.3)	Can hear noises only
3	(33.3)	Cannot hear anything
9	(100)	

Summary

It can be seen from these tables that the deaf respondents from Lincoln Deaf Club and Spalding share the main characteristics of members of the deaf "community" mentioned in the literature (p:324f). They became deaf in childhood, attended schools for the deaf, use Sign Language, marry other deaf people, attend deaf clubs and are in skilled manual or lower social classes.

66

References

Jones, K.   The Social Effects of Deafness
              from Birth or Early Childhood.
              A Study of the Adult Deaf
              Population of South Humberside

Typewritten. M.Phil. Thesis. Unpublished, 1982

PART I

THE DEVELOPMENT OF SERVICES TO MEET THE PECULIAR

NEEDS OF DEAF PEOPLE

INTRODUCTION TO PART I

Services to meet the special needs of adult
deaf people began in the early part of the 19th
century, following the founding of schools for the
deaf. In order to put into perspective the present
study's findings relating to deaf people's social
intercourse with "hearing" people (which are examined
in part ll), part l consists of a resumé of these
services.

One of the clearest indications that deaf
people have social problems caused by lack of fluent
inter-personal communication with "hearing" people,
is that there are organisations to help them overcome
these difficulties. Similarly, the fact that deaf
people need fellowship, and cannot get it from
"hearing" social groups, is demonstrated by deaf
people's friendships and marriages with other Sign
Language using deaf people, the proliferation of
deaf clubs, and other "deaf" social/recreational
activities.

This study considers the **peculiar** needs
of deaf people, and by examining the services set
up to help them it is possible to gain an insight
into the providers' perception of deafness and the
needs of deaf people. The suggestion that deaf people
might be, to some extent, victims of their

"benefactors" is introduced at this early stage,
with evidence that deaf and "hearing" people's
perceptions of the needs of deaf people differed.
This is necessary in order to make the comparison
with more recent developments.

The main features of the newly established
services are enumerated, so that comparison can be
made with later provision. The legislation, such
as it is, is examined and the duties of social workers
with deaf people are considered.

The establishment of deaf clubs and other
services to deaf people took place mainly during
the nineteenth century, a period which is marked
by great social change. A social system established
over hundreds of years to maintain the law, care
for the sick and give shelter to the poor was unable
to cope with the movement, slow at first but
increasing rapidly during the century, from rural
to urban living. Problems of disease, poverty,
ignorance and crime were created on a scale hitherto
unknown.

Attempts to ameliorate some of the misery
caused by these social conditions were made by 'a
multiplicity of voluntary organisations formed all
over the country in isolated endeavours'
(Brasnet:1969:p:2). Thane (1982:pp:18-19) writes
that action was taken in different ways, for example
pressure groups combined with practical action on
the lines of the National Society for the Prevention
of Cruelty to Children (founded 1884), or
organisations which helped the poor by removing them
from their environment and some which tried to change
the environment; others, such as the Salvation Army
(founded 1866) set out to save souls, though at the
same time realising that they had to feed the man.

Philanthropy at this time played a number
of roles, including political reform and direct action
(Seed:1973:p:11); to this could be added self-help.
Direct action to relieve pain, suffering and the
social conditions which caused them in many cases
led to political action and eventually to legislation
to regulate industry, urban sanitation, housing,
poor relief, education, child protection and other
areas of people's lives.

Self-help began, naturally enough, with
the family and the local community. Thane
(1982:pp:18-19) describes how the family would give
money or food and look after the children; friends
and neighbours helped with food, clothing, shelter
and attendance. This would be followed by recourse
to the pawnbroker: '....it is only in the most serious
pressure that help is asked either of the clergy....or
one of the numerous charitable societies which
distribute relief in food or clothing'. Self-help
also took the form of the trade union movement, the
working men's clubs and the eighteenth century
friendly societies which became the large insurance
societies such as the Prudential, founded on the
need for sick pay and the bitter experience of the
cholera epidemic of 1848-49 (Bruce:1961:p:112).

The voluntary societies, according to
Brasnet (1969:p:2), were 'without concert or

co-operation', and Roofe (1957:p:264) writes 'with one or two exceptions the nineteenth century was characterised by individualism in the field of philanthropy as well as that of industry'. This led to attempts to efficiently organise private charity, one of the best known being the Charity Organisation Society which, founded in 1869, did much to reduce 'the evil of indiscriminate and thoughtless almsgiving' through its 'new scientific approach in the field of personal service' (Brasnet:1969:p:5).

Many of the well known names in the field of social reform and the alleviation of suffering were religiously motivated. Writing about the movement for infant welfare Roofe (1957:p:32) suggests that 'we cannot omit the influence of religion and the strong moral fervour of the Victorian era, which inspired so many pioneers'. Thane (1982:p:20) writes that 'the largest single inspiration to charitable effort, religious in character, was that of Evangelism'. She goes on to state that three-quarters of voluntary charities established in the second half of the nineteenth century were Evangelical in inspiration.

According to Heasman (1962:p:198) the awakening interest in blind people in the second half of the nineteenth century was brought about

almost entirely by the Evangelicals. In relation
to deaf people Heasman (1962:p:201) writes that
William Wilberforce was involved with the Asylum
for the Deaf and Dumb Poor (founded 1807) and Thomas
Arnold and Dr.William Stainer, also Evangelicals,
are cited by her as being prominent deaf educators
(1962:pp:201-202). Arnold in particular is known
as a pioneer of "oralism" in deaf education in the
United Kingdom.

Before the exodus from the countryside
to the towns many deaf people are likely to have
been isolated individuals in small "hearing"
communities, such as Luny Joe, described by Flora
Thompson in her book 'Lark Rise to Candleford'
(1980:pp:426-428); or Dumb Jack, totally uneducated
and living alone (Roe:1917:pp:ix-x). The combination
of urbanisation and the establishment of schools
and numerous charitable institutions for deaf people
in Victorian times, gave them the opportunity to
congregate in sufficient numbers to form deaf clubs
and eventually create the deaf social group in the
form in which it can be seen today.

Deaf people are known to live in the
community at large and generally to conduct themselves
in their everyday lives much the same as their
"hearing" contemporaries. Thus in the early
nineteenth century they would have suffered or enjoyed

the conditions of the social class to which they were born; those of low estate being the recipients of Victorian charity and the Poor Law. Some would doubtless have slept on the streets or in cheap lodging houses and presumably have been amongst the army of neglected children described by contemporary philanthropists and campaigners such as Mayhew and Barnardo.

Deaf children would have been educated charitably until 1893, if they were educated at all, because it was twenty three years after the legislation making children's education mandatory that local education authorities were directed to provide day classes for deaf children (DHSS:1988:p:2). Prior to this the Poor Law Guardians were empowered by the Poor Law Act of 1862 to send deaf children of the poor to one of the voluntary institutions or asylums, paying £25 a year for their keep. According to Heasman (1962:p:202) very few did so.

The point to be made about services to deaf people is that they give the appearance of taking account of their special needs. There was certainly an element of general welfare, with Missions to the deaf usually having sick and provident societies, some maintaining branches of organisations such as the National Deaf and Dumb Teetotal Society (Heasman:1962:p:2205); but it can be seen that the

main features of the provision were specific to their particular needs. The provision shared, however, the generally religious flavour.

Adult deaf people's special needs attracted attention as early as 1818 in Scotland (Lysons:1965:pp:30-31) and in the 1840s in London (Heasman:1962:p:204), though there had been institutions and asylums in which "indigent deaf" were taught as early as 1772 (Heasman:1962:p:200). One such institution, The Asylum for the Deaf and Dumb Poor, was established in the Old Kent Road in 1807 and was the leading school for the deaf children of the poor at the time; it is now the Margate school for the deaf. Children were admitted 'to protect them from a cruel and competitive world' (Heasman:1962:p:201). They were taught ordinary subjects as well as tailoring and shoemaking for the boys and housework for the girls.

It is difficult to establish to what extent deaf people contributed to their own welfare in these early days, or to what extent their needs were really being catered for. Even in the early stages of development there is evidence of differences of opinion between deaf and "hearing" people, about the real needs of deaf people and their need to congregate. Nevertheless, the development continued and deaf people themselves were involved as founders

of some of the Missions and as paid workers.

In the following chapters the development
of services to deaf people and the main features
of those services are considered. The legislation
does not play a major part as it is framed for the
most part with general classes of disabled people
in mind, although one Ministry of Health circular
(32/51) in particular, is devoted to deafness and
deaf people. This circular, which will be examined
later (p:113f), is not innovatory and does little
more than approve the provision already made. Indeed
Heasman (1962:p:207) is correct when she points out
that the methods introduced by the Victorian
Evangelicals were still in use in the 1960s and the
organisations established by them still undertook
the greater part of the work. Of much greater
importance as a contribution to changes in services
to deaf people were changes in attitude to Sign
Language and thence to deafness and deaf people,
in the 1970s and 1980s.

References

Brasnett, M.   Voluntary Social Action

    National Council of Social Service, 1969

Thane, P.   The Foundations of the Welfare
                                State

    Longman, 1982

Seed, P.   The Expansion of Social Work
                                in Great Britain

    Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1973

Bruce, M.   The Coming of the Welfare
                                State

    B.T.Batesford Ltd., 1972

Rooff, M.   Voluntary Societies and Social
                                Action

    Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1957

Heasman, K.   Evangelicals in Action

    Geoffrey Bles, 1962

Thompson, F.   Lark Rise to Candleford

    Penguin Books, 1980

Roe, N.R. Ph.D.   Snapshots of the Deaf

    Benrose and Sons Ltd., MCMXVII (1917)

Social Services   'Say It Again': Report of
Inspectorate   an Inspection of Contemporary
                                Social Work Practice with
                                People who are Deaf or Hard
                                of Hearing

    Department of Health and Social Security, 1988

Lysons, Clifford   .   Some Aspects of the Historical
Kenneth   Development and Present
                           Organisation of Voluntary
                           Welfare Societies for Adult
                           Deaf Persons in England
                           1840-1963

     Typewritten. M.A. Thesis.   Unpublished, 1965

Ministry of   Circular 32/51.   National
Health   Assistance Act 1948.   Welfare
                           Services for Handicapped
                           Persons other than the Blind
                           and Partially Sighted

     H.M.S.O., 1951

CHAPTER 6   'Main Features In The Development Of
             Services To Deaf People

In addition to the services which arose to
meet the peculiar needs of deaf people, for example the
deaf clubs for social activities, Sign Language
interpreters for communication with "hearing" people
in certain situations and help in finding suitable
employment, there are certain other special features
which are also discussed in this chapter. One such is
that there were paid workers from the time the Missions
to deaf people were first established. Another is that
although deaf people were involved with the setting up
of many of the Missions, it is evident that there was
disagreement between deaf and "hearing" people about
how deaf people should adapt to their deafness. It is
also clear that the paid workers thought deaf people
to be in need of "care" and a degree of paternalism
developed. Throughout the development of services the
recurring theme of inter-personal communication is
observed.

The Need To Meet

Perhaps the most outstanding feature to be
observed of deaf people and their social behaviour is
their apparent need to meet other deaf people who use
Sign Language. A deaf man is reported to have said in
relation to attending a deaf club 'I don't pay fares
to come and play games, I want to talk' (Lysons

1965:p:242). This need probably originated from the
time deaf children were first brought together in the
schools for the deaf. The Missions to the deaf were
usually founded shortly after the schools and Sutcliffe
(undated:p:2) suggests this was because the children
so valued the relationships made at school that they
wanted to continue them into adult life.

Although deaf people would no doubt meet others
like themselves and create a means of communication
through signs before the deaf clubs were established
(Miles:1988:p:14) it is probable that the majority of
deaf people would be "non-social" (Jones:1982:pp:299-300).
Jones (1982:p:301) writes 'it seems reasonable to suppose
that the coming of education for the deaf in the
nineteenth century marked the release of deaf people
from part, at least, of the total social restriction
imposed by deafness and allowed them to be social beings'.

The importance of the deaf clubs is examined
in detail later (p:287f). It should be noted at this
stage, however, that deaf people have created a complex
social/recreational network which operates from local
to international level. It is this cohesive network of
individual friendships and social groups which illustrates
most vividly deaf people's marginal status in "hearing"
society and highlights the inadequacy of lipreading as
a means of enabling them to become assimilated into society
at large.

Spiritual Ministration

Closely allied to the need to meet was the provision of spiritual ministration. Although deaf people had peculiar needs in this respect in that they needed services to be "signed" and pastoral care also required the use of Sign Language, it should be noted that spiritual ministration was a pre-occupation of much of pioneering and Victorian social welfare and not directed exclusively at deaf people.

Lysons (1965:pp:30-31) suggests that when the first Mission to the deaf was established in Edinburgh in 1818, there were two elements involved which were characteristic of the founding of most of the early Missions, namely the congregation of groups of deaf people wanting to meet others like themselves and the intervention of an individual or individuals motivated by compassion, religious zeal and charitable concern who tried to obtain premises where deaf people could meet socially and for religious meetings.

This religious motive is evident in the first appointments of missioners or missionaries and the early minutes of the Lincoln Diocesan Mission to the Deaf and Dumb (Minutes: December 1895) record that the committee decided to advertise for a 'Deaf Missionary, a Churchman qualified to be licensed as a Lay Reader'. A suitable person was found and he held his first church service for deaf people at Lincoln on May 27th 1896

(note added to Minutes: February 27th 1896).

Lysons (1965:pp:30-75) reveals that spiritual
ministration to deaf people weaves a thread throughout
the early years of the Missions and continues into
the 1960s. He finds that following the establishment
of the British Deaf and Dumb Association in 1890 (1965:
pp:68-69) there was 'a rapid expansion of diocesan mission
work for the deaf as a result of representations made
by officials of the BDDA (British Deaf & Dumb Association)
to the Bishops of several diocese in pursuance of the
Association's declared aim of establishing Missions in
neglected areas'. The fact that the national organisation
representing deaf people and run by deaf people, saw
spiritual ministration as a need, makes it reasonable
to suppose that this was a "deaf" perceived need. It
should be borne in mind, however, that the Missions not
only provided spiritual ministration, they also provided
a place to meet and helped find work for deaf people
amongst other things, so that the British Deaf & Dumb
Association would have other reasons as well for wanting
the Missions established.

In 1922 the Central Advisory Council for
promoting the Spiritual Care of the Deaf and Dumb was
established by the convocations of Canterbury and York
(Lysons 1965:p.71). Thus the Church of England recognised
the particular needs of deaf people in relation to their
spiritual care - though it will be observed that the

workers, missioners or missionaries as they were then called, did much besides to help deaf people and laid the foundations of present day social welfare services to deaf people.

The influence of the Church of England is still strong and in the diocese of Lincoln, which covers the county council areas of Lincolnshire and South Humberside, the voluntary organisation is the Lincoln Diocesan Deaf Association. The Chairman is nominated by the Bishop of Lincoln and the Bishop himself is the President. Founded in 1895 and appointing its first paid worker a year later, the Association provided all services for deaf people until 1965 when the county councils in Lincolnshire decided to make direct provision for deaf people through an ad hoc committee called the Lincolnshire Deaf Committee (Lincoln Diocesan Deaf Association Minutes:22nd March 1966).

The Lincoln Diocesan Deaf Association has continued to provide church services in Lincolnshire and a good working relationship with the county council social services department has resulted in financial grants being made towards social/recreational activities.

The Involvement Of Deaf People And Self Help

It can be readily appreciated that deaf people have difficulty in gaining access to information of all kinds because of their deafness, so that self-help would always be a problem for them. The survey of referrals

(p:313f) shows that deaf people have problems mainly of information due to lack of fluent communication and that they have to depend upon communication intermediaries to find out what is going on in their parental families and at work and in order to communicate their own thoughts and needs to "hearing" people (p:302f).

At an early time in the evolution of services to deaf people there was a paid worker, as often as not a "hearing" person who could interpret for them. It is clear that as time went on these paid workers became predominant, managing the deaf clubs through the committees of management and even managing the British Deaf & Dumb Association (p:88).

Clearly, deaf people have a dilemma in relation to self-help, in that they cannot communicate their needs properly; this can be seen in particular in relation to education, where "hearing" people have interpreted their need as assimilation into "hearing" society through speech, when it has been evident that deaf people have been unable to achieve this (in spite of learning to speak in some cases) because of the difficulties of receiving spoken communication. The powerful combination of educators and parents who, reasonably, want their children to be "normal", has prevailed until recently.

In the social welfare field, self-help, so promisingly started by the British Deaf & Dumb Association in the 1890s and by the involvement of deaf people in

the setting up of the Missions, was eroded by the very agent which should have stimulated it, the paid worker (p:87f). Writing about disabled people in general, Wood (1988:p:16) states '....despite a long tradition of service delivery by the professional agencies they have done little or nothing to promote positive images of disabled people, nor had their services enabled disabled people to live as full and equal members of society'. This applies equally to deaf people. The changes described later (p:414f) have come about because of deaf people's recent powerful advocacy of their need to be accepted as "deaf" and as independent members of society.

Deaf people were, however, involved in the establishment of the Missions to the deaf (Ladd:Miles 1988:p:30). Lysons (1965:pp:48-53) shows that deaf people played a leading part in the setting up of the Manchester and Liverpool Missions as well as Oldham and Stoke-on-Trent. A deaf man, James Herriott, not only helped to establish the Manchester organisation, he was also involved with setting up smaller Missions in other parts of the north (Doncaster, for example) (Lysons 1965:p:57).

It has already been noted (p:83) that the British Deaf and Dumb Association was much involved in encouraging the dioceses to start ministries to deaf people where they had not already been started. A large proportion of the original missionaries were deaf people

or deaf people acting as lay helpers (Lysons 1965:p:119).

It is probable however, that, as time went on, deaf people became less involved with the overall policy governing the Missions, though they continued to run the social and games sides of the deaf clubs. It is by no means clear what the exact position was. Certainly, after the International Education Conference in Milan in 1880, the official method of communication in the education of deaf children in the United Kingdom was "oral" rather than Sign Language; it is likely that from then on Sign Language in schools for the deaf was frowned upon and repressed (Jones:1982:p:301). Ladd (Miles:1988:p:27) puts it rather more strongly 'British Sign Language in the deaf community had reached a peak around the time of the Milan Conference in 1880, but once governments, working with oralists, set in motion their programmes to eradicate it, it was a hundred years before the language and its people started to emerge with confidence again'. Ladd continues (1988:p:30) 'as the twentieth century moved on, however, there were fewer school leavers who could communicate effectively in either English or British Sign Language thanks to the emphasis on oral teaching. Young people entering deaf clubs could not understand or be understood by the existing members. Few of them were interested in or capable of holding key positions in the club such as secretary or treasurer'.

That the missioner (or welfare officer for the

deaf) was the most important person so far as the

organisation of the deaf clubs is concerned, is definitely

the impression given by Firth (1966:p:102). He writes

'the Missioner sits in the difficult position of crown

in Parliament, the supreme authority, but confined in

a circle of custom and caselaw'. Firth adds later

(1966:pp:107-108) 'the Missioners, or Welfare Officers

for the Deaf, have carried the whole thing on their own

shoulders and have done so, I believe, for too long'.

It is clear from what Ladd writes (Miles:1988:

pp:29-30) that he puts the demise of the "deaf" person

down to the influence of "oralism" and it is possible

to have considerable sympathy for this view. Ladd

explains that 'as oralism tightened its grip and deaf

literacy in English declined, the organisation (the

British Deaf and Dumb Association) became dominated

mainly by hearing people so that by the 1970s, deaf

involvement at the top was almost nil'.

Although deaf people were considerably involved

in the establishment, organisation and staffing of the

early Missions, it is claimed that their influence was

greatly reduced over the years.

"Deaf" And "Hearing" Perception Of Need

Another feature of the early days of the Missions

which is closely allied to the discussion in the last

section, is that "hearing" people did not necessarily

see deaf people's needs in the same way that deaf people

did. For example, in 1866 the Association in Aid of the
Deaf and Dumb in London found itself faced with a group
of seven deaf men who wanted a proper church for deaf
people because the rooms used by the chaplain were too
secular (Lysons 1965:pp:41-43). The committee of the
Association were opposed to the suggestion at first because
a separate church would 'perpetuate the distinctions
between persons so afflicted and the hearing'; that a
deaf church would strengthen 'the class feeling among
the deaf and dumb so that the endeavour to qualify for
general intercourse would be forgotten'; that few of the
deaf people were intelligent enough to follow the Communion
service 'and to the very few we should hestitate to
encourage the administration in the vague language of
Signs except under special circumstances in which no Church
is required'; that the special church would involve such
practical details as the alteration of rubrics and 'the
omission of many parts of the service untranslatable in
signs'; that it would be difficult to replace the then
chaplain to carry on special services if he should leave.

     The deaf men replied that to them an ordinary
service was 'lifeless and monotonous'; that deaf people
were as entitled to a properly constituted service in
their own language as foreigners who, living in London,
attend special services to meet their needs; regarding
the distinction between the deaf and dumb and "hearing"
society,'the difference arose from deafness'; finally,

'the pious deaf and dumb ought to receive the Lord's Supper and however deficient they may be in ordinary language, it could be so explained to them by signs that its meaning and import would be clear to them'.

The first point which arises from this altercation is that some "hearing" people in positions of power did not understand the needs of deaf people; it is interesting that when the "hearing" people sought the advice of four headmasters, three of the four sided with the Association in Aid of the Deaf and Dumb in not recognising the need for special church services in Sign Language (Lysons:1965:p:43). It seems clear from their remarks that the "hearing" people sought the assimilation of the deaf congregation and felt that they should not be encouraged to act as a separate group. They also appear to have thought of most deaf people as not intelligent and that Sign Language was not up to the task of conveying the meaning of the Communion service.

The answers of the deaf men encapsulate the pleas of deaf people at the present time; that deafness makes them different but not deviant; that they have a right to the same provision as "hearing" people; that Sign Language is an appropriate means of conveying whatever provision is necessary. This incident involving the Association in Aid of the Deaf and Dumb occured a century ago, yet only now is some progress being made. Whilst it can be appreciated that the "hearing" people wanted

deaf people to be part of society, they did not understand how much a handicap deafness is to fluent inter-personal communication between deaf and "hearing" people without Sign Language. "Hearing" society is only now beginning to realise that Sign Language is not a marginalising agent, but can be used to integrate deaf people into "hearing" community life (p:439f).

Similarly the British Deaf and Dumb Association was established because deaf people disagreed with "hearing" people's perception of their needs in relation to Sign Language and social life. The Royal Commission on the Blind Deaf and Dumb, set up in 1886, had only two members with any practical experience of deaf people (Lysons 1965:pp:67-69). During a meeting of deaf people to discuss the recommendations of the Commissioners (which came out against Sign Language and deaf clubs) it was agreed to form a national body, 'the chief objects of which will be the elevation, education and social status of the deaf in the United Kingdom'. The first object of the new Association was 'to affirm to the Educational Department, Members of Parliament, School Authorities. etc., information as to the conditions, education and opinions of the deaf and dumb' (Lysons:1965:p:68). Lysons (1965:footnote (b) p:68) writes that 'the basic reason for the dislike shown by the majority of the commissioners to both the manual system and the adult deaf missions was that these factors tended to produce a result at

variance with the recommendation 'that the deaf and dumb
should be kept as far as possible from being a race apart'
(report of the Royal Commission, para:620)'. It can be
seen that the British Deaf and Dumb Association (now the
British Deaf Association) has recently taken up once again
the first object of giving out information about deaf
education, and deaf people's opinions on Sign Language
and their special way of life (p:458f).

Miles (1988:p:23) notes a similar state of
affairs in the United States of America at about the same
time; 'suddenly many people became aware that deaf persons
everywhere tended to socialise among themselves......
This "clannishness" disturbed a number of prominent
citizens'. These included Alexander Graham Bell,
himself married to a deaf woman. According to Miles
(1988:p:25) Sign Language was anathema to Bell and he
argued strongly against deaf people being allowed to marry
other deaf people. Bell and others in America were in
the vanguard of the "oralist" movement which was to sweep
the world and cause so much controversy.

Laurent Clerc, the deaf man who taught in the
United States of America and died in 1869, before the
Conference of Milan, wrote 'powerful people want to replace
our language, to educate us in a foreign tongue, to
prohibit our public worship, to disperse our gatherings,
to ban our marriages - and why? Because we do not speak
as they do. Will they have their way, until the deaf

are scattered, isolated and stupid everywhere? Or will the deaf continue to gather into associations, clubs and schools which defend our rights, exalt our language, educate our children, inform our hearing friends and teach them Sign?' (Lane:1988:p:336).

Again, it is evident that "hearing" people in positions of influence have perceived deafness and deaf people's needs differently from deaf people and that these "hearing" people see social assimilation as necessary. This theory or method, according to Ladd (Miles:1988:pp:28-29) was taken up enthusiastically by the parents of deaf children who influenced policy through the National Deaf Children's Society. The gulf which exists between the aspirations of parents and the actual oral achievements of deaf people is apparent in the findings of the present study (p:220f) . In this connection, Firth (1966:p:73) writes 'it remains true that most parents do not want their children to be absorbed into any deaf community' and a headmaster of a school for the deaf is quoted as saying in the 1980's that his school did not want the children to grow up into a deaf "sub-culture" but to be part of the community at large (p:216f).

It is evident in the United Kingdom and probably in other parts of the world, there was always disagreement between deaf people and their "hearing" "benefactors" about how deafness and its social consequences should

be perceived. These two elements are seen to influence
the social welfare of deaf people to the present day.
It is noteworthy that changes did not come about until
Sign Language had been shown to be a legitimate grammatical
language, and deaf people re-emerged as powerful advocates
of their own cause (p:414f).

Sign Language Interpreting

It will be seen later (p:101) that one of the
objects of the Liverpool Adult Deaf and Dumb Benevolent
Society was that of providing an interpreter in cases
of dispute between employers and deaf employees.
Lysons (1965:p:176) found that Sign Language inter-
pretation was one of the duties of the welfare officers
employed by the voluntary societies and they could
expect to do so in one of three ways: person to person;
person to group; group to group. Lysons states that the
person to person interpreting includes such occasions
as interviews with personnel officers, medical examinations
and police investigations. Person to group work would
include church services, lectures and educational classes.
Group to group interpreting would facilitate the exchange
of information between deaf and "hearing" people, for
example, at a committee of management wanting to convey
its views to the deaf members of a welfare society and
vice versa. Lysons (1965:p:176) also reports that the
Home Office at one time circulated a list of institutes
for the deaf, indicating that these organisations would

provide "official" interpreters for the police. Thus

at least some authorities accepted the need for trained

or recognised Sign Language interpreters.

The training of paid workers with deaf people

started in the late 1920s (Lysons 1965:p:140) and included

examination of practical ability in Sign Language. The

guidance notes to those supervising in-service training

suggest 'regular time to be given each week to instruction

and guidance in finger-spelling, signing and lipreading,

both as to execution and reading' (Lysons:1965:p:144).

The Paid Worker With Deaf People

Heasman (1962:p:205) writes that 'social and

welfare activities always formed an important part of

their (the Missions) work. Jobs were found for those

who had just left the deaf schools or who were capable

of normal employment'. Much of this work was done by

a paid worker able to communicate with deaf people. In

1845 the Institution for the Employment, Relief and

Religious Instruction of the Adult Deaf and Dumb, a London

Society, appointed a missionary and biblical instructor

whose work involved 'the discovery of the neglected deaf

and dumb' (Lysons 1965:p:37). The Lincoln Diocesan Mission

to the Deaf and Dumb, it has already been noted (p:82)

appointed their missionary in 1896, only a year after

the Mission's establishment and it is clear from the

literature that the paid worker has been a feature of

the social welfare history of deaf people from the very

start of the Missions.

The early Missions recruited their staff from three sources namely, teachers of the deaf, the children of deaf parents and deaf people themselves (Lysons 1965:pp:113-121). Lysons describes how deaf people turned to their teachers for assistance because they could use Sign Language, as it was an accepted method of communication with deaf children in the schools of the mid-nineteenth century. Some of these teachers might also have been deaf because at that time there was no discrimination against deaf teachers of the deaf. Employing an ex-teacher of the deaf was also a means of ensuring some qualification for work with deaf people and Lysons (1965:p:114) reveals that the Liverpool and Manchester Societies both called for 'a duly qualified teacher of the deaf' to act as their missionary.

The children of deaf parents have always been a natural source of recruitment for workers with deaf people and though there are no statistics available, it is noteworthy that this source is being tapped at the present time for Sign Language interpreters. A number of the most expert and senior interpreters have deaf parents. Lysons (1965:p:118) quotes the Rev.F.W. Gilby, superintendent of the Royal Association in Aid of the Deaf and Dumb, as saying that he could sign at a time when other children were learning to talk. Lysons (1965:Table 19) reveals that in 1962 43% of 56

superintendents and chaplains of voluntary societies for
the deaf in England had one or more deaf relatives.

It was common in the early days of the deaf
missions for the paid worker to be a deaf person (Lysons
1965:p:119) and there were also lay helpers who were deaf.
Lysons (1965:pp:119-120) writes that there seemed to be
a preference on the part of deaf people for their
missionary to be a deaf person like themselves because
they thought only deaf people could really understand
other deaf people and they would not be patronising.
How patronising "hearing" people were to become is
described rather bitterly by Ladd (Miles:1988:pp:33-34).
Ladd's sentiments however, are readily understood after
reading Firth's book (Plate Glass Prison:1966) which
creates a stereotype of the dependent deaf person being
ministered to by the welfare officer for the deaf.

Lysons (1965:p:120) also mentions the factors
which limit the effectiveness of deaf people as workers
with deaf people, principally the inability to interpret
or to use the telephone, though this latter would be less
of a handicap nowadays when they would be less likely
to work on their own. He suggests that consultations
with local authorities and communication with the employers
of deaf people might be difficult, but even these would
be possible at the present time with an interpreter.
The present writer worked for three years with a social
worker who was deaf and this man successfully made a

specialism of finding suitable work for deaf people.

It is clear that there is a tradition of full-time paid workers going back to the time of the establishment of the Missions to the deaf; and many of these workers were deaf people or "hearing" people who knew how to communicate in Sign Language because they had been teachers of the deaf or had deaf relatives. Not only would these people have been able to communicate with deaf people, they would have had some understanding of the social problems facing them.

Concern has recently been expressed that the numbers of paid workers are falling. The Royal National Institute for the Deaf carried out an analysis of the staffing situation between 1984 and 1987 (Peckford and Hawcroft:1988) which suggests (1988:p:1) 'the retention and turnover rates for the specialism do not offer grounds for optimism'. The reasons given by Peckford and Hawcroft (1988:p:4) for difficulties in recruitment and retention are lack of career or salary incentives, additional skills and training not reflected in salary gradings, low priority afforded to the service, limited promotion prospects, professional isolation and inadequate supervision.

The Royal National Institute for the Deaf (RNID) research report 'Is There Anybody Listening?' (1988:p:3:para:1) confirms that the number of posts in the specialist field of work with deaf people has fallen since 1977 . Their means of calculating this was to

establish the number of posts to each one thousand of
the total population of each local authority.

What is not stated however, is the number of
workers there should be and what their duties should be.
For example, the RNID (1988:p:1:Para:7) state 'there are
a small number of posts for Sign Language Interpreters'
but there is no recommendation about a separate interpreter
service and the assumption must be that they expect the
social workers with deaf people to do this.

In the late 1970s the Advisory Committee on
Services for Hearing-Impaired People (ACSHIP)
(1977p:29:para:102) was expressing similar concern that
there were not enough specialist workers with deaf people.
This report gives a similar hint about interpreting
services but again assumes that the social worker will
provide the service, stating (1977:p:17:para:57) 'the
adult prelingually deaf usually attain a large degree
of stability and independence. They will however,
frequently require the services of an interpreter....'.
They continue 'we should like to stress that an
interpretation service is not synonymous with social work
support'.

It can be seen that in the 1970s deaf people
were recognised as needing separate interpreting services,
but to the present time surveys of staffing have not
grasped the nettle of recommending separate services.
This is surprising because in the 1960s the Royal National

Institute for the Deaf did not hesitate to link a staffing
formula with a recommended list of services to be provided.
They recommend (undated:about 1961:para:5) that 'the
minimum professional social work staff for an agency
responsible for the full range of services should be in
the ratio of not less that 1:100 registered deaf people;
where more than one such worker is employed, a mix of
both male and female workers is desirable'. They suggest
(undated:para:7) that there should be additional staff
for areas with more than one centre for the deaf and for
rural areas (undated:para:8).

It is left to the Social Services Inspectorate
(1988:p:30:para:3.2.12) to suggest to local authorities
that it is time to consider separate   services for
social work and interpreting; they write 'consideration
should be given to the tasks for which interpreters (not
social workers) should be employed and available to work
in conjunction with social services staff, including
emergency duty teams. The location and funding of an
interpreting service within the organisation of the local
authority is a matter the local authority needs to
consider'.

The present study suggests that any discussion
of numbers of staff is irrelevant until proper decisions
have been made about restructuring services to deaf people,
taking into account their special communication needs.
It is clear that changes are necessary, but it is equally

clear that incorporating changes into service provision
is likely to take time. Recruitment, qualification and
funding are all matters which will be seen as obstacles
by some and will take time to resolve in any case.

Work

Deaf people who are physically able bodied are
able to work, though it is likely that they will have
greater difficulty than most in persuading employers
to take them on. It was recognised almost from the
start by the Missions to the deaf that if deaf people
were to work they would need help. The Association in
Aid of the Deaf and Dumb, for example, started life as
the Institution for Providing Employment and Religious
Instruction for the Adult Deaf and Dumb, and was mainly
a residential establishment; the first of its objects
was 'to instruct deaf people in various occupations'
(Lysons 1965:p:33).

The founder of the Mission in Manchester, a
deaf man named James Herriott, is said to have given up
his tailoring business because of the constant demands
upon his time by deaf people out of work. At a general
meeting of the Liverpool Adult Deaf and Dumb Benevolent
Society in 1865, a statement of the objects of the Society
included 'provision of an interpreter in cases of dispute
between employer and employees' (Lysons 1965:p:55). It
is interesting to note here a link with the present, in
that the main reason Lincoln respondents used the services

of the social worker with deaf people at work was in cases of dispute (p:267). The first paid worker in Lincoln reported to the committee in 1899 amongst other matters that 'all our members, I am happy to say, are in employment: three girls having finished their school term have been apprenticed and as far as I can learn, are doing well' (Minutes:May 1899).

Most of the early schools for the deaf had some arrangement for the apprenticing of their former scholars (Lysons 1965:pp:201-202), though finding work for deaf adults and young people mainly became the responsibility of the Missions to the deaf. In fact, in 1932 Dr.Eichholz, commissioned to investigate the industrial and social conditions of deaf people, suggested that the Missions were more suited to undertake placement work with deaf people than the labour exchanges because of their expertise and experience (Lysons 1965:p:210). This was given tangible recogition soon after, when the Ministry of Health Circular 1337 encouraged county and county borough councils to provide financial resources to Missions to the deaf to assist them in this placement work (Lysons 1965:p:211).

Firth (1966:pp:71-85) devotes a whole chapter to the subject of work-seeking for deaf people, in which the welfare officer for the deaf is seen as the expert, whilst Lysons (1965:p:220) saw the main roles of the welfare worker in relation to employment of deaf people as work-seeker, interpreter and adviser.

Deaf people are usually able to find work, but
it is probable that they are under-employed in the sense
that they do not have opportunity to train for jobs which
their intelligence or other aptitudes might suit them;
or simply because of the impediments to fluent
communication between deaf and "hearing" people caused
by deafness (British Deaf Association 1974:p:15:para:103b).
Attention has been drawn more recently to the fact that
deaf people are under-employed, in that they are
restricted to a particular range of jobs because of their
communication difficulties. Jones (1982:pp:63-66) found
that respondents in South Humberside had a narrower range
of jobs than their fathers and he also found, in reviewing
the literature (1982:pp:60-69) that the low economic status
of deaf people was a common feature. This is also noted
in the present study as a feature of the deaf social group;
it can be seen that those respondents questioned were
generally in skilled manual occupations (social class
IIIM) and below (table:11p:64). An interesting point,
however, is that Jones (1982:p:69) found a relatively
higher proportion of skilled manual workers amongst deaf
people than in the "hearing" population. Drewry
(1958:p:10) makes a similar point, remarking 'the
preponderance of male adolescents in skilled occupations
is high'.

It is probable that one of the reasons for deaf
people's restricted employment

opportunities is lack of educational attainments and this is highlighted by the British Deaf Association working party report 'Training Facilities and Employment Opportunities for Deaf School Leavers' (1974:p:6); 'it might be said that the schools for the deaf in Britain seem to have adopted a rather narrow attitude with regard to education, confining their attention to the care of deaf children without much reference to their subsequent careers as adults in the world of work. The main aim would seem to be to remove the social effects of their handicap rather than to inculcate special skills necessary if they are to cope successfully with their hearing competitors and make full use of their inborn capabilities. The Working Party therefore, would urge that any real improvement could only stem from a change of emphasis in the design of education for the deaf'.

The Royal National Institute for the Deaf, in their report 'Communication Works' (1987:SUMMARY) suggest that deaf people are 'overlooked at school by an understaffed careers service; inadequately helped as job-seekers by Jobcentre staff and MSC alike'. They go on to say (1987:SUMMARY:para:At Work) that 'when at work our inquiry shows over-whelmingly that deaf people feel they can overcome their impairment. Once a deaf person gets to know other people and provided that hearing people make the effort to communicate, carrying out the job itself is reasonably straightforward'. The whole tenor of this

report is that deaf people need communication help in various situations relating to their work; whilst it is not possible to argue with this, the report makes no mention of the importance of an education which will allow them opportunity to gain basic academic qualifications, so that they can obtain jobs in competition with their "hearing" contempories. The provision of adequate education is crucial and basic. The need for communication helpers **then** becomes evident, for work seeking, initial training, training for promotion, disputes and so on. The present study suggests that deaf people will remain handicapped for work whilst their education fails to educate them to their individual potential.

The RNID report (1987:p:14) suggests that at present deaf people are badly served by the disablement resettlement officers, who work as part of the Manpower Services Commission from the jobcentres, to support disabled people seeking work or training. It states (1987:pp:14-15) that they have only half a day's training on deafness and continues, 'finding DROs who cannot communicate well (with deaf people) would be a bit like having a plumber without any tools - they may be nice, they may sometimes be able to help but more often than not they will be unable to do anything'. The report (1987:p:18) suggests that there are two alternatives: to improve the existing service or to provide a separate service for deaf people. It recommends that disablement

resettlement officers should have access to Sign Language interpreters for interviews with deaf people, as well as training in the special needs of deaf people and communication.

Although the Royal National Institute for the Deaf report makes no mention of the social worker for deaf people in relation to deaf people and work, it is clear from the findings of the present study (p:184f) that they are still very much involved and this situation is unlikely to change until Sign Language interpreting services are introduced and disablement resettlement officers and careers officers are better trained.

Identification Of Need

The subject of deaf people's peculiar needs is examined later (p:523f). It is necessary at this stage simply to introduce the idea. What soon becomes clear is that deaf people have the same social-psychological and social welfare needs as "hearing" people. To a greater or lesser extent they need to meet socially, to worship, to work to support their families and, of course, to enjoy the facilities of modern society, hygiene and social services and the supply of water and power.

The means of attainment of the social-psychological satisfactions and access to the social welfare services, however, is inhibited for deaf people by the lack of the means of fluent inter-personal communication with "hearing" people. This deficiency

is made up for by Sign Language, which allows them to
communicate fluently with other deaf people and through
which they have created an alternative way of life through
the deaf social group. They are also able to have access
to "hearing" society through communication mediators using
Sign Language. The early Missions to the deaf recognised
these needs by providing places to meet and professional
workers to act as interpreters and help deaf people find
work.

It is evident that Sign Language is the
foundation of deaf people's adaptation to life in "hearing"
society and it must not be overlooked that to communicate
fluently is their most fundamental need.

Other, more subtle, needs such as being in
control of their own disability, were perhaps taken for
granted in the early days but were eroded, possibly because
of the development of professionalism and the views of
the education authorities on "oralism", which created
a divide between the aims of education, which were for
assimilation of the deaf person into society and those
of deaf adults who found assimilation difficult. The
views of parents of deaf children, influenced by the
educators, contributed to the divide. The seeds of this
controversy, in which deaf people perceive their social
welfare needs in what might be thought of as a more
pragmatic fashion, are seen to be sown at this early stage.

Summary

The Missions to the deaf, which were established
from the 1820s, soon showed features which give indications
that they were formed to meet certain needs of deaf people,
either those perceived by deaf people themselves or by
their "hearing" benefactors.

Deaf people have the same social-psychological
and social welfare needs as "hearing" people but they
need a means of fluent communication. Sign Language
is seen to fulfil this need. They need to work and paid
workers employed by the Missions help them to do this.
Deaf people's need to socialise is recognised and one
of the first provisions was a room for social activity
and worship.

Deaf people themselves were involved in the
establishment of the first Missions and their national
organisation, the British Deaf and Dumb Association,
actively encouraged the "hearing" church organisations
to extend their work amongst deaf people. Some of the
first paid workers were also deaf people.

It is evident even at this early stage that
there were differences of opinion about what were deaf
people's needs and in particular, "hearing" people's fear
that they would become a "race apart". This is a
fundamental issue which has divided deaf adults and those
who support them, from those responsible for their

education in particular.

Sign Language interpreting was seen as a need from the first and this was supplied by paid workers drawn from the ranks of teachers of the deaf and the children of deaf parents.

It can be seen from Lysons' history of the voluntary organisations for deaf people in England (1965) that the deaf social group and work to meet their needs developed along lines outlined above. There were some changes in the period up to 1960 but they were mostly consolidating the status quo. It was not until the 1960s that fundamental changes began to appear; these were procedural changes at first, followed by changes in attitude to Sign Language and deaf people - though these changes have yet to be fully translated into practice.

References

Lysons, Clifford   Some Aspects of the Historical
Kenneth   Development and Present
                          Organisation of Voluntary
                          Welfare Societies for Adult
                          Deaf Persons in England
                          1840-1964

    Typewritten. M.A. Thesis. Unpublished, 1965

Sutcliffe, The Rev.   The Origins and Development
T.H. M.A.   of Missions to the Deaf and
                          Dumb

    Typewritten. Undated

Miles, Dorothy   British Sign Language. A
                          Beginners Guide

    BBC Books, 1988

Jones, K.   The Social Effects of Deafness
                          from Birth or Early Childhood.
                          A Study of the Adult Deaf
                          Population of South Humberside

    Typewritten. M.Phil. Thesis. Unpublished, 1982

Minutes   Minutes of the Lincoln Diocesan
                          Deaf Association

Wood, Richard   'Disabled People Point the Way
                          Forward'
                          Social Work Today
                          January 21 1988, Vol.19 (20)
                          pp:16-17

Ladd, Paddy   Chapter 2 in Miles, Dorothy
                          British Sign Language. A Beginners
                          Guide

    BBC Books, 1988, pp:27-43

Firth, The Rev.   The Plate Glass Prison
George C.

    The Royal National Institute for the Deaf and George
    Firth, 1966

Lane, Harlan   When the Mind Hears. A History
                                of the Deaf

      Penguin Books, 1988

Heasman, K.   Evangelicals in Action

      Geoffrey Bles, 1962

Peckford, Bob   Social Workers with Deaf People.
&   A Brief Analysis of Recruitment
Hawcroft, Lynne   Retention and Turnover

      Pamphlet. Royal National Institute for the Deaf, 1988

Royal National   Is There Anybody Listening? Survey
Institute for   of Staff Employed in England to
the Deaf   Provide Social Services for Deaf
                                People

      Pamphlet. Royal National Institute for the Deaf, 1988

Advisory Committee   Report of a Sub-Committee appointed
on Services for   to Consider the Role of Social
Hearing Impaired   Services in the Care of the Deaf
People   of all Ages

      Department of Health and Social Security, 1977

Royal National   Staffing in Welfare Agencies for
Institute for   Deaf and Hard of Hearing Persons
the Deaf

      Pamphlet. Royal National Institute for the Deaf,
      undated, about 1961

Social Services   'Say It Again': Report of an
Inspectorate   Inspection of Contemporary Social
                                Work Practice with People who
                                are Deaf or Hard of Hearing

      Department of Health and Social Security, 1988

The British Deaf   Working Party Report. Training
Association   Facilities and Employment
                                Opportunities for Deaf School
                                Leavers

      The British Deaf Association, 1974

Drewry, R. B.A.   The Deaf School Leaver in Northern
                        England

    Typewritten. North Regional Association for the
    Deaf, 1958

Royal National   Communication Works. An RNID
Institute for   Inquiry into the Employment of
the Deaf   Deaf People

    Royal National Institute for the Deaf, 1987

CHAPTER 7   'Legislation And Services'

There has been no legislation specially for
deaf people but Ministry of Health circular 32/51,
following the National Assistance Act of 1948, makes
particular mention of them and it is on the
recommendations of that circular that present day
services to deaf people are based. However, it is
important to note that services to deaf people were
already well established by the end of the second world
war, through the efforts of the voluntary organisations
and the legislation gives recognition to deaf people's
need for services, rather than suggesting new ones.
The Missions to the deaf provided practical day to day
help for deaf people, by providing a place to meet and
worship and a professionally trained worker to help
them find work, and to act as communication intermediary.

Ministry Of Health Circular 32/51

The circular (32/51) recognised the difference
between those becoming deaf in later life and those
acquiring deafness in childhood, and the fact that the
latter use Sign Language and might have difficulties
with English language (1951:p:7). It also suggested
that these deaf people should be 'dealt with by persons
who are conversant with manual language and other methods
of communication alternative to normal speech'
(1951:para:4:p:6). Section 9 (1951:p:7) mentioned

113

assistance in finding suitable employment, social

activities, religious services, travel to special centres

and the use of voluntary visitors (1951:p:5). The

circular (1951:p:9) asserted that 'the services of an

efficient interpreter are therefore an essential feature

of the organisation of a social centre or club for the

deaf'.

Lysons (1965:p:94) states that he studied

a large number of the "schemes" prepared by local

authorities and they all followed the pattern laid down

by the Ministry of Health in circular 32/51. He comments

that either the authorities found the outline scheme

so comprehensive that there was nothing for them to

add, or they did not know enough about deaf people and

the services needed to be able to suggest any innovations

to improve the Minister's proposals.

Failure To Secure A Deaf Persons Act

It was suggested in the 1930s that there should

be legislation specially for deaf people. According

to Lysons (1979:p:136) 'the campaign to secure an

enquiry into the conditions of the adult deaf, with

particular reference to their employment difficulties,

was waged by the National Institute for the Deaf'.

In April 1930 the Ministry of Health and Board of

Education finally agreed that Dr.Alfred Eichholz should

be appointed to undertake a survey 'to obtain fuller

information on the position in industry of deaf and

dumb persons and the facilities for their education
and training and for securing employment' (Lysons:1979:p:
137).

Following the Eichholz report there was a
'sustained attempt led by the National Institute for
the Deaf to secure the passing of a Deaf Persons Act',
and the Minister of Health was asked to appoint a
permanent Advisory Committee on the Welfare of the Deaf,
similar to that for blind people (Lysons:1979:p:254).
The National Institute for the Deaf called a conference
in 1933 to consider the Eichholz report (Lysons:1979:pp:
254-255), at which a resolution expressed the opinion
that 'it should be mandatory for local authorities to
meet the needs of deaf persons'. 'For this purpose
the conference emphasises that legislation is essential
and urges its provision on the Government'. In each
case they were unsuccessful. The matter was brought
up again in 1939 and then finally dropped because of
the outbreak of war; also because some of the demands
were met by the Disabled Persons Employment Act of 1944
(Lysons:1979:p:255).

Some of the reasons given for the failure
to secure special legislation for deaf people are
interesting. Deaf people were thought to be more
economically self-sufficient than blind people
(Lysons:1979:p:294) and they did not evoke the sympathy
blind people did, particularly those wounded in the

first world war (Lysons:1979:p:295). Significantly,

blind people were successful partly because they had

blind leaders; deaf people had to rely upon "hearing"

leadership (Lysons:1979:p:295).

It was thought at the time that 'a deaf persons

Act will not be obtained by any such popular

demonstration as that which helped the blind, but must

come as a result of educating public opinion'. It is

interesting that one of the greatest changes recently

has been the re-emergence of the deaf person (p:414f)

and many of the changes of attitude can be attributed

to deaf people's advocacy of their own cause.

It is suggested by the present study that

there will eventually be a need for legislation in order

to secure the recognition of British Sign Language in

Great Britain, recognition of national languages of

member countries already having been secured in the

European Parliament (p:430).

Voluntary Organisations Continue To Provide Services

It is significant that in the 1960s, local

authorities did not consider it necessary to provide

direct services for deaf people but employed the

voluntary organisations under agency agreements.

The local authorities appeared slow to act and had to

be directed to exercise their powers under section 29

of the National Assistance Act through circular 15/60.

By 1962 (Lysons:1965:table:8) all 145 local authorities

in England and Wales had schemes approved; by 1963 there were 101 local authorities in England with full agency agreements with one or more voluntary societies for the deaf, 11 with partial agency agreements and partial direct services, 6 with full welfare services for the deaf directly operated, 2 with parts of the county on agency agreements and other parts operating a direct service and 8 not included in the survey (Lysons:1965: Table:9).

Younghusband (1959:para:528:p:145) reveals that in 1956, 92% of local authorities in England, Wales and Scotland provided services to deaf people through voluntary organisations. Eight workers with deaf people were employed directly by the welfare departments and about 160 by voluntary organisations (Younghusband: para:794:p:224).

It is noteworthy that in 1962, out of 84 superintendents and qualified assistants of voluntary organisations for deaf people, 69 had passed the Deaf Welfare Examination Board diploma by examination and three the certificate, with only ten being without qualification, two having been awarded honorary diplomas.

It can be seen, therefore, that at the beginning of the 1960s, the Missions to the deaf still provided services to deaf people, the only difference being that Government now recognised that deaf people had special social welfare needs and some local

authorities gave some financial support towards this provision; also, the paid workers were generally qualified through a specialist examination board.

Changes In Delivery Of Services To Deaf People

The publishing of the report of the Working Party on Social Workers in the Local Authority Health and Welfare Services (HMSO:1959) under the chairmanship of Miss Eileen Younghusband, marks a turning point in the provision of services to deaf people which led eventually to changes in attitude towards Sign Language and deaf people. The particular suggestions by Younghusband which affected deaf people were:

1. A two year full-time training course for social workers (1959:para:870(b):p:246).

2. That all local authorities would take a more direct interest in services to deaf people (1959:para:722:p:204). 3. That local authorities would not necessarily undertake all the functions of the voluntary organisations in particular, church and social activities. Thus began the processes of professionalisation and bureau cratisation, with paid workers having professional social work training, and the local authorities gradually taking over direct responsibility for services to deaf people.

Professionalisation

One way in which the Younghusband report influenced events was to recommend social work training

(1959:para:870(b):p:246). It has been seen that workers
with deaf people in 1962 were well qualified for the
times (p:117) and over the years between then and the
1980s they became a professionally qualified social
worker group, to the extent that by the time of the
present study 87.6% of the respondents in the population
surveyed had the Certificate of Qualification in Social
Work or its equivalent (table:28:p:156).

According to Seed (1973:p:78) there had been
pressure for a unified social work profession for some
time before the setting up of the Younghusband committee
in 1955, from social work practitioners and academics.
Writing of the Younghusband, Ingleby, and Seebohm
committees, Seed (1973:p:78) states 'each stopped short
of being able to demand the establishment of a new single,
unified social work department....'.

However, stimulus for training social workers
came with the Younghusband Report in 1959, and the
professional social work organisations saw this as an
opportunity for a unified training which would also confer
professional recognition. Seed (1973:p:79) describes
how, in 1962, the Association of Social Workers recommended
a national association based on a minimum qualification
in social work. This was followed by seven organisations
forming a Standing Conference of Social Workers 'which
issued various criteria for professional membership of
a body representing all social workers'. The unifying

body, the British Association of Social Workers was formed in 1970.

Social work training courses were set up by statute in 1962 (Seed:1973:p:76), with the Council for Training in Social Work approving the courses and awarding the certificate. As Seed (1973:pp:76-77) states 'professionalisation forced a fresh definition of the role of certain groups, for example, social welfare officers....'. This would eventually include welfare officers for the deaf, as the paid workers with deaf people were known at the time.

With the benefit of hindsight it might be judged unfortunate that those working with deaf people took the social work path at this time, bearing in mind the present movement to "de-social work" work with deaf people (p:414). When workers with deaf people became professional social workers, deaf people became "clients", and the deaf social group a "client group". It is now suggested (p:506f) that deaf people are autonomous members of society needing, in the main, communication help from Sign Language interpreters. But at the time of Younghusband paternalism prevailed, and opinion was that deaf people required "care". It is ironic that it required professional social workers with deaf people, whose existence turned deaf people into "clients", to eventually suggest that deaf people needed a separate Sign Language interpreting service (p:488f).

However, had they not become professional social workers, they might have been left, as Seed (1973:p:77) says of education welfare officers, 'uncertain of their existing role'. As it has turned out (p:576), it is likely that the profession of Sign Language interpreters formed in the late 1980s will be doing much of what the welfare officer for the deaf did in the past, in helping deaf people negotiate the communication hazards of a "hearing" world, without the casework. Unfortunately, the 1950s and 1960s did not have a background conducive to change. "Oralism" appeared to be still dominant in deaf education (Conrad:1979), William Stokoe was only just embarking on his research into Sign Language, and the new professionals had yet to overturn the paternalism prevalent in work with deaf people at the time.

Bureaucratisation

An extra impetus to the Younghusband recommendations on local authority direct interest in work with deaf people came from the Seebohm report (The Report of the Committee on Local Authority and Allied Personal Social Services:HMSO:1968). This recommended that the welfare services provided under the National Assistance Act 1948 should be included in the new social services departments which they envisaged (1968:p:51:para:168(b)); thus services for deaf people would become part of the bureaucratic structure of local government. Seebohm expected that the move from using

the voluntary organisations as agencies, to direct provision by the local authorities would be accelerated (1968:p:106:para:336), but noted that 'there will remain ample scope for locally based voluntary bodies in co-operating with each other and with the local authority services to provide, for example, social centres, self-help groups....'.

Lysons (1965:p:298) writes 'the voluntary societies for the deaf must face the possibility that sooner or later, some or all of their functions will eventually be taken over by local authority welfare departments'. An example of this was in Lincolnshire where, in 1965, the Lincoln Diocesan Deaf Association's welfare officer for the deaf was taken over as a direct service by the local authorities (p:84).

The combined effect of the generic training of social workers and the organisational changes recommended by Younghusband and Seebohm, led to the situation in 1977 in which, of 109 local authorities surveyed (DHSS:1977:appendix:2:1), 46% provided a direct service, 18% a service through an agency agreement and 36% had a direct service and an agency agreement. Only one had no service at all. There were only 15% of social workers with deaf people with their workbase in a voluntary organisation.

Services Provided Remain Unchanged

Despite the considerable organisational changes

which took place in the twelve years between the publishing
of the Younghusband report and the establishment of the
social service departments in 1971, there were not
commensurate changes in the services provided. The workers
began the process of becoming qualified as social workers
but continued to provide a "one person" service, with
the possible exception of church work, though some workers
continued to conduct these services as well.

The Single Worker Service

Burton (1962:pp:105-106) describes how versatile
the 1960s worker had to be. 'The Welfare Officer for
the Deaf is a man with a great number of duties... He
is called upon to organise Church services, social
activities for all types and ages, interpret, find jobs,
visit, resolve problems, raise money, do his office work,
carry out publicity and education work'. Rodgers and
Dixon (1960:pp:143-146) give a similar impression of an
"all purpose" worker, in their brief description of work
with deaf people in a northern town in the 1950s. They
describe how the "missioner" works for a voluntary
organisation which receives a grant from the local
authority. He interprets, attends the deaf club, visits
deaf people who live in isolated places, and those in
residential homes and hospitals, and "advises" deaf people.
He also conducts a Sign Language class.

As late as 1981 the National Council of Social
Workers with the Deaf (1981:p:2:para:2) was suggesting

that profoundly prelingually deaf people will see the social worker with the deaf as "the system". They write 'there are no alternative services for deaf people and those which exist offer a very limited choice. It is questionable whether any other group of clients are placed in this position'. Jones (1982:p:327) comments in similar vein, stating that deaf people have no direct access to professional help because of their communication difficulties; he writes 'their choice of social life means that they do not come under the influence of youth leaders and other community leaders and necessary contact with doctors, nurses, social workers and the like must normally be limited, at best through a third person - a Sign Language interpreter'. He goes on to say that South Humberside had at that time two social workers for the deaf and a chaplain. 'These people have to be all things to the small group they serve and however well they do their jobs, respondents are limited in the choice they have'.

Services Recommended By The National Institute For The Deaf And The National Council Of Missioners And Welfare Officers To The Deaf

In 1947 the National Institute for the Deaf (now the Royal National Institute for the Deaf) produced a draft scheme of the activities which they thought would comprise an efficient welfare service for deaf people

(Lysons:1965:p:167). There were six categories:

1. Interpretation.

2. Spiritual care.

3. Placement and industrial supervision.

4. Social services.

5. Visiting.

6. Individual welfare.

This was followed by an undated staffing formula from the Royal National Institute for the Deaf (sometime during or after 1961 because it contains the revised definitions of categories of deaf people suggested by Ministry of Health Circular 25/61). This staffing formula contains '......the range of specialist services, within the pattern of welfare provision overall which should be available to those who are deaf or hard of hearing.....' (undated:Introduction:para:1). In summary, these services included:

1. Interpreting.

2. Casework support.

3. Visiting and follow-up services.

4. Special aids to hearing.

5. Recreation.

6. Employment for deaf people.

7. Advice and guidance to parents of deaf children.

8. Church.

9. Sign Language teaching.

10.Advising generic social workers and public relations

activities to keep the needs of deaf people before the public.

The National Council of Missioners and Welfare Officers to the Deaf (now the National Council of Social Workers with Deaf People) in its memorandum to the Ministry of Health Working Party on Social Workers suggests (1956:p:7:para:(d)) that 'an efficient welfare service for the deaf provides:

1. Placement and industrial supervision.

2. Social services and recreational facilities.

3. Visiting.

4. Individual welfare.'

These are similar recommendations to those of the Royal National Institute for the Deaf in 1947, and their later one in 1960s.

Basically the three lists contain the same provision, though couched in different terms. Sign Language interpreting, employment for deaf people and individual welfare feature in all of them. The term casework is used in the second RNID list, perhaps because Younghusband (1959:p:197:para:693) writes that 'we think a casework service should be provided for those deaf people who need it, even if this must be attempted through an interpreter at first', and because the leaders of work with deaf people wished to be recognised amongst the professionals.

Younghusband mentions in the same paragraph

the education of the general public and the need to lessen

the isolation of deaf people, which perhaps accounts for

the inclusion of "public relations activities" in the

Royal National Institute for the Deaf's 1960s list.

Interestingly, the parents of deaf children are mentioned

in the later list, though little progress seems to have

been made by as recently as 1981, when the National Council

of Social Workers with the Deaf (now the National Council

of Social Workers with Deaf People) said in its evidence

to the Barclay report (March 1981:p:9:para:ii) 'as yet,

very few social workers with the deaf are involved with

the assessment of deaf children and support for their

families'.

Therefore, at 1971, the new social services

departments provided an impetus to the professionalisation

of social work started by Younghusband twelve years

earlier. The "new" workers were "enlightened" about deaf

people (p:479f) and this factor, together with the self-

advocacy of the deaf community which began and failed

in the 1890s and had a resurgence in the 1970s, contributed

to the considerable changes in attitude towards deaf people

in the 1980s (p:396f).

Organisational Changes

The publishing of the Chronically Sick and

Disabled Persons Act (1970), the introduction of social

services departments in 1971, and the re-organisation

of local government boundaries in 1974, stimulated

some interest in services to deaf people, but did not
throw up any particularly new thought.

There are few reports from the time available;
those that are, demonstrate a mixture of traditional
outlooks and innovation. For example, the Suffolk
working party produced a list of 'Needs of the Deaf'
(1974:p:1:para:2) including:

1. Registration.

2. Adjustment to the handicap.

3. Communication and interpretation.

4. Social work domiciliary service.

5. Spiritual and cultural services .

6. Recreation and social activities.

7. Provision of aids.

8. Further education service.

9. Employment service.

This is very much a traditional list and the Oxfordshire
report (Livingstone:1973) is similar. In relation
to services to young deaf people Livingstone speaks
in terms of "care", for example (1973:p:53) '...and
it is important to see that when they (the young deaf
people) grow up and leave the shelter of these
(education) authorities, there is a smooth change-over
to the care of the Social Services, Employment and
Further Education Departments....'.

However, some others are more encouraging.
The report on 'The Hearing Impaired in Hillingdon',

for example, mentions (1973:p:vii) that a greater number

of prelingually deaf people wanted interpreting than

wanted social work services; and the writers highlight

the fact that (1973:p:21) 'a hearing impaired child

can be the cause of a great deal of stress within the

family situation', suggesting (1973:p:vi) that the

parents of deaf children need social work support.

A Surrey County Council working party also

had new ideas. Its report states (1974:p:3) 'it has

been a long standing complaint of some handicapped

people that they have little voice in decision making

when policies that affect them are discussed', and

in fact 3 deaf people were appointed to the working

party. Amongst other recommendations it was suggested

that the social workers should no longer be responsible

for the management of the deaf clubs, and that a social

worker should be on the co-ordinating group set up

by the education department and the area health

authority to discuss handicapped children (in spite

of the fact that the senior medical officer stated

that the team of health visitor, teacher of the deaf

and speech therapist was 'fully able to provide all

advisory and counselling services required by parents').

Most significantly, it was recommended (1974:p:32)

that the social services department should set up 'a

generally available interpreting service which is not

solely dependent upon the department's own social

workers'. It was suggested (1974:p:13) that social
workers faced difficulties over confidentiality when
interpreting for their own clients in some instances,
and 'there are, moreover, many occasions when a deaf
person requires an interpreter in situations quite
unconnected with social work and which do not require
the skills of a social worker.'

It can be seen that there are isolated
examples that attitudes to deaf people and their needs
are changing, though there is not yet any firm
suggestion of changed priorities. Even the ACSHIP
report, although it states (1977:p:17:para:57) 'the
adult pre-lingually deaf normally attain a large degree
of stability and independence. They will, however,
frequently require the services of an interpreter',
does no more than caution (1977:p:17:para:57) 'we should
like to stress that an interpretation service is not
synonymous with social work support'.

The ACSHIP report is perhaps a good indication
of the thinking of the time. The working party was
appointed in 1975 as a sub-committee of the Secretary
of State's Advisory Committee on Services for Hearing
Impaired People 'to consider the role of social services
in the care of the deaf of all ages and to make
recommendations' (1977:p:1:para:1). The report
highlights a number of matters which needed airing:
1. The need for close co-operation between

health, education and personal social services.

2. The fact that there was a shortage of social workers with deaf people.

3. The need for work with the parents of deaf children.

4. The identification of areas of concentration of social work effort, and the most efficient use of specialist staff.

5. The recognition that "social work" and "interpreting" are not "synonymous".

6. The unpreparedness of some deaf adolescents for employment.

The first point is mentioned in particular in relation to deaf children, and it is suggested (1977:p:11:para:30) that the 'ideal aim' would be multi-disciplinary teams 'in which a medical, educational and social assessment all make a contribution to the overall decision regarding treatment and rehabilitation'.

Second, the need for more specialist social workers is stressed (1977:p:29:para:102); '....if urgent measures are not taken soon to increase the throughput of social workers on the specialist course, the present service inevitably will deteriorate to a point where even the most basic needs of clients will not be able to be met. In these circumstances we do not feel it is unreasonable to expect every SSD or the voluntary organisation acting as its agent, as an absolute minimum

of provision, to employ one professionally qualified social worker with an additional specialist qualification to work with deaf people, although we would not expect the larger authorities to find this level of provision adequate'. This state of affairs does not seem to have improved. Smallridge and Peckford (1987:pp:14-16) state that numbers of specialist social workers are falling and Peckford and Hawcroft (1988:p: 1) make the same point.

Third, the need for social work support for the parents of deaf children was given considerable space in the ACSHIP Report; for parents of children with a 'socially significant hearing loss' (1977:p:11:para:30); the parents' relationship with the deaf child - 'the mother may be faced with extreme difficulty in developing emotionally satisfying communication with her child'; the anxiety of the parents, the need to communicate, the need to meet other parents, and the contribution of the **deaf** parents of deaf children to "hearing" parents' understanding of their deaf children (1977:pp:12-13:paras:31-35).

Fourth, the Report attempts to lay down some sort of paradigm, or model of social work with deaf people, by suggesting areas where effort might be concentrated (1977:p:19:para:64).
1. The assessment stage 'when parents are often most vulnerable'.

2. Entry to secondary school 'when behavioural problems are most likely to arise'.

3. School-leaving/adolescence.

4. Marriage.

5. Post retirement.

It also highlights the specialist character of the service by suggesting ways in which the specialist social worker can be most appropriately employed (1977:p:19:para:63). 'It is essential that skilled staff should not be employed on work for which their training and qualifications are inappropriate and consideration will need to be given therefore, to;

1. Identifying tasks requiring fluent communication abilities.

2. Using the specialist in a consultative capacity.

3. Identifying needs which can be met by welfare assistants with some manual communication skills.

4. Identifying the most economical methods of supporting residential workers, day care and ATC staff involved with pre-lingually deaf people.

5. The training and support of deaf and hearing volunteers'.

Fifth, the recognition that social work support and interpreting services are not synonymous (1977:p:17:para:57) has already been commented upon (p:130). Although the report does not over-emphasise this, and there are no particular recommendations,

it is an indication of the way in which people were
beginning to think.

Sixth, the highlighting of the fact that
some deaf adolescents are not ready for employment
(1977:p:15:para:45) is again suggestive that there
is a need for social work intervention, and that some
young deaf people are vulnerable and perhaps immature.

Perhaps the importance of the report is that
it drew people's attention to deaf people and their
needs. The recognition that parents of deaf children
need support is the only new suggestion the report
has to make. The criticisms of it are that it does
not call for research into deaf people's experience
of deafness, it sees the resolution of problems posed
by deafness through social work intervention and it
does not recognise the part to be played by deaf people
in planning and provision. In terms of the development
of understanding of deaf people's needs the report
does not substantially contribute and the mould prepared
by the Victorians remained unbroken.

Changes In The Paid Workers' Attitudes

However, during the 1970s the seeds of change
were sown, particularly in the attitudes of the workers.
Ladd (Miles:1988:pp:33-34) has some hard things to
say about welfare officers for the deaf. He recognised
their ability to use British Sign Language but did
not like their attitudes to deaf people. There is

an irony in the fact that he liked the attitudes of
the new breed of social workers but regrets their lack
of understanding of Sign Language. He writes
(1988:p:34) 'as local government started to take over
and rule welfare services for the population as a whole,
so too did a new kind of welfare service emerge to
deal with the deaf community. This source, although
it produced workers who were in many cases more
"enlightened" and more encouraging than the former
Welfare Officers to the Deaf, largely failed to
recognise that deaf people formed a linguistic community
and thought that "learning to communicate with the
deaf" was enough. This and other factors led to an
actual fall in numbers of those who had a good command
of British Sign Language and many deaf people came
to regret the passing of the Welfare Officers to the
Deaf, despite their autocratic behaviour. Thus the
deaf community lost the potential support for British
Sign Language from the only group of hearing people
who were aware of it'.

Whilst Ladd was correct in that the new
workers were more "enlightened" and were not, in some
cases, good practitioners of British Sign Language,
he was quite wrong about their attitudes. From the
comments made by the members of the National Council
of Social Workers with Deaf people (appendix:6p:696f)
it is evident that they have a sound understanding

of the social and linguistic needs of deaf people.
These "enlightened" attitudes, though by no means the
sole cause of changes described in part III (p:396f),
were a major contributing factor.

Changing attitudes are illustrated by the
tone of the evidence given by the National Council
of Social Workers with the Deaf to the National
Institute for Social Work working party on 'The Role
and Tasks of Social Workers'. It suggests (1981:p:3)
that 'the main service users (deaf clients and their
families) have expectations in 4 areas:

1. Communication.

2. Direct intervention on behalf of client with family
and neighbours.

3. As a resource provider from the social workers own
agency, and to be knowledgeable about other agencies.
The expectation is for the social worker with the deaf
to be an enabler and an advocate.

4. Adviser and counsellor for personal problems -

The evidence goes on to say (1981:p:3) that
the social worker for the deaf relates to other
professions and services; legal, education, housing,
religious, employment, social security, and other social
services personnel.

Commenting upon the restrictions of being
deaf (1981:p:8) the report states 'deaf people with
very little communication may rely almost solely on

the Social Worker with the Deaf for their information.
This may be tinged with the Social Worker's own beliefs,
philosophy and political leanings'. This last point
is mentioned by Warren (1977:p:20) who gives the example
of the social worker with deaf people who has moral
objections to the contraceptive pill, and so persuades
a young deaf woman not to ask for it to be prescribed.

The report also suggests (1981:p:8) that
the social worker with deaf people should be a member
of multi-professional assessment and joint care planning
teams. It complains that the specialist worker with
deaf people is first involved with deaf people at
adolescence, which is considered to be too late; 'many
families need support at the point of the child's
diagnosis and close co-operation is needed between
parents, social workers and teachers of the deaf'.

It can be seen that the whole tone of the
evidence relates to the problems which the deaf person
might encounter, rather than a list of services. It
also expresses disquiet about the central role of the
social worker in the lives of deaf people (1981:p:8),
and makes the point (1981:p:3) that 'there are no
alternative services for deaf people, and those which
exist offer a very limited choice. It is questionable
whether any other group of clients is placed in this
position'. Evidently social workers with deaf people
are by this time questioning the "one person" service

to deaf people.

As the report states (1981:p:2) 'historically, the care of deaf people was mainly the responsibility of voluntary organisations such as Benevolent Deaf and Dumb Societies, Missions for the Deaf etc., but since the advent of Social Services Departments, many local authorities now run a direct service'. The difference in outlook shows in the way the social workers express themselves in relation to deaf people, and paves the way for the changes in outlook that are described later (part III:p:396f).

Summary

Services to deaf people were originally provided by voluntary organisation and even the advent of legislation in 1948 did not effect any change in this. The recommendations of the Younghusband and Seebohm reports created organisational changes which resulted in local authority social services departments providing direct services to deaf people in most areas.

However, in spite of organisational changes, services continued to be provided through one person, the worker with deaf people, and the services themselves remained basically the same. Casework/counselling, Sign Language interpreting and finding work for deaf people were the main pre-occupations of workers with deaf people up to the present time, though it is evident

that changes are beginning to be made, notably in relation to Sign Language interpreting, with suggestions of a separate service for this. There is no evidence, unfortunately, of a recognition that services should be based on deaf people's experience of deafness. Neither is there any suggestion that services should be provided other than through the social worker, except for Sign Language interpreting. Social·work/pathology continued to be the model.

References

Ministry of Health
Circular 32/51. National
Assistance Act 1948. Welfare
Services for Handicapped
Persons other than the Blind
and Partially Sighted

H.M.S.O., 1951

Lysons, Clifford
Kenneth
Some Aspects of the Historical
Development and Present
Organisation of Voluntary
Welfare Societies for Adult
Deaf Persons in England
1840-1963

Typewritten. M.A. Thesis. Unpublished, 1965

Lysons, Kenneth
M.A. M.Ed. Ph.D.
The Development of Local
Voluntary Societies for Adult
Deaf Persons in England

Pamphlet. The British Deaf Association, 1979

Younghusband,
Eileen L.
Report of the Working Party
on Social Workers in the
Local Authority Health and
Welfare Services

H.M.S.O., 1959

Seed, P.
The Expansion of Social Work
in Great Britain

Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1973

Conrad, R.
The Deaf Shool Child

Harper & Row, 1979

Seebohm, Frederic
Report of the Committee on
Local Authority and Allied
Personal Social Services

H.M.S.O., 1968

Advisory Committee   Report of a Sub-Committee
on Services for   Appointed to Consider the
Hearing Impaired   Role of Social Services in
People   the Care of the Deaf of all
                            Ages

    Department of Health and Social Security, 1977

Burton, Derek   'Albemarle and all that'
                            The Silent World
                            April 1962 Vol.17(4)

    pp:104-106

Rodgers, Barbara N.   Portrait of Social Work.
&   A Study of Social Services
Dixon, Julia   in a Northern Town

    Oxford University Press, 1960

National Council of   Evidence to the National
Social Workers with   Institute for Social Work
the Deaf   Working Party on the Role
                            and Tasks of Social Workers

    National Council of Social Workers with the Deaf.
    Typewritten. Unpublished, 1981

Jones, K.   The Social Effects of Deafness
                            from Birth or Early Childhood.
                            A Study of the Adult Deaf
                            Population of South Humberside

    Typewritten. M.Phil. Thesis. Unpublished, 1982

Royal National   Staffing in Voluntary Agencies
Institute for   for Deaf and Hard of Hearing
the Deaf   Persons

    Pamphlet. Royal National Institute for the Deaf.
    undated, about 1961

National Council   Memorandum to the Ministry
of Missioners and   of Health Working Party on
Welfare Officers   Social Workers
to the Deaf

    National Council of Missioners and Welfare
    Officers to the Deaf. Typewritten. Unpublished,
    1956

| Chronically Sick
and Disabled
Persons Act 1970 | Chronically Sick and Disabled
Persons Act 1970 Chapter
44 |

H.M.S.O., 1970

| Suffolk Mission
to the Deaf | Report of Working Party on
Services to the Deaf |

Suffolk Mission to the Deaf. Typewritten.
Unpublished, 1974

| Livingstone, F. | A Comprehensive and
Co-ordinated Service for
all those Handicapped by
a Hearing Defect in
Oxfordshire |

Oxfordshire County Council. Typewritten.
Unpublished, 1973

| London Borough
of Hillingdon | The Hearing Impaired of
Hillingdon: a Report to Assess
the Needs of those with
Hearing Impairments and to
Make Recommendations for
the Improvement of Current
Services |

London Borough of Hillingdon. Typewritten.
Unpublished, 1973

| Surrey County
Council | Report of the Working Party
on Services for the Deaf
and Hard of Hearing in Surrey |

Surrey County Council. Typewritten. Unpublished,
1974

| Smallridge, Peter
&
Peckford, Bob | 'Hearing Aides'
Social Services Insight
August 1987 Vol.5(1)
pp:14-16 |

| Peckford, Bob
&
Hawcroft, Lynne | Social Workers with Deaf
People. A Brief Analysis
of Recruitment, Retention
and Turnover |

Pamphlet. Royal National Institute for the
Deaf, 1988

Ladd, Paddy   Chapter 2 in <u>Miles</u>, Dorothy
                               <u>British Sign Language. A</u>
                               <u>Beginners Guide</u>

    BBC Books, 1988, pp:27-43

Warren, F.   'Marital Counselling'
                               <u>Papers from One Day Conference</u>
                               <u>on Marital Work with the</u>
                               <u>Deaf - A Role for the Social</u>
                               <u>Worker</u>

    National Council of Social Workers with the Deaf.
    Yorkshire/ Humberside and Northern Counties
    Branches, October 1977, pp:1-14

CHAPTER 8   'Social Workers With Deaf People:

                Background Information'

A number of special features become apparent
from an examination of the available literature on deaf
people and their needs. One of these is the prominence
of the paid worker (p:95f), who has been in evidence
from the establishment of the Missions to the deaf.
Therefore, in 1986-87 a postal survey was made for the
present study of the 126 members of the National Council
of Social Workers with Deaf People, to which there were
73 replies, 66 from social workers (including one social
work assistant) and 7 from clergy and care assistants.

The objects of the survey were to discover
what workers with deaf people thought was expected of
them professionally, what they actually did
professionally, and what they thought of the present
state of affairs in the "deaf world". It was thought
that a survey of this kind, added to the information
obtained from deaf people about communication with
"hearing" people and their views on their "welfare"
needs, together with the survey on referrals, would
combine to build up an objective assessment of deaf
people's peculiar needs.

Numbers In Sample

73 respondents out of a total of 126 replied
to the questionnaire (appendix:10:p:751f), of whom 30

were senior or principal social workers, 26 level 3 social workers, 8 level 2 social workers, 1 a level 1 social worker and one a social work assistant (table:20 p:146). Seven were clergymen or care assistants and they are not included in the main statistics, because it was thought better to include only the work of those in a "social work" environment. The clergymen and others were only included in the first place because they were members of the National Council of Social Workers with Deaf People.

It should be noted that the social worker levels 1, 2 and 3 relate to professional grades, with 1 being the most junior. There were 36 men and 37 women in the total group.

Total National Numbers

It is not possible to make comparisons of total numbers because not all social workers with deaf people belong to the National Council of Social Workers with Deaf People. However, Smallridge & Peckford (1987:pp:14-16) suggest that the 127 posts advertised between 1984 and 1987 might represent approximately one third of the total establishment of specialist workers with deaf people - that is 381 workers. According to Smallridge & Peckford (1987:p:14) 92 of the 127 vacancies were filled but 60 of the successful candidates, although qualified social workers, had no experience with deaf people and 32 were not qualified as social workers,

table 20

Social Worker Respondents: by grade and by sex

Social Worker Respondents

Sex	Soc.Work Assist.	Soc.Wkr. Level 1	Soc.Wkr. Level 2	Soc.Wkr. Level 3	Senior Worker	Total Soc.Worker Respondts.	%
Male	0	1	1	12	19	33	50
Female	1	0	7	14	11	33	50
	1	1	8	26	30	66	100

with 15 having "deaf" experience.

Experience

It is evident that respondents have considerable experience of work with deaf people, as well as being involved with deafness in their personal lives and having known something of deafness and deaf people before becoming full-time workers. 46 (69.7%) respondents had six years or more and 29 (44%) had 11 years or more experience (table:21:p:148). 17 (26.2%:65 replies) respondents were deaf or partially deaf themselves (table:22:p:149) and 16 (24.6%:65 replies) had either deaf parents or other deaf relatives (table:23 p:150). Over half (35:53%) of the respondents had some experience of deafness before starting work with deaf people (table:24:p:151), ranging from their own or family deafness, through voluntary work and childhood friendships, to chance encounters.

Experience Of Generic Social Work

31 (47%) respondents had some previous experience of social work before coming into work with deaf people (table:25:p:152) and a number (14 out of 62:22.6%) were involved with generic social work in addition to their work with deaf people (table:26:p:153).

NOTE: "Respondent" refers to the 65 social workers and 1 social work assistant throughout.

table 21

Social Worker Respondents: by grade and by how long they have been in their present post and by how long they have worked with deaf people

Social Worker Respondents

Length of time in present post & worked with deaf people		Soc.Work Assist.	Soc.Wkr. Level 1	Soc.Wkr. Level 2	Soc.Wkr. Level 3	Senior Worker	Total Soc.Wkr. Respondts.	%
Present Post Yrs.	Work with deaf people Yrs.							
0- 5	0- 5	1	1	5	12	1	20	30.3
0- 5	6-10	0	0	1	5	7	13	19.7
6-10	6-10	0	0	1	1	2	4	6.1
0- 5	11-20	0	0	0	2	13	15	22.7
6-10	11-20	0	0	1	0	3	4	6.1
11-20	11-20	0	0	0	5	0	5	7.6
0- 5	21-30	0	0	0	0	2	2	3.0
11-20	21-30	0	0	0	1	0	1	1.5
11-20	31+	0	0	0	0	1	1	1.5
21-30	31+	0	0	0	0	1	1	1.5
		1	1	8	26	30	66	100

table 22

Social Worker Respondents: by grade and by whether they are deaf,
partially deaf or "hearing"

Social Worker Respondents

	Soc.Work Assist.	Soc.Wkr. Level 1	Soc.Wkr. Level 2	Soc.Wkr. Level 3	Senior Worker	Total Soc.Worker Respondts.	%
Deaf	0	0	0	4	4	8	12.3
Partially deaf	1	0	2	3	3	9	13.8
"Hearing"	0	1	6	18	23	48	73.8
	1	1	8	25	30	65	100
Did not answer	0	0	0	1	0	1	
	1	1	8	26	30	66	

table 23

Social Worker Respondents: by grade and by whether or not they have deaf relatives

Social Worker Respondents

Relatives	Soc.Work Assist.	Soc.Wkr. Level 1	Soc.Wkr. Level 2	Soc.Wkr. Level 3	Senior Worker	Total Soc.Worker Respondts.	%
Mother and father deaf	0	0	2	2	3	7	10.8
Mother deaf, father "hearing"	0	0	0	1	0	1	1.5
Mother "hearing" father deaf	0	0	0	0	1	1	1.5
Mother & father "hearing"	1	1	6	19	22	49	75.4
Parents "hearing" other relative deaf	1	0	0	3	3	7	10.8
	2	1	8	25	29	65	100
Did not answer	0	0	0	0	1	1	
	2	1	8	25	30	66	

table 24

Social Worker Respondents: by grade and by whether or not they
had experience of pre-lingually deaf people before
starting work with deaf people

Social Worker Respondents

Experience of pre-lingually deaf people	Soc.Work Assist.	Soc.Wkr. Level 1	Soc.Wkr. Level 2	Soc.Wkr. Level 3	Senior Worker	Total Soc.Worker Respondts.	%
None	0	0	3	13	15	31	47.0
Own deafness	0	0	1	5	3	9	13.6
Family deafness	0	0	1	3	5	9	13.6
As a student	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.0
Voluntary work	0	0	1	2	2	5	7.6
Deaf client	1	0	2	1	1	5	7.6
Childhood/friends	0	0	0	0	2	2	3.0
Parents know deaf people	0	0	0	0	1	1	1.5
Chance meeting	0	0	0	1	1	2	3.0
	1	1	8	26	30	66	100

table 25

Social Worker Respondents: by grade and by their previous experience in social work

Social Worker Respondents

Previous experience		Soc.Work Assist.	Soc.Wkr. Level 1	Soc.Wkr. Level 2	Soc.Wkr. Level 3	Senior Worker	Total Soc.Wkr. Respondts.	%
Agency	Years							
None	None	1	1	3	11	19	35	53.0
Child care	0- 5	0	0	2	0	1	3	4.5
Residential	0- 5	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.5
Misc/General	0- 5	0	0	1	7	6	14	21.2
Child care	6-10	0	0	0	0	1	1	1.5
Residential	6-10	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.0
Misc/General	6-10	0	0	0	4	1	5	7.6
Child care	11+	0	0	0	0	1	1	1.5
Residential	11+	0	0	0	1	0	1	1.5
Misc./Gen.	11+	0	0	0	1	0	1	1.5
		1	1	8	26	30	66	100

table 26

Social Worker Respondents: by grade and by generic social work duties they have to perform in addition to their work with deaf people.

Social Worker Respondents

Generic Duties	Soc.Work Assist.	Soc.Wkr. Level 1	Soc.Wkr. Level 2	Soc.Wkr. Level 3	Senior Worker	Total Soc.Work Respdnts	%
None	1	1	4	21	21	48	77.4
Yes:no details							
Supervision etc.	0	0	0	0	1	1	1.6
Sundry handicap teams	0	0	0	0	1	1	1.6
Stand by duty	0	0	1	2	2	5	8.1
Handicapped and elderly work	0	0	1	0	0	1	1.6
Welfare rights	0	0	0	0	1	1	1.6
Family therapy	0	0	0	0	1	1	1.6
Child care/adoption	0	0	0	0	2	2	3.2
Advice Centre	0	0	0	1	0	1	1.6
A bit of everything	0	0	0	1	0	1	1.6
	1	1	6	25	29	62	100
Did not answer	0	0	2	1	1	4	
	1	1	8	26	30	66	

Social Work Qualifications

Just over a third of respondents (34%:65 replies) had degrees, over half of which (12 out of 22) were relevant to social work (table:27:p:155), and 57 (87.7%:65 replies) held a Certificate of Qualification in Social Work or its equivalent (table:28:p:156).

The Royal National Institute for the Deaf report 'Is There Anybody Listening?' (1988:p:10:Para:4.4) states 'the rate (sic) of qualification (of social workers with deaf people) ie. a social work qualification with or without a specialist qualification is 69%, which is substantially below the average 85% in the Local Government Training Board study (1986)'. By comparison, 87.6% of respondents in the present study were qualified in social work.

Specialist Qualifications

Although respondents are seen to be well qualified as a group in social work, over half have no specialist qualification in work with deaf people. Only 21 (32.3%:65 replies) of respondents held a social work qualification specific to work with deaf people, with another 10 (15.4%:65 replies) holding the Diploma or Certificate of the Deaf Welfare Examination Board (table:29:p:157), which no longer exists.

The Royal National Institute for the Deaf (1988p:15:para:2) found that only 17% of social workers with deaf people had any specialist "deaf"

table 27

Social Worker Respondents: by grade and by whether or not they have a degree and whether it is relevant to social work.

Social Worker Respondents

Degree	Soc.Work. Assistant	Soc.Wkr. Level 1	Soc.Wkr. Level 2	Soc.Wkr. Level 3	Senior Worker	Total Soc.Wkr. Respondts	%
Yes (relevant)	0	0	2	6	4	12	18.5
Yes (not relevant)	0	1	1	4	4	10	15.4
None	1	0	5	16	21	43	66.2
	1	1	8	26	29	65	100
Did not answer	0	0	0	0	1	1	
	1	1	8	26	30	66	

table 28

Social Worker Respondents: by whether or not they
have a professional social work qualification

Social Worker Respondents

Professional Social Work Qualification	Soc. Work Assistant	Soc.Wkr. Level 1	Soc.Wkr. Level 2	Soc.Wkr. Level 3	Senior Worker	Total Soc.Wk. Respndts	%
C.Q.S.W.	0	0	4	22	26	52	80.0
Cert.Soc.Work	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.6
Child Care Cert.	0	0	1	0	0	1	1.5
Other	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.6
None	1	0	1	2	0	4	6.2
Cert.Soc.Work.& Child Care Cert.	0	0	1	0	0	1	1.5
On C.Q.S.W.training	0	1	0	0	0	1	1.5
	1	1	8	25	30	65	100
Did not answer	0	0	0	1	0	1	
	1	1	8	26	30	66	

156

table 29
Social Worker Respondents: by grade and by whether or not they
hold a qualification related to work with deaf people.

Social Worker Respondents

Qualification related to work with deaf people	Soc.Work Assist.	Soc.Wkr. Level 1	Soc.Wkr. Level 2	Soc.Wkr. Level 3	Senior Worker	Total Soc.Wkr Respondts.	%
Deaf Welfare Exam. Board Diploma	0	0	0	0	7	7	10.8
Deaf Welfare Exam. Board Cert.	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.6
Post Qualification Cert. (Deaf)	0	1	0	10	10	21	32.3
Chaplains Cert.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
None	1	0	7	15	10	33	50.8
Other	0	0	1	0	0	1	1.5
Deaf Welfare Exam Board Diploma and Chaplain's Cert.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	1	1	8	26	29	65	100
Did not answer	0	0	0	0	1	1	
	1	1	8	26	30	66	

qualifications, in spite of the ACSHIP (1977:p:29:
para:102) suggestion, made as long ago as 1977, that
each local authority should employ at least one
qualified professional social worker, who also possesses
a specialist "deaf", qualification to work with deaf
people.

It is expected that a new specialist "deaf"
qualification (for qualified social workers) will start
in 1991, which might go some way towards rectifying
the present situation. In 1985 the training committee
of the National Council of Social Workers with Deaf
People 'on behalf of a consortium of the major
organisations in the field of deafness, prepared a
document for submission to the finance committee of
the Royal National Institute for the Deaf with the
request that the Royal National Institute for the Deaf
fund a two year project to establish specialist training
for social workers with the deaf, based on a distance
learning model' (Taylor:1985:p:6).

Since that time the matter has progressed
to the point where it is anticipated that a course will
start in January 1991 and will be organised by the Open
University. The course will have two parts. The first
year will involve the academic component and will be
open to anyone wanting to study aspects of deafness.
The second, and more practical year, will be for
qualified social workers only (British Deaf

News:1989:p:6:) and will include placements, communication skills and a research project.

Previous post-qualification courses for social workers with deaf people have been full-time over a period of one year, but both (Moray House, Edinburgh, and North London Polytechnic) have closed, probably for lack of support. It is possible that a distance learning course will be more attractive to social workers who have already had a lengthy education, followed by professional training.

Sign Language Qualifications

The Social Services Inspectorate in their report 'Say It Again' (1988:p:30:para:3.2.10)) suggest that social workers with deaf people should have at least stage 2 certificate of communication competence of the Council for the Advancement of Communication with Deaf People (CACDP). CACDP is a relatively recent innovation and not all social workers will have yet had the opportunity to take the examinations. It may also be the case that some, having worked with deaf people for several years, did not think it necessary to gain a qualification of this sort which is not demanded by their employer.

Seventeen (26.6%:64 replies) respondents did not have any Sign Language qualification,15 (23.4%:64 replies) held stage I, 12 (18.8%:64 replies) held stage II and 20(31.3%:64 replies) held stage III or Interpreter

level (table:30:p:161); so half had a recognised level of Sign Language communication ability or above and half did not. The Royal National Institute for the Deaf (1988:p:15:para:2) notes that less than 30% of the workers in their sample had 'accredited proficiency in sign communication at the CACDP stage II level'.

It should be noted, however, that stage II is a level of competence which some would not find acceptable. On this matter Scott-Gibson (1989:p:3) writes 'I personally would refute this (that stage II is a high enough level) and state that competence at stage III level is the minimum starting point for social workers who wish to work effectively with the Deaf community'. It should be added that Scott-Gibson is qualified as a social worker and is a native Sign Language user with qualification at interpreter level.

It should go without saying that social workers need fluency in communication with deaf people quite as much as those who act as interpreters. The social workers will be dealing with people needing help, perhaps experiencing crises in their lives. Above all, clients will want someone with whom they can "talk things over". For this they need a person fluent in their language, and stage II standard is not this, as Scott-Gibson (1989:p:3) makes clear; having gained an "A" level pass in French she comments '....I would be most reluctant to interpret from French into English, and vice versa

table 30

Social Worker Respondents: by grade and by whether or not they hold
a Sign Language interpreting qualification

Social Worker Respondents.

Sign Language qualification	Soc. Work Assistant	Soc.Wkr Level 1	Soc.Wkr. Level 2	Soc.Wkr. Level 3	Senior Worker	Total Soc.Worker Respondts	%
Stage I	1	1	4	5	4	15	23.4
Stage II	0	0	1	6	5	12	18.8
Stage III	0	0	1	7	7	15	23.4
Interpreter Level	0	0	0	2	3	5	7.8
None	0	0	2	6	9	17	26.6
	1	1	8	26	28	64	100
Did not answer	0	0	0	0	2	2	
	1	1	8	26	30	66	

for native French speakers going for job interviews, medical examinations, or attending college courses, and therefore have some sympathy for those, who having attained a stage II or III pass in sign communication skills and without the benefit of additional training, are obliged to try to do so'.

It does appear that the social work profession has not taken the issue of communication with deaf people seriously. Even the new Open University course does not seem to have grasped the point that fluent communication is essential. It is suggested (British Deaf News ... :1989:p:6) that students should have stage I to start with, and stage II before they start their placements in the second year. There is no mention of stage III or interpreter level, so it must be assumed that social workers with deaf people will become qualified at stage II level. The present study suggests that this is not good enough.

Nonetheless, the sample of social workers in the present study, although small, is certainly professionally well qualified and has considerable experience in work with deaf people. Viewing the situation optimistically, it might be expected that they would eventually gain the necessary communication qualifications and it is possible that after the six years or more in which most of them have been involved with deaf people (p:147), they will have built up

considerable communication expertise in any case.

In regard to the special post-qualifying certificate in deaf studies, the one year full-time courses started in the late 1960s at North London Polytechnic and Moray House College, Edinburgh had both closed by 1984 (Smallridge & Peckford:1987:p:14). They suggest (1987:p:14) that there is now a shortage of qualified social workers with deaf people, as did the ACSHIP Report (1977:p:29:para:102) and they welcome the suggestion of a part-time course based on distance learning and supervised practical work to be run by the Open University.

Whilst there is talk of a shortage of social workers with deaf people, a recruitment drive to fill the vacancies might be premature, bearing in mind the changes taking place or being discussed at the present time (part III p:396f). It might be that less social workers will be necessary, with the numbers made up with Sign Language interpreters or communication intermediaries. If this situation comes about there will be a small but well qualified group of professionals ready for the task of social casework provision.

Employer

Forty-nine (75.4%:65 replies) respondents were employed by local authorities and 15 (23.1%:65 replies) were the employees of voluntary organisations (table:31:p:164). It can be seen that voluntary

table 31

Social Worker Respondents: by grade and by employer and place of work

Social Worker Respondents

Employer and place of work	Soc.Work Assistant	Soc.Wkr Level 1	Soc.Wkr. Level 2	Soc.Wkr Level 3	Senior Worker	Total Soc.Worker Respondts.	%
Local Authority at H.Q.	0	0	1	5	7	13	20.0
Local Authority at district office	1	0	4	13	11	29	44.6
Local Authority at deaf centre	0	1	0	1	2	4	6.2
Voluntary org.at deaf centre	0	0	3	6	6	15	23.1
Other (no details)	0	0	0	0	1	1	1.5
Local Authority at other	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.6
	1	1	8	26	29	65	100
Did not answer	0	0	0	0	1	1	
	1	1	8	26	30	66	

organisations still have a considerable influence in
work with deaf people, with nearly a quarter of the
respondents employed by them. In addition, a further
4 (6.2%:65 replies) respondents, although employed by
the local authority, were based at the voluntary
organisation.

The argument against the basing of workers
with deaf people outside the social services department
is that it cuts them off from the mainstream of social
work, thus isolating workers from current thought and
deaf people from the benefits of this; in addition,
it increases the marginal status of deaf people in
society.

The Teams They Work In

Although they work for local authorities,
only 8 (12.9%:62 replies) respondents work in generic
teams, the rest (87.1%:65 replies) operating from
specialist teams (table:32:p:166). It would be
interesting to know what their relationship is with
the generic workers because their status as specialist
teams could isolate them from general services; on the
other hand, being a specialist team within the general
framework gives the specialist some recognition and
at the same time allows for consultation and co-operation
when necessary.

Consultation And Supervision

It is interesting to see that 30 (50.8%:59 replies)

table 32

Social Worker Respondents: by grade and by the type of team they work with.

Social Worker Respondents.

Type of team	Soc.Wk. Assist.	Soc.Wkr. Level 1	Soc.Wkr. Level 2	Soc.Wkr. Level 3	Senior Worker	Total Soc.Wkr. Respondts	%
Deaf team in one geographical area	0	0	4	4	4	12	19.4
Deaf team personally resp.for 1 geog.area	0	1	0	12	5	18	29.0
Generic team	0	0	2	5	1	8	12.9
Alone	0	0	1	3	3	7	11.3
Deaf team geog.area supervision resp.	0	0	0	1	10	11	17.7
Deaf team supervision resp.& personally resp.for geog.area	0	0	0	0	2	2	3.2
Deaf team supervision resp.	0	0	0	0	4	4	6.5
	0	1	7	25	29	62	100
Did not answer	1	0	1	1	1	4	
	1	1	8	26	20	66	

respondents refer to a generic senior worker for
consultation in their work, 21 (35.6%:59 replies) of
these referring to no-one else (table:33:p:168). There
is a similar situation in relation to supervision, with
21 (35.6%:59 replies) respondents referring to a senior
generic worker for supervision exclusively and 5 (8.5%:59
replies) referring to both generic and specialist deaf
seniors. 18 (30.5%:59 replies) refer only to a senior
worker with deaf people and 15 (25.4%:59 replies) have
no supervision (table:34:p:169).

Clearly, there is a link with generic services
in some cases at consultation and supervision level,
and this will help to integrate the specialist service
into the mainstream of social services department
provision, something recommended by the Social Services
Inspectorate (1988:p:29:para:3.2.4).

Policymaking And Consultation With Deaf People

Policy is decided by the professionals within
the local authorities (table:35:p:170) and over half
the respondents (37:57.%:65 replies) report that there
is some consultation with deaf people (table:36:p:171).
This is an area where change is apparent and deaf
people's views on services provided for them are
considerably influencing the course of events. The
process will doubtless be accelerated because the social
workers' attitudes are sympathetic to this need for
consultation (table:93:p:485). However, there is some

table 33

Social Worker Respondents: by grade and by whether they refer to a social worker
with deaf people or generic worker for consultation in their work

Social Worker Respondents

Consultation	Soc.Wk. Assist.	Soc.Wkr. Level 1	Soc.Wkr. Level 2	Soc.Wkr. Level 3	Senior Worker	Total Soc.Work Respondts	%
Senior worker with deaf people	0	1	2	11	5	19	32.2
Senior generic worker	0	0	3	7	11	21	35.6
Both	1	0	2	3	3	9	15.3
None	0	0	1	4	5	10	17.0
	1	1	8	25	24	59	100
Did not answer	0	0	0	1	6	7	
	1	1	8	26	30	66	

table 34

Social Worker Respondents by grade and by whether they refer to a senior worker
with deaf people or generic worker for supervision of their work

Social Worker Respondents

Supervision	Soc.Work Assist.	Soc.Wkr. Level 1	Soc.Wkr. Level 2	Soc.Wkr. Level 3	Senior Worker	Total Soc.Wkr. Respndts	%
Senior worker with deaf people	0	1	3	11	3	18	30.5
Senior generic worker	1	0	5	6	9	21	35.6
Both	0	0	0	3	2	5	8.5
None	0	0	0	5	10	15	25.4
	1	1	8	25	24	59	100
Did not answer	0	0	0	1	6	7	
	1	1	8	26	30	66	

169

table 35

Social Worker Respondents: by grade and by who is responsible for formulating and recommending deaf social work policy in their area.

Social Worker Respondents

Responsibility for policy	Soc.Work Assist.	Soc.Wkr. Level 1	Soc.Wkr. Level 2	Soc.Wkr Level 3	Senior Worker	Total Soc.Wkr. Respdts	%
Self	0	0	2	2	13	17	27.0
Line manager and above	1	1	1	16	7	26	41.3
Advisory group or committee	0	0	3	6	5	14	22.2
Self and senior	0	0	1	2	3	6	9.5
	1	1	7	26	28	63	100
Did not answer	0	0	1	0	2	3	
	1	1	8	26	30	66	

table 36

Social Worker Respondents: by grade by whether or not there is a consultative process with deaf people in the planning and provision of services

Social Worker Respondents

Consultative process	Soc.Work Assist.	Soc.Wkr. Level 1	Soc.Wkr. Level 2	Soc.Wkr. Level 3	Snr. Wkr.	Total Soc.Wkr. Respondts.	%
None	1	1	5	10	11	28	43.1
Deaf people as committee	0	0	0	2	5	7	10.8
Social worker is go-between	0	0	2	6	4	12	18.5
Formal/informal meeting with deaf c'ttee or deaf people	0	0	1	4	5	10	15.4
Much involvement – unspecified	0	0	0	1	0	1	1.5
Limited involvement	0	0	0	3	1	4	6.2
Unspecified involvement	0	0	0	0	1	1	1.5
Voluntary orgs. consulted	0	0	0	0	2	2	3.1
	1	1	8	26	29	65	100
Did not answer	0	0	0	0	1	1	
	1	1	8	26	30	66	

way to go yet, as 43% of workers still have no system of consultation.

The Social Services Inspectorate Report (1988:p:30:para:3.2.5.) recommends that 'hearing impaired people should be involved and consulted in the development of services to meet their needs'. A practical application of this occurred in May 1988 in Strathclyde (1988:p:3); two hundred deaf people assembled 'to debate, discuss, suggest and criticise the work of the Social Work Unit for the Deaf in Strathclyde Regional Council'. The purpose of the meeting was 'to give the deaf the chance to advise the social workers what was wrong'.

Summary

This sample of social workers with deaf people, all members of the National Council of Social Workers with Deaf People, contains people who are well qualified as social workers. They have considerable experience of deafness and deaf people although they do not generally have Sign Language qualifications.

Not only are they qualified as social workers, three-quarters of the respondents work in local authority social services departments and some of them consult with generic senior workers about their work; so there is a close relationship between services to deaf people and generic services provided by social services departments.

This state of affairs is an improvement on
the situation found by the ACSHIP investigating committee
(1977:para:65:p:19) who wrote... 'we suspect that
management staff in SSDs do not always appreciate either
the wide range of social problems with which the
specialist social worker working on his own is involved
or what appears to be his isolation from the mainstream
of social work'.

There is not a close relationship between
respondents and deaf people in relation to policymaking,
but there is no doubt that this is an area of change
and the fact that there is any consultation with deaf
people at all is a welcome occurrence.

References

Smallridge, Peter
&
Peckford, Bob

'Hearing Aides
Social Services Insight
August 1987, Vol.5 (1)
pp:14-16

Royal National
Institute for
the Deaf
    Services for Deaf People

Is There Anybody Listening?
Survey of Staff Employed in
England to Provide Social

Pamphlet. Royal National Institute for the
Deaf, 1988

Advisory Committee
on Services for
Hearing Impaired
People

Report of a Sub-Committee
Appointed to Consider the Role
of Social Services in the Care
of the Deaf of all Ages

Department of Health and Social Security, 1977

Taylor, George

'NCSWDP - Training'
The Journal of the National
Council of Social Workers with
the Deaf
September/October 1985,
Vol.1(6) p:6

The British Deaf
News. Report

'Crisis in Deaf Social Work'
The British Deaf News
May 1989, Vol.20(5) p:6

Social Services
Inspectorate

'Say It Again': Report of an
Inspection of Contemporary social
Work Practice with People who
are Deaf or Hard of Hearing

Department of Health and Social Security, 1988

Scott-Gibson, Liz.

'Warning'
Deafness. The Journal of the
Sociology of Deafness
Spring 1989, Vol.5(1) p:3

The British Deaf
News. Report

'Deaf are Heard in Strathclyde'
The British Deaf News
September 1988, Vol.18(9) pp:3-4

CHAPTER 9   'Social Workers With Deaf People: Their
            Duties'

        The social worker respondents were asked about

the services they provided, as part of the present

study's assessment of the special needs of deaf people.

These questions were also necessary in order to assess

whether changes are taking place in provision of

services.

        Respondents were asked what duties they were

expected to undertake and what they actually did over

a range of duties which included casework/counselling,

Sign Language interpreting, employment,

social/recreational, group work, community work, and

visiting.

Casework/Counselling And Involvement With Generic Social

Workers

        Respondents expected to have to do casework

as part of their work; 61 (92.4%) answered "yes" to the

question whether they expected to do casework/counselling

and the 5 who answered "no" were senior workers likely

to have only supervisory duties (table:37:p:176). From

table 38 (p:177) it can be seen that respondents spend

a large proportion of their time on this work, bearing

in mind their other duties. It should be remembered,

however, that casework was not defined and it is possible

that some respondents will have included work of a general

table 37

Social Worker Respondents: by grade and by whether or
not they are expected to do casework/counselling

Social Worker Respondents

Casework	Soc.Work Assist	Soc.Wkr. Level 1	Soc.Wkr. Level 2	Soc.Wkr. Level 3	Snr. Wkr.	Total Soc.Wkr. Respondts.	%
No	0	0	0	0	5	5	7.6
Yes	1	1	8	26	25	61	92.4
	1	1	8	26	30	66	100

table 38

Social Worker Respondents: by grade and by the percentage of their time spent on casework/counselling in the week prior to completing the questionnaire

Social Worker Respondents

% of time spent on casework	Soc.Work Assist.	Soc.Wkr. Level 1	Soc.Wkr. Level 2	Soc.Wkr. Level 3	Snr. Wkr.	Total Soc.Wkr. Respondts.	%
None	1	0	0	3	6	10	17.2
1 - 5%	0	0	0	3	0	3	5.2
6 - 10%	0	0	2	2	2	6	10.3
11 - 15%	0	0	1	0	3	4	6.9
16 - 20%	0	0	1	3	4	8	13.8
21 - 30%	0	0	3	7	4	14	24.1
31 - 50%	0	0	1	4	4	9	15.5
51% +	0	0	0	2	2	4	6.9
	1	0	8	24	25	58	100
Did not answer	0	1	0	2	5	8	
	1	1	8	26	30	66	

nature which is not strictly casework.

Respondents were relatively heavily involved with generic workers as co-workers, advisors or interpreters. Over half (30:50.2%:59 replies) were involved with generic workers as co-workers (table:39 p:179); most of them (25:42.4%:59 replies) dealing with between one and five cases in this way. Similarly, 28 (49.1%:57 replies) respondents were acting as advisers to generic workers (table:40:p:180), again, with most of them (22:38.6%:57 replies) having between one and five shared cases.

A much smaller number, 14 (23.7%:59 replies) respondents, were acting as interpreters (table:41:p:181) and this reflects the status of the specialist worker as a qualified social worker.

Sign Language Interpreting

Fifty-eight (87.9%) respondents were expected to undertake Sign Language interpreting duties (table:42 p:182) and during the week prior to completing the questionnaire 41 (70.7%:58 replies) respondents did some interpreting (table:43:p:183); so in addition to their casework/counselling work, respondents can be seen to be Sign Language interpreters for deaf people.

It has already been noted that interpreting is a feature of work with deaf people (p:94f) . The very first workers with deaf people were usually those who had some "deaf" background (p:96) and could therefore

table 39

Social Worker Respondents: by grade and by the number of cases in which they are involved with generic social workers as specialist worker/co-worker

Social Worker Respondents

Number of cases	Soc.Work Assist.	Soc.Wkr. Level 1	Soc.Wkr. Level 2	Soc.Wkr. Level 3	Snr. Wkr.	Total Soc.Wkr. Respondts.	%
None	0	0	4	9	16	29	49.2
1 - 5	0	0	3	13	9	25	42.4
6 - 10	1	0	0	1	0	2	3.4
11 - 15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
16 - 20	0	0	0	0	1	1	1.7
21 - 25	0	0	1	0	0	1	1.7
26 - 30	0	0	0	1	0	1	1.7
	1	0	8	24	26	59	100
Did not answer	0	1	0	2	4	7	
	1	1	8	26	30	66	

table 40

Social Worker Respondents: by grade and by the number of cases in which they are involved with generic social workers as specialist worker/adviser

Social Worker Respondents

Number of cases	Soc.Work Assist.	Soc.Wkr. Level 1	Soc.Wkr. Level 2	Soc.Wkr. Level 3	Senior Worker	Total Soc.Wkr. Respondts.	%
None	1	0	2	12	14	29	50.4
1 - 5	0	0	6	9	7	22	38.6
6 - 10	0	0	0	1	2	3	5.3
11 - 15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
16 - 20	0	0	0	2	1	3	5.3
21 - 25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
26 - 30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	1	0	8	24	24	57	100
Did not answer	0	1	0	2	6	9	
	1	1	8	26	30	66	

table 41

Social Worker Respondents: by grade and by the number of cases in which they are involved with generic social workers as specialist worker/interpreter

Social Worker Respondents

Number of cases	Soc.Work Assist.	Soc.Wkr. Level 1	Soc.Wkr. Level 2	Soc.Wkr. Level 3	Senior Worker	Total Soc.Wkr. Respondts.	%
None	1	0	6	20	18	45	76.3
1 - 5	0	0	2	3	7	12	20.3
6 - 10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
11 - 15	0	0	0	0	1	1	1.7
16 - 20	0	0	0	1	0	1	1.7
21 - 25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
26 - 30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	1	0	8	24	26	59	100
Did not answer	0	1	0	2	4	7	
	1	1	8	26	30	66	

table 42

Social Worker Respondents: by grade and by whether or not they are
expected to undertake Sign Language interpreting

Social Worker Respondents

Interpreting	Soc.Work Assist.	Soc.Wkr. Level 1	Soc.Wkr. Level 2	Soc.Wkr. Level 3	Senior Worker	Total Soc.Wkr. Respondts.	%
No	0	0	2	0	6	8	12.1
Yes	1	1	6	26	24	58	87.9
	1	1	8	26	30	66	100

table 43

Social Worker Respondents: by grade and by the percentage of
their time spent on Sign Language interpreting
in the week prior to completing the questionnaire

Social Worker Respondents

% of time spent on Sign Language interpreting	Soc.Work Assist.	Soc.Wkr. Level 1	Soc.Wkr. Level 2	Soc.Wkr. Level 3	Senior Worker	Total Soc.Wkr. Respondts.	%
None	0	0	2	7	8	17	29.3
1 - 5%	0	0	1	2	4	7	12.1
6 - 10%	0	0	2	6	10	18	31.0
11 - 15%	0	0	1	2	2	5	8.6
16 - 20%	1	0	0	5	1	7	12.1
21 - 30%	0	0	1	2	0	3	5.2
31 - 50%	0	0	1	0	0	1	1.7
51% +	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	1	0	8	24	25	58	100
Did not answer	0	1	0	2	5	8	
	1	1	8	26	30	66	

communicate in Sign Language. There is evidence that this is still the case with some respondents (table:24 p:151) but the social worker respondents as a whole are by no means well qualified formally by present day standards (table:30:p:161). Many respondents are, however, aware of this and their views are doing much to influence the changes which are taking place (p:488f).

Deaf People's Employment

Again, this is seen to be a feature of work with deaf people from the beginning of services (p:101f). Change is already apparent in this field of operation, with less than half (28: 42.4%) the respondents now expected to do work-seeking on their own initiative (table:44:p:185). This change is by no means complete and a larger proportion of respondents (52:78.8%) said they were expected to do employment work with deaf people in co-operation with careers officers and disablement resettlement officers (table:45:p:186). A similar number (51:77.3%) were expected to act as interpreters in deaf people's work places (table:46:p:187). This last duty dates back to the very beginning of work with deaf people, when the Liverpool Society had, as one of its objects, the provision of a worker to act as interpreter between employers and deaf employees (p:101).

Just under half the 58 respondents who replied did some employment work during the week prior to completing the questionnaire (table:47:p:188).

table 44

Social Worker Respondents: by grade and by whether or not they
are expected to do workseeking on their own initiative

Social Worker Respondents

Workseeking on own initiative	Soc.Work Assist.	Soc.Wkr. Level 1	Soc.Wkr. Level 2	Soc.Wkr. Level 3	Senior Worker	Total Soc.Wkr. Respondts.	%
No	0	0	6	13	19	38	57.6
Yes	1	1	2	13	11	28	42.4
	1	1	8	26	30	66	100

table 45
Social Worker Respondents: by grade and by whether or not they are
expected to do workseeking in conjunction with
careers officers and disablement resettlement officers

Social Worker Respondents

Workseeking in conjunction with careers officers and DROs	Soc.Work Assist.	Soc.Wkr. Level 1	Soc.Wkr. Level 2	Soc.Wkr. Level 3	Senior Worker	Total Soc.Wkr. Respondts.	%
No	0	0	1	2	11	14	21.2
Yes	1	1	7	24	19	52	78.9
	1	1	8	26	30	66	100

table 46
Social Worker Respondents: by grade and by whether or not they are
expected to help maintain deaf people in employment by
interpreting at their workplaces when necessary

Social Worker Respondents

Maintaining deaf people in employment	Soc.Work Assist.	Soc.Wkr. Level 1	Soc.Wkr. Level 2	Soc.Wkr. Level 3	Senior Worker	Total Soc.Wkr. Respondts.	%
No	0	0	1	1	13	15	22.7
Yes	1	1	7	25	17	51	77.3
	1	1	8	26	30	66	100

table 47
Social Worker Respondents: by grade and by the percentage of their time spent on employment work with deaf people during the week prior to completing the questionnaire

Social Worker Respondents

Percentage of time spent on employment work	Soc.Work Assist.	Soc.Wkr. Level 1	Soc.Wkr. Level 2	Soc.Wkr. Level 3	Senior Worker	Total Soc.Wkr. Respdts.	%
None	0	0	5	14	12	31	53.4
1 - 5%	0	0	2	4	4	10	17.2
6 - 10%	1	0	1	5	7	14	24.1
11 - 15%	0	0	0	1	1	2	3.4
16 - 20%	0	0	0	0	1	1	1.7
21 - 30%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
31 - 50%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
51% +	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	1	0	8	24	25	58	100
Did not answer	0	1	0	2	5	8	
	1	1	8	26	30	66	

188

Respondents' Involvement In Social/Recreational Activities

Nearly two thirds of respondents (40:60.6%) said they were not expected to organise social/recreational activities for general age groups of deaf people (table:48:p:190) though half (34:51.5%) were expected to organise for specific groups (table:49 p:191). It is reasonable that deaf people should organise their own social activities, indeed it is unreasonable to suggest that they might not; yet a third of respondents evidently consider this to be part of their duties.

It might be considered reasonable that social workers with deaf people should think it necessary for to organise social activities for specific groups of deaf people - old people and youth groups for example; but in "hearing" society this would most likely be done by volunteers, trained or untrained, perhaps supervised by a professional. However, the professional is more likely to be a youth or community worker than a social worker. There are now courses for deaf people for youth leadership (p:418) and the changing attitudes are clearly seen here.

That nearly two thirds of respondents do not think it necessary for them to organise social activities even for special groups (table:49:p:190), shows that change is at work amongst the social workers, and their positive attitudes to the involvement of deaf people (p:483f), are proof of this. As one respondent remarked

table 48
Social Worker Respondents: by grade and by whether or not they are
expected to organise social activities for all ages of deaf people

Social Worker Respondents

Social activities for all ages	Soc.Work Assist.	Soc.Wkr. Level 1	Soc.Wkr. Level 2	Soc.Wkr. Level 3	Senior Worker	Total Soc.Wkr. Respdts.	%
No	0	1	7	13	19	40	60.6
Yes	1	0	1	13	11	26	39.4
	1	1	8	26	30	66	100

table 49
Social Worker Respondents: by grade and by whether or not they are expected to
organise social activites for specific groups of deaf people

Social Worker Respondents

Social activities for specific groups	Soc.Work Assist.	Soc.Wkr. Level 1	Soc.Wkr. Level 2	Soc.Wkr. Level 3	Senior Worker	Total Soc.Wkr. Respdts.	%
No	0	1	4	12	15	32	48.5
Yes	1	0	4	14	15	34	51.5
	1	1	8	26	30	66	100

'I don't see that social workers have any business to be part of the social life of deaf people unless invited. If hearing people run clubs for deaf people this is paternalism - it is still so evident' (appendix:6p:698).

This is reflected in the views of Lincoln deaf people, who did not think it necessary for the social workers with deaf people to be involved with the deaf clubs (appendix:5p:689f). In fact, only 18 (31%:58 replies) respondents spent any time on social/recreational work during the week prior to completing the questionnaire; none of these spent more than 11-15% of their time on it (table:50:p:193).

Small Group Work, Community Work And Informal Involvement With Deaf People

Respondents are expected to engage in small group work with deaf people (49:74.2%) (table:51:p:194) and to engage in informal work with deaf people through social activities (36:54.5%) and community work (38:57.6%) (tables:52 & 53 pp:195 & 196).

Whilst small group work might reasonably be regarded as part of a social worker's duties, it is debatable whether community work should be. However, bearing in mind that the role of the social worker with deaf people is under examination, it is of interest that respondents are divided almost equally about the need for them to do either job. Some respondents suggested

table 50

Social Worker Respondents: by grade and by the percentage of their time
spent on social/recreational activities with deaf people
during the week prior to completing the questionnaire

Social Worker Respondents

Percentage of time spent on social/ recreational activities	Soc.Work Assist.	Soc.Wkr. Level 1	Soc.Wkr. Level 2	Soc.Wkr. Level 3	Snr. Wkr.	Total Soc.Wkr. Respdts.	%
None	1	0	6	11	19	37	63.8
1 - 5%	0	0	1	3	2	6	10.3
6 - 10%	0	0	1	8	1	10	17.2
11 - 15%	0	0	0	0	1	1	1.7
16 - 20%	0	0	0	1	1	2	3.4
21 - 30%	0	0	0	1	1	2	3.4
31 - 50%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
51% +	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	1	0	8	24	25	58	100
Did not answer	0	1	0	2	5	8	
	1	1	8	26	30	66	

table 51

Social Worker Respondents: by grade and by whether or not they are
expected to undertake small group work with deaf people

Social Worker Respondents

Small group work	Soc.Work Assist.	Soc.Wkr. Level 1	Soc.Wkr. Level 2	Soc.Wkr. Level 3	Senior Worker	Total Soc.Wkr. Respondts.	%
No	1	1	2	5	8	17	25.8
Yes	0	0	6	21	22	49	74.2
	1	1	8	26	30	66	100

table 52

Social Worker Respondents: by grade and by whether or
not they are expected to undertake informal work with
deaf people through social activities

Social Worker Respondents

Informal work with deaf people	Soc.Work Assist.	Soc.Wkr. Level 1	Soc.Wkr. Level 2	Soc.Wkr. Level 3	Senior Worker	Total Soc.Wkr. Respondts	%
No	0	1	4	5	20	30	45.5
Yes	1	0	4	21	10	36	54.5
	1	1	8	26	30	66	100

table 53

Social Worker Respondents: by grade and by whether or not they are expected to undertake community work with deaf people

Social Worker Respondents

Community work with deaf people	Soc.Work Assist.	Soc.Wkr. Level 1	Soc.Wkr. Level 2	Soc.Wkr. Level 3	Senior Worker	Total Soc.Wkr. Respndts.	%
No	0	0	4	10	14	28	42.4
Yes	1	1	4	16	16	38	57.6
	1	1	8	26	30	66	100

that there should be community workers to act in a catalystic role in relation to the deaf community (appendix:6p:698).

Under a third of respondents did any small group work during the week prior to completing the questionnaire (table:54:p:198).

Getting To Know Deaf People Through Social Activities

Forty (60.6%) respondents expected to get to know deaf people through social activities (table:55 p:199). Deaf people are the potential clients of social workers with deaf people; but it is reasonable to ask how many "hearing" social workers would think it necessary to mix socially with "hearing" people in order to get to know them. There might be a special case to make for becoming known to deaf people whilst the social worker with deaf people is still the "all purpose" worker. The strength of the argument will diminish as the social work role gains definition and clarification.

Home Visiting

Fifty-four (81.8%) respondents expected to do home visiting and 39 (67.2%:58 replies) actually did some of this work during the week prior to completing the questionnaire (tables:56 & 57 pp:200 & 201). No details were asked about why they visited but the subject is mentioned by the Royal National Institute for the Deaf (p:125) in the list of activities for workers with deaf people, and three of the agencies surveyed about

table 54

Social Worker Respondents: by grade and by the percentage of their
time spent on small group work with deaf people during
the week prior to completing the questionnaire

Social Worker Respondents

Percentage of time spent on small group work	Soc.Work Assist.	Soc.Wkr. Level 1	Soc.Wkr. Level 2	Soc.Wkr. Level 3	Senior Worker	Total Soc.Wkr. Respndts.	%
None	0	0	6	14	20	40	69.0
1 - 5%	0	0	2	6	3	11	19.0
6 - 10%	0	0	0	2	1	3	5.2
11 - 15%	1	0	0	0	1	2	3.4
16 - 20%	0	0	0	2	0	2	3.4
21 - 30%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
31 - 50%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
51% +	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	1	0	8	24	25	58	100
Did not answer	0	1	0	2	5	8	
	1	1	8	26	30	66	

table 55
Social Worker Respondents, by grade and by whether or not they are expected
to undertake involvement with social activities in order to
become known to deaf people and to get to know them

Social Worker Respondents

Involvement with social activities	Soc.Work Assist.	Soc.Wkr. Level 1	Soc.Wkr. Level 2	Soc.Wkr. Level 3	Senior Worker	Total Soc.Wkr. Respndts.	%
No	0	1	3	5	17	26	39.4
Yes	1	0	5	21	13	40	60.6
	1	1	8	26	30	66	100

table 56
Social Worker Respondents: by grade and by whether they are
expected to undertake home visiting

Social Worker Respondents

Home visiting	Soc.Work Assist.	Soc.Wkr. Level 1	Soc.Wkr. Level 2	Soc.Wkr. Level 3	Senior Worker	Total Soc.Wkr. Respndts.	%
No	0	0	0	1	11	12	18.2
Yes	1	1	8	25	19	54	81.8
	1	1	8	26	30	66	100

table 57

Social Worker Respondents: by grade and by the percentage of
their time spent home visiting with deaf people
during the week prior to completing the questionnaire

Social Worker Respondents

Percentage of time on home visiting	Soc.Work Assist.	Soc.Wkr. Level 1	Soc.Wkr. Level 2	Soc.Wkr. Level 3	Senior Worker	Total Soc.Wkr. Respndts.	%
None	1	0	0	3	15	19	32.8
1 - 5%	0	0	0	2	1	3	5.2
6 - 10%	0	0	1	2	4	7	12.1
11 - 15%	0	0	0	2	1	3	5.2
16 - 20%	0	0	4	4	2	10	17.2
21 - 30%	0	0	1	6	1	8	13.8
32 - 50%	0	0	1	5	1	7	12.1
51% +	0	0	1	0	0	1	1.7
	1	0	8	24	25	58	100
Did not answer	0	1	0	2	5	8	
	1	1	8	26	30	66	

services also mentioned it (appendix:4p:680).

Gateshead Metropolitan Borough, in their report Social Work with the Deaf & Hard of Hearing (undated:about 1985:p:5) state, 'Visiting and Follow-up Services. This refers in particular to elderly housebound people, those in prison, long term hospital stay or receiving psychiatric care. People in these situations are extremely isolated and vulnerable and much liaison/educational work and regular visits are carried out by the social worker for the deaf'. It is likely that this area of work is closely bound to both casework/counselling and Sign Language interpreting.

Other Duties And Public Relations

Nearly all respondents (48:82.7%:58 replies) had no duties extra to those they were questioned on, surprisingly not even environmental aids (table:58:p:203). Over half, however, were involved with public relations (table:59:p:204). Although the details of this were not specified, it is likely that it involved giving talks about deafness, amongst other similar activities.

Summary

Respondents are predominantly formally qualified social workers and much of their work involves casework/counselling. Although they are not well qualified as Sign Language interpreters, they are nearly

table 58

Social Worker Respondents: by grade and by other duties at work

Social Worker Respondents

Other duties	Soc.Work Assist.	Soc.Wkr. Level 1	Soc.Wkr. Level 2	Soc.Wkr. Level 3	Senior Worker	Total Soc.Wkr. Respndts.	%
Aids to hearing	1	0	0	1	0	2	3.4
Transport of clients	0	0	0	1	0	1	1.7
Duty cover	0	0	0	1	0	1	1.7
Travelling	0	0	1	1	1	3	5.2
Life skills class	0	0	0	1	0	1	1.7
M.S.C.	0	0	0	0	1	1	1.7
Child care	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Communication class	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Further education	0	0	0	0	1	1	1.7
None	0	0	7	19	22	48	82.8
	1	0	8	24	25	58	100
Did not answer	0	1	0	2	5	8	
	1	1	8	26	30	66	

table 59

Social Worker Respondents: by grade and by the percentage
of their time spent on public relations during the
week prior to completing the questionnaire

Social Worker Respondents

Percentage of time spent on public relations	Soc.Work Assist.	Soc.Wkr. Level 1	Soc.Wkr. Level 2	Soc.Wkr. Level 3	Senior Worker	Total Soc.Wkr. Respndts.	%
None	0	0	6	12	9	27	46.6
1 - 5%	0	0	2	4	7	13	22.4
6 - 10%	1	0	0	3	5	9	15.5
11 - 15%	0	0	0	2	1	3	5.2
16 - 20%	0	0	0	2	2	4	6.9
21 - 30%	0	0	0	1	1	2	3.4
31 - 50%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
51% +	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	1	0	8	24	25	58	100
Did not answer	0	1	0	2	5	8	
	1	1	8	26	30	66	

all expected to act as interpreters. They are expected to be involved with the employment of deaf people, but change is evident here in that they generally work through the careers officers and disablement resettlement officers.

Change is also apparent in the area of social activities, with respondents less involved with this area of deaf people's lives, though half expected to act as community workers and to get to know deaf people through social activities. Respondents also did visiting, though it was probably associated with their casework duties.

Over half the respondents had public relations work to do but few had duties other than those they were questioned about.

Gateshead   Social Work with the Deaf and
Metropolitan   Hard of Hearing
Borough

   Gateshead Metropolitan Borough.   Typewritten.
   Unpublished, undated, about 1985

Gateshead
Metropolitan
Borough

Social Work with the Deaf and
Hard of Hearing

CONCLUSION TO PART I

It can be seen from this examination of the development of services to deaf people that they have a number of needs peculiar to their deafness. Their basic need is communication, and it is significant that although the schools for the deaf adopted an "oral" policy at an early stage (p:87), deaf children found it necessary to create Sign Language in order to satisfy the major need related to inter-personal communication, namely fellowship.

Deaf people came to the attention of "hearing" people originally because they were looking for meeting places (p:82). "Hearing" people helped them to find somewhere, but also preached the Gospel to them, took over the management of welfare services and installed themselves as "carers". Deaf and "hearing" people's ideas of the special needs of those who live in a "hearing" world, but cannot hear, are inextricably bound together from the start, and clearly they did not always coincide (p:88f). Thus two significant factors are apparent immediately; deaf people's need for fellowship, which cannot be met through social intercourse with "hearing" people, and "hearing" people's imposition of themselves as "carers" and spokesmen, based upon their own observation of deaf people's needs.

The practical everyday needs of deaf people
appear to be met (though those who provide the
services evidently think of deaf people as dependent
rather than independent citizens). The deaf clubs
provide a place to meet, and the social relationships
of deaf people are allowed to flourish in an
un-handicapped environment. Individual friendships
and marriages are contracted there, and opportunities
for group involvement, although inhibited by the
presence of the paid worker, usually a "hearing"
person, and the existence of management committees
composed of "hearing" people who know little about
deafness or deaf people (p:401), are available through
committee work and the organisation of sports and
social activities (appendix:2p:645f).

The Sign Language interpreter is seen to
be at the founding of the services (p:94), and this
is clearly a special need. The communication
intermediary features strongly in all aspects of
deaf people's lives which involve them with "hearing"
people.

Deaf people have the same need for economic
security as "hearing" people, and unlike some
physically disabled people are able to do manual
work. One of the original tasks of the paid worker
was that of advocate with employers. However, deaf
people are seen to be in low socio/economic categories

because of the restrictions imposed by their deafness at work (p:339f), and it is likely that this has been a factor in deaf people's poor public-image, and possibly a reason why "hearing" people saw them as objects of care.

Poor educational attainment is likely to have been a factor in deaf people losing control of the management of the deaf clubs (Ladd:Miles:1988:p:30) and their inability to rise above skilled manual occupations (social class IIIM). Deaf people needed help with management of the deaf clubs, and in finding jobs, and it is possible that the early workers did not see them as capable of greater attainment in either situation, so rather than educate and enable, they took over. Thus attitudes to deaf people were set by these early workers which were to influence the lives of deaf people until at least the 1970s.

It can be seen that deaf people are not involved in services to meet their needs. There is no research into the real life experience of deaf people, and there is no evidence of any dialogue with deaf people about their needs. All the evidence points to the fact that services are based upon the observation of need by "hearing" people. Thus services are on the welfare or social work/pathological model, in which deaf people feature

as the cared for. This is particularly evident in the various lists of services needed, which have been issued by the Royal National Institute for the Deaf and other organisations (p:124f).

The services can be seen to be a package of care, all provided by the same agency, and delivered by the all purpose worker. This means that deaf people do not have any choice. They have to go to the one person for all services, either directly, if they want social work help or work, or through an interpreter for going to the doctor, for example. Whatever services they want, unless they go alone the social worker with deaf people will be involved.

The professionalisation of the paid workers and the bureaucratisation of the services (p:118f) moved them from the Victorian model of charitable provision, to the more objective social work model, which, although it was an advance on Victorian paternalism, retained, unfortunately, the pathological element. At first there was little change, but it can now be seen that the combination of deaf people's advocacy of their own cause, the professional approach of the social workers with deaf people, and the general climate of change in the field of disability (p:396f), is forcing change upon "hearing" society's attitudes to deaf people, so that the idea of the

social model of deafness, although not strongly
evident in services at present, is at the centre
of the debate.

There does not appear to be any central
control of services to deaf people and the three
major national organisations, the British Deaf
Association, the Royal National Institute for the
Deaf and the National Deaf Children's Society
(although they come together with the British
Association of the Hard of Hearing on some issues),
all have their own unrelated policies. The Department
of Social Security, (previously the Department of
Health and Social Security) through its inspectorate,
might claim to perform a unifying role, but its main
report (ACSHIP:DHSS:1977) did no more than perpetuate
the social work-pathological model, and suggested
policies which were based upon that model (p:130).
Therefore services are developed piecemeal, as can
be seen from the survey of agencies (appendix:4
p:680f).

There is no legislation particularly for
deaf people and present services are based upon the
schemes prepared in response to Ministry of Health
circular 32/51 (p:113f). Services suggested after
that are all based upon the same model - the
stereotyped deaf person needing care.

Deaf people are marginal members of society

because of their difficulties of inter-personal communication, and it is suggested that the services which are delivered to them further marginalise them, by treating the problems deaf people present, without considering their underlying lack of independence. The policies, such as they are, are not inspired by any philosophy of deafness which has as its basis the independent, autonomous deaf person.

Finally, all the policies and services put the onus of responsibility upon deaf people to accommodate to "hearing" society. There is no suggestion that "hearing" people should accommodate to deafness. Present policies isolate deaf individuals and the deaf social group. It is suggested that a philosophy of deafness is needed which will be the basis for policies which put the onus upon "hearing" society to integrate deaf people into the community, whilst accepting their peculiar needs, which are manifest in the their sub-cultural adaptations.

Having considered the services provided to meet the special needs of deaf people, the everyday communication experiences of deaf people in "hearing" society will now be examined. This is particularly important in view of the fact that there is no face to face research with deaf people available at the present time, which relates to their communication

needs. Until these communication needs are properly

established it will not be possible to formulate

a philosophy of deafness, upon which realistic

policies can be based.

References

Ladd, Paddy   Chapter 2 in <u>Miles</u>, Dorothy
                               <u>British Sign Language.   A</u>
                               <u>Beginner's Guide</u>

          BBC Books, 1988, pp:27-43

<u>Advisory Committee</u>   <u>Report of a Sub-Committee</u>
<u>on Services for</u>   <u>Appointed to Consider the</u>
<u>Hearing Impaired</u>   <u>Role of Social Services in</u>
<u>People</u>   <u>the Care of the Deaf of all</u>
                               <u>Ages</u>

          Department of Health and Social Security, 1977

<u>Ministry of</u>   <u>Circular 32/51.   National</u>
<u>Health</u>   <u>Assistance Act 1948.   Welfare</u>
                               <u>Services for Handicapped</u>
                               <u>Persons other than the Blind</u>
                               <u>and Partially Sighted</u>

          H.M.S.O., 1951

PART II

DEAF-"HEARING" SOCIAL INTERCOURSE AND DEAF PEOPLE'S

SUB-CULTURAL ADAPTATIONS

INTRODUCTION TO PART II

Deaf people have no alternative to living
and working in "hearing" society, yet they are unable
to learn and exercise the method of communication
employed by "hearing" people. They live in "hearing"
families, at least for the earlier part of their
lives, have "hearing" neighbours and work with
"hearing" people. In "hearing" society it is
generally expected that people communicate with one
another by listening and speaking, and much of social
life takes place in groups.

Respondents' education at schools for the
deaf prepared them optimistically for participation
in "hearing" society, with a naive faith in
lipreading. This is exemplified by the remarks of
a headmaster of a school for the deaf
(Whyatt:1982:p:42): 'we don't wish our children to
be part of a sub-culture....able only to communicate
with other deaf children but to take part in the
life of the community. They can do this if they
lipread, not if they know only sign language'.

It is suggested (p:276f) that deaf people
need to make certain adaptations to life in "hearing"
society, because of the insuperable communication
difficulties with which they are faced. Therefore
questions were asked to ascertain how respondents

managed in communication situations in social life with "hearing" people, their parental families and at work.

In view of the fact that most respondents were deaf to conversation in most situations and had to rely upon lipreading to receive speech, attention is given to the possible difficulties of lipreading, and other factors which can inhibit fluent inter-personal communication between deaf and "hearing" people.

Respondents were asked if they felt "separated" or "excluded" from their families and fellow workers because of lack of communication. There is no sign for "exclude" so the sign used was "separate". It was clear that respondents had feelings of exclusion in their parental families and at work, though not so much in "hearing" social life, because in that area of their lives they could choose not to be involved, and of course they had an alternative, the deaf social group.

It is important that these feelings of separateness, or exclusion, be understood, because it then becomes clear how important the deaf social group is to respondents. The methodology of this study is designed to examine how certain groups of deaf people manage their lives in "hearing" society. The response highlights the largely negative feelings

deaf people have to mixing with "hearing" people; though it must be added that they are not shy of mixing. It does not, to the same extent, show deaf people's delight with the fellowship they enjoy within the deaf social group.

The adaptations which respondents make to life in "hearing" society are discussed. Sign Language is clearly the major force in their lives because it allows them fluent inter-personal communication with other Sign Language users. The deaf social group and the use of communication intermediaries are the natural consequences of this alternative form of communication.

Finally, the idea that because deaf people come together for their social life, they form a "community" with its own "culture" is discusssed.

References

Whyatt, David

'The Royal School for the Deaf'
Derbyshire Life and
Countryside
November 1982, pp:40-42

CHAPTER 10   'Impediments To Fluent Inter-Personal
             Communication Between Deaf And "Hearing"
             People'

        On the whole the deaf person will use speech
and lipreading with his parents and at work, according
to Kyle & Allsop (1982:pp:48 & 85). In fact it is likely
that they will use speech and lipreading generally with
"hearing" people (Jones:1982:p:202), though sometimes
supplemented by gesture. Writing is only occasionally
used. In all situations about which respondents were
questioned in the present study it was found that most
used speech and lipreading helped out by gesture. In
this section, therefore, lipreading is considered as
a means of receiving spoken communication.

        There are two elements to the possible
limitations of lipreading; the physical act of observing
or "reading" the lips and the language content of the
message. Respondents reported difficulties in following
conversation on "hearing" people's lips because, for
example, they spoke too quickly. In a number of cases
they also reported "hearing" people using "hard" or
"difficult" words. It is in this respect that the poor
English language attainment of some respondents militates
against fluent lipreading, in addition to the physical
limitations.

        Other impediments to fluent communication
between deaf and "hearing" people are also considered;

repetition, the poor speech of some respondents and eye contact.

Lipreading In Group Conversation With "Hearing" People

Lincoln Deaf Club Members were asked about group conversation with "hearing" people and forty-two (91.3%) said they could not follow anything that was said; a further three (6.5%) said they could only follow sometimes.

The problem is that lipreading is not omni-directional (Conrad:1979:p:177) therefore the respondents, concentrating as they must on one person's lips, will lose track of the conversation immediately another person starts speaking; by the time he has identified the new speaker, who may not be fully facing him, he will have missed the start of what was being said. If the new speaker has, in addition, changed the subject, the lipreader will have another problem to deal with. It is also likely that at times two or more speakers will "overlap", thus rendering lipreading extremely difficult, if not impossible (Jones:1982:p:232).

In a passage on lipreading in which he describes it as "inadequate", Higgins (1980:pp:157-158) suggests that group conversation is difficult for deaf people. He mentions sight lines from the deaf person to various potential speakers are not equally clear and if they were, such an arrangement would inhibit the inter-action; the difficulty of following the flow of conversation

from speaker to speaker; the difficulty of following
when several people are speaking at the same time.

It is noteworthy that most respondents were
either scornful or amused by the question about group
conversation, because it was so obvious to them that
lipreading was impossible in this situation.

Lipreading As An Acquired Skill

Lipreading is a skill which has to be learned,
so that 'the extent of its acquisition depends upon the
intelligence, natural aptitude and interest of the deaf
person involved. The success of its utility depends
not only upon the extent of skill acquired but upon the
manner in which the "hearing" person speaks to the
lipreader, the conditions of light and comfort and
irritants such as tobacco smoke' (Jones:1982:pp:230-231).

Physical Strain Of Lipreading

It also depends upon how the lipreader feels,
whether he has a headache, whether his eyesight is of
the necessary standard or whether he is tired or not.
One of the Lincoln Committee Members commented 'it would
be difficult to spend an evening with "hearing" friends,
tired to lipread in a short time'; and Paul Whittaker
(1986:p:7), writing of his undergraduate experiences
at Oxford University, says of lipreading; 'in lectures
I manage quite well, although I admit I try to get by
with going to the absolute minimum.... What people don't
always understand - and this very much applies to my

whole life, not just lectures - is that lipreading takes

so much out of you. For example, concentrating for three

hours, in three different lectures, is a strain on

anyone's mental resources. And when you have to lipread

everything, it's extremely hard work'. This strain will

be compounded by the fact that much of lipreading must

necessarily be guesswork (Jones:1982:p:224).

Lipreading Limited To Speech

Lipreading is limited to speech. There is

no birdsong, music, warning noises (Lysons:1978:p:89).

This means, of course that the deaf lipreader has no

conversational background, which would include the sounds

of reinforcement. The lipreader would not hear the

grunts, exclamations and laughter which people use to

encourage (or discourage) a speaker and to show that

they are still attentive (Jones:1982:p:224).

It is possible that this conversational handicap

is made worse by the fact that the deaf person, not fully

understanding the non-verbal part of "hearing"

conversation, will not employ these techniques himself.

This could apply to tone of voice, with the deaf person

not picking up messages contained in the "hearing"

person's tone of voice or inflection and himself not

able to use that technique either because of ignorance

of it, or inability to regulate his own voice

(Higgins:1980:p:159).

Lipreading Needs A Clear Sight Of The Speaker's Lips

It should go without saying that in order to lipread it is necessary for the deaf person to have a clear sight of the speaker's lips. This requires that the light should be on the speaker's face and that both participants have their faces on the same level. This is likely to rob the conversation of spontaneity at the onset and can also limit the non-verbal signals in how people space themselves in conversation and the degree of intimacy one or the other may wish to convey. Respondents commented that "hearing" people with beards made lipreading difficult, as well as the fact that some people moved their heads when speaking (table:60:p:230).

Lipreading Does Not Record Everything Said

Much of what a speaker says does not appear on the lips. Sutcliffe (1971:p:3) suggests that well over half of the consonants are ambiguous 'and as certain vowels cannot be distinguished from others, this means that some thousands of words can be misjudged or guessed wrongly'. In addition to this, many words are homopheneous, that is they share visual characteristics (Conrad:1979:p:199) and therefore need context to give them meaning. Higgins (1980:pp:157-158) writes that 'many speech sounds are indistinguishable on the lips' and gives /b/ and /p/ as examples.

Prefacing his passage on lipreading with the words 'the great drawback to lipreading is its

inexactness', Sutcliffe (undated:pp:6-7) explains how certain letters of the alphabet look alike on the lips but sound different; T, D and N; P, B, M; F and V; K, hard C and G; J, SH, CH, are all examples of this, making words such as Jews, shoes and choose look alike but differ greatly in meaning. Nolan & Tucker (1988:pp:192-193) write 'two-thirds of the sounds which make up the English language are either invisible or virtually ambiguous. Many are for instance greatly dependent on voicing and nasality for their intelligibility, features which are not visible, so that groups of sounds such as /p, b, m; t, d, n; s, z/ are liable to frequent confusion. Other consonants, /k, g, v/ are made far back in the mouth and are totally invisible'.

The Person Speaking Needs Skill In Speaking To A Lipreader

Respondents commented that "hearing" people were difficult to lipread (table:60:p:230). Some of the problems they experienced, words with different meanings looking alike, for example, are built into lipreading, but others could be lessened if some care was taken. Some deaf people do find that their communication with certain "hearing" people improves as they become familiar with each other (p:303f), possibly because the "hearing" person has taken the trouble to think the situation through.

Respondents also claimed that "hearing" people spoke too quickly (p:230). It is possible that this

is a difficulty because the average speaker makes about
13 articulatory noises in one second and the eye can
only pick up 8 or 9 such movements in the same space
of time (Lysons:1978:pp:88-89). This means that
respondents could be losing about a quarter of what
appears on the speaker's lips and it would be extremely
difficult to receive a message, bearing in mind the other
impediments to lipreading. One respondent commented
'talk with "hearing" difficult: at work talk slow, can
follow'; and another said 'pals at football say "he's
deaf, don't talk too fast"' (appendix:5p:691). In
addition to the difficulties involved in lipreading,
there are other impediments to fluent interpersonal
communication between deaf and "hearing" people.

Repetition

Some respondents stated that conversation with
"hearing" people contained much repetition which was
caused, no doubt, by the many difficulties involved with
lipreading mentioned above. It is not difficult to
envisage that constant repetition could lead to mutual
embarrassment and a swift end to the conversation.

Respondents' Speech Not Intelligible

It was also reported by some respondents that
"hearing" people did not understand their speech.
Certainly this is likely, bearing in mind that 30
(65.2%) of the Lincoln Deaf Club Members (table:10:p:63)
and 2 (22.2%) of Spalding respondents (table:17:p:65)

were assessed by the interviewer as having speech which
was not intelligible.

Eye Contact

Eye contact is important in conversation but
can perhaps cause "hearing" people embarrassment when
being stared at by a lipreader for any length of time
(Jones:1982:pp:223-224). This again can lead to lack
of ease on the part of deaf and "hearing" people and
inhibit fluent conversation. Higgins (1980:p:159) thinks
that this embarrassment caused by constant attention
on the face is because "hearing" people are not used
to continual eye contact in conversation.

Language And Lipreading

Jones (1982:pp:233-236) suggests that for those
deaf from early childhood, the matter of lipreading is
'vastly complicated' and he quotes Conrad (1979:p:200)
thus; 'a contingent aspect of the difficulty of lipreading
is linguistic. Hearing people first learn language by
hearing it, so making it available for speech
communication. Congenitally deaf people may have first
to learn language by lipreading it before it can be used
for communication; because lipreading is an extremely
difficult skill, relatively little language is learned,
greatly reducing its effectiveness as a communication
mode. Above all, had deaf children the knowledge,
redundancies of spoken language would permit guessing
to fill the gaps in visibility. Lipreading itself

apparently fails to provide this knowledge'.

To be able to lipread it is necessary to understand the language employed by the speaker. Thus the deaf person with a limited vocabulary and limited understanding of English grammar, is likely to experience difficulty when attempting to lipread English as it is generally spoken amongst "hearing" people. Jones (1982:p:234) writes that others, including H.Jones (1968:pp:VII & IX), Gorman (1960:p:202) and Sutcliffe (undated:p:14) also mention deaf people's lack of language. It is likely that at least those respondents with unintelligible speech will fall into the category described by Conrad.

A number of respondents, when describing their communication difficulties with "hearing" people, suggested that the "hearing" people used "hard" or difficult words (appendix:5p:687) and it is likely that they were also using phrases or grammatical constructions which respondents unfamiliar with English language would not be able to lipread. Conrad (1979:p:XI) writes 'most deaf children leave school massively disabled with respect to their ability to understand speech, to be understood when they speak or to comprehend meaning in everday language'.

In this respect, it is likely that those "hearing" people who "get used" to deaf people have learned that their deaf friends have restricted language

and organise their communication accordingly. Sutcliffe
is quoted by Jones (1982:p:234) as suggesting that
"hearing" people who talk to deaf people should speak
in the simplest possible terms in order to take into
account their limited knowledge of English language.
However, this can limit the content and consequent
enjoyment of conversation between deaf and "hearing"
people; as an elderly deaf person remarked to the present
writer, '"Hearing" talk short to deaf - boring'. This
is perhaps another reason why deaf people enjoy the
unimpeded communication of the deaf social group.

      This study has concentrated upon the reactions
of deaf people to those who can hear in certain social
situations. It is clear that "hearing" people react
in a number of ways to meeting deaf people in the same
situations, some negatively but others in a very positive
way. It is important, if deaf people are to become more
involved in "hearing" society, that these "hearing"
reactions are investigated. In particular the reasons
why few "hearing" people can use Sign Language with any
fluency.

Lincoln Deaf Respodents' Observations On Communication
With "Hearing" People

      Bearing in mind the discussion on lipreading
and other impediments to fluent communication between
deaf and "hearing" people, respondents' comments on the
inadequacies of their communication with "hearing" people

229

add strength to the suggestion that lipreading is a
thoroughly inadequate means of receiving spoken
communication.

table 60

Lincoln Committee Members: their difficulties when
communicating with "hearing" people

     %
1 (5.9) no difficulties
3 (17.6) difficulties at first
3 (17.6) "hearing" people speak too fast
3 (17.6) "hearing" people do not make a big enough
         mouth to lipread
1 (5.9) "hearing" people sometimes have beards
1 (5.9) "hearing" people move their heads
1 (5.9) "hearing" people shout
2 (11.8) respondents' speech is not understood
5 (29.4) conversation with "hearing" people is difficult
17 (100)
(Note: some of the 17 respondents gave more than one

answer.)

          As Miles (1988:p:7), a deaf person, rightly
says 'oral skills (speech and lipreading) are useful,
but in practice they are not easy to acquire nor can they
always be used effectively in real life situations'.
This view is supported by Nash & Nash (1981:pp:86-87)
who write that 'the deaf person can never completely hide
behind the skills of lipreading and speech production.
There are too many conditions of social interaction in
which overheard, out of sight conversations and subtle

non-verbal clues play an important role'.

Summary

As the majority of respondents are not able to hear spoken communication, they have to rely upon lipreading for the reception of speech. Lipreading in a group is very difficult, not so much because of the task of lipreading itself but because of locating the speaker, distance, context and over speaking.

However, even for one-to-one communication, the difficulties are considerable because of the inherent flaws in lipreading; it is an acquired skill, limited to speech and needing a clear sight of the speaker's lips. Many words or parts of words look alike but have different meanings.

The fact that a deaf person is lipreading can inhibit his reception of non-verbal communication clues and the constant repetition due to misunderstandings can possibly, because of the deaf person's poor speech ability, interfere with spontaneity of a conversation. Some respondents lack a knowledge of English language and this makes lipreading 'vastly complicated'.

Lipreading is the deaf person's only means of receiving spoken communuication but it is clearly not a reliable method. Just how unreliable it is, will be seen in the following sections, in which respondents' attempts to communicate with "hearing" people are examined.

References

Kyle, J.G.
&
Allsop, L.

Deaf People and the Community. Final Report to the Nuffield Foundation

Bristol University. Typewritten. Unpublished, 1982

Jones, K.

The Social Effects of Deafness from Birth or Early Childhood. A Study of the Adult Deaf Population of South Humberside

Typewritten. M.Phil. Thesis. Unpublished, 1982

Conrad, R.

The Deaf School Child

Harper and Row, 1979

Higgins, Paul C.

Outsiders in a Hearing World

Sage, 1980

Whittaker, Paul

'Paul Whittaker, Organist'
Soundbarrier
September 1986, (10) pp:7-8

Lysons, Kenneth

Your Hearing Loss and How to Cope with it

David and Charles, 1978

Sutcliffe, The Rev.
T.H. M.A.

Deafness - Let's Face It

Royal National Institute for the Deaf, 1971

Sutcliffe, The Rev.
T.H. M.A.

The Origins and Development of Missions to the Deaf and Dumb

Typewritten. Undated

Nolan, Michael
&
Tucker, Ivan G.

The Hearing Impaired Child and the Family

Souvenir Press (E&A) Ltd., 1988

Jones, Harry

Talking Hands. An Introduction to Sign Language

Stanley Paul and Co. Ltd., 1972

Gorman, Pierre
Patrick

Certain Social and Psychological
Difficulties Facing the Deaf Person
in the English Community

Typewritten. Ph.D. Thesis, 1960

Miles, Dorothy

British Sign Language. A
Beginner's Guide

BBC Books, 1988

Nash, Jeffrey E.
&
Nash, Anedith

Deafness in Society

Lexington Books, 1981

CHAPTER 11   'The Involvement Of Lincoln And Spalding
              Respondents In Social/Recreational
              Organisations And Activities With "Hearing"
              People'

        A distinction was made between membership of
"hearing" social/recreational organisations and attendance
at activities, in order to establish whether respondents
really belonged or were just peripheral members. It was
thought that membership or not of "hearing" committees
would be an important indication of deaf people's
integration in this area of their lives.

        Respondents' means of communication with
"hearing" people is examined and those who tried to join
"hearing" organisations give their reasons for withdrawing.

Respondents' Membership Of "Hearing" Social/Recreational
Organisations

        Less than half of Lincoln Deaf Club members
had joined "hearing" social/recreational organisations
(table:61:p:235) and when they did, they did not help
with the management through committee membership.

        None of the Spalding respondents belonged to
"hearing" social/recreational organisations and of those
who had hobbies, only one attended a class connected with
it; this respondent's hobby was "keep-fit".

        No respondents served on "hearing" committees;
this is of particular significance. A committee is a

table 61

Lincoln Deaf Club Members: their membership of "hearing" social/recreational organisations

%

29 (63.0) do not belong to any

13 (28.3) belong and attend weekly

 1 (2.2) belong and attend fortnightly

 2 (4.3) belong and attend sometimes

 1 (2.2) belong but do not attend
46(100)

table 62

The seventeen Lincoln Deaf Club Members who belong to "hearing" social/recreational organisations: the organisations to which they belong

%

9 (53.0) indoor games clubs (working men's clubs
        or public houses)

2 (11.8) Royal British Legion

1 (5.9) old people's club

1 (5.9) community centre

1 (5.9) cage bird society

3 (17.6) trades unions

2 (11.8) football clubs

1 (5.9) fishing club
17 (100)

(Note: some of the 17 respondents gave more than one answer.)

group and presumably even if a respondent was appointed, he would be unable to follow the business by lipreading. This is a situation in which a deaf person is denied opportunity; opportunity to be of service, exercise a skill, be a leader and to know that he has high esteem in the opinion of others. This sort of opportunity for psychological satisfaction is usually only open to respondents in the deaf social group, though the case of Richard Williams who served on the committee of his local community council (British Deaf Association:1987:p:22) demonstrates that Sign Language can give access to public service.

It can be seen from table 62 (p:235) that respondents tend to join organisations in which communication through speech is not essential, with the emphasis on sport and indoor games. Respondents were asked about their attendance at "hearing" social activities; a distinction being made between membership and attendance in order to establish whether respondents did more than visit the public house. In fact, the main recreational activity outside the deaf club was a visit to the public house or licensed social club.

It is interesting to note that respondents do not avoid social contact with "hearing" people (Kyle & Allsop:1982:p:67) and it is likely that they attend these activities because they have no choice, as there is no licensed bar at the Lincoln deaf club. For activities

table 63

Lincoln Deaf Club Members: their frequency of attendance at "hearing" social/recreational activities

%

19 (41.3) none

14 (30.4) attend weekly

 1 (2.2) attend less than weekly but at least once every two weeks

 5 (10.7) attend less than every two weeks but at least once a month.

 7 (15.2) attend sometimes

46 (100)

table 64

Lincoln Deaf Club Members who attend "hearing" social/recreational activities: the activities they attend:

%

23 (85.2) public house or working men's club

 1 (3.7) football

 1 (3.7) motorcycle and motor racing

 1 (3.7) day centre for the elderly

 1 (3.7) leisure centre - swimming

27 (100)

(Note: some of the 27 respondents gave more than one answer)

involving more intensive communication, respondents choose
to attend the deaf club (table:12:p:64).

Means Of Communication With "Hearing" People At
Social/Recreational Organisations

Lipreading and speech is the most likely form
of communication at these activities with "hearing" people,
though only the Lincoln Committee Members were asked about
this (table:65 below), of whom only 8 (47.1%) belonged.

table 65

Lincoln Committee Members Belonging to "Hearing"
Social/Recreational Organisations: their means of
communication with "hearing" people at these organisations

%
3 (37.5) speech and lipreading
3 (37.5) speech and lipreading: gesture and pointing
1 (12.5) speech and lipreading: gesture and pointing:
        writing
1 (12.5) asks another deaf person to speak for him
8 (100)

It can be seen that in these limited
communication situations, speech and lipreading, helped
out by gesture and perhaps writing, will suffice; but
it will also be clear to respondents and the "hearing"
people they meet at these activities, that their
communication abilities would not be up to committee
membership, though two respondents helped in other ways,
one as a steward at cage bird shows and another by baking
for refreshments at a sports club.

Respondents seem to know not to join "hearing" organisations and their comments on social activities with "hearing" people bear this out (appendix:5:p:690f). For example, respondents said 'in pub all talk, talk, talk: difficult for deaf to mix': 'talk, talk, talk; you can't follow if you're deaf': 'never tried to join, don't like on my own'. Commenting on being made to join a youth club by his mother, a respondent said 'mother pushed me. I know really - deaf'. Others said 'knew (I was) deaf, couldn't manage': 'not worth it: by (because of) my deafness.'

Withdrawal From "Hearing" Organisations

The few respondents who tried to join "hearing" organisations and later withdrew, all found that their ability to communicate was not sufficient for the sorts of organisations they aspired to, youth clubs and women's organisations, for example. It is noteworthy that these sorts of organisations are not those which respondents usually belonged to (table:62:p:235).

Only one Lincoln Committee Member joined a "hearing" organisation and later withdrew. At the first Women's Institute meeting she attended, someone wrote down the proceedings for her. She withdrew when it became clear that this was too much trouble and not a satisfactory way of keeping up with what was going on at such a communication intensive activity as this.

Five Spalding respondents had belonged to

"hearing" organisations and withdrawn. They made the
following comments:

1. Youth Club: 'I couldn't follow'

2. Youth Club: 'mother pushed me: I knew really - deaf'

3. Several Organisations: "hearing" people don't understand
don't know how to talk to the
deaf: too frightened to speak
to the deaf, move away.

4. Women's group: 'first meeting fine: then forgot
about me; talk,talk;talk'.

5. Royal British Legion: 'left when deaf snooker team
withdrew, no point in belonging:
can't join in talk'.

It is interesting that the respondent who tried
to join several organisations without success had some
hearing and intelligible speech. He had attended a school
for the deaf known for its oral only policy and it was
he who found deaf people difficult to communicate with
- in spite of the fact that he attended the Spalding deaf
club regularly. Nevertheless, he found deaf company less
frustrating than "hearing". His experience was that
"hearing" people just did not understand: they appeared
to him to be 'frightened' of conversing with deaf people
and not knowing how to speak to them, they moved away.
It is possible that this is a not uncommon experience,
as Kyle & Allsop (1982:p:67) suggest that "hearing" people
might avoid deaf people. However, this particular

respondent having some hearing and good speech and having
attended an "oral" school was probably a relative newcomer
to the deaf social group; it is possible that he had not
learned through the alternative socialisation process
experienced by pre-lingually deaf people, that deaf and
"hearing" people do not mix easily socially. As one
respondent put it 'never joined "hearing" club because
I'm deaf and I know how difficult it is: you can't follow
with a group'.

Accumulated Wisdom Of Deaf Culture

It is possible that there is an accumulated
wisdom about such things as marriage to other deaf people,
which is passed down through the deaf sub-culture: Jones
(1982:p:323) quotes the deaf woman who related how she
wanted to marry a particular "hearing" man, but eventually
married a deaf man 'because deaf and hearing do not mix'.
The respondent who persisted in trying to join "hearing"
organisations had to learn the hard way, whereas those
who are socialised as "deaf" adapt to their deafness,
developing a realistic acceptance of their deaf identity
without a deep sense of loss (Jones:1982:pp:354-355);
and Schein is quoted by Rodda (1982:p:126) as stating
that 'deaf children need to be taught to be deaf'.

The Need For Access To Mainstream Services Through
Sign Language

However, this does not mean that deaf people
are not aware of what they are missing through lack of

access to parts of the "hearing" world; and it is this awareness which is the cause of present day agitation by deaf people for access to mainstream "hearing" services through Sign Language (British Deaf Association:1987). The call for the use of Sign Language demonstrates the acceptance; the call for access to services shows the awareness of being left out. The "oralist" suggestion that deaf people should seek integration through speech and lipreading (W.Lynas 1986) is rejected by the deaf "community" (British Deaf Association:1985) and it is not difficult to understand their reasoning after examination of their communication experiences with "hearing" people (table:60p:230). As Rodda (1982:p:144) has said 'integration will not occur simply because of proximity'; and Seidel (1982:p:137) suggests that 'the existence of deaf people as individuals and as organised communities, challenges the validity of the oralist assumption'.

Summary

Generally, respondents do not join "hearing" social/recreational organisations and those who do so do not take any part in their management, presumably because their communication abilities would not be sufficient within a group such as a committee. Those respondents who attend "hearing" social/recreational activities confine themselves in most cases to the public

house or licensed social club. Significantly, they do not attend "hearing" activities which require any serious level of communication.

The means of communication employed is speech and lipreading, helped out in some cases by gesture and occasionally by writing.

Few respondents had withdrawn from "hearing" organisations, mainly because few had joined in the first place. Their comments made it clear that poor communication resulted in their withdrawal. It is thought that one reason why respondents did not join "hearing" organisations was because they had learned through the deaf "culture" at an early age that this sort of organisation would not suit their communication needs.

References

The British Deaf
Association

BSL - Britain's Fourth Language.
The Case for Official Recognition
for British Sign Language

Pamphlet. The British Deaf Association, 1987

Kyle, J.G. and
Allsop, L.

Deaf People and the Community.
Final Report to the Nuffield
Foundation

Bristol University. Typewritten. Unpublished, 1982

Jones, K.

The Social Effects of Deafness from
Birth or Early Childhood. A Study
of the Adult Deaf Population of
South Humberside

Typewritten. M.Phil. Thesis. Unpublished, 1982

Rodda, Michael

'An Analysis of the Myth that
Mainstreaming and Integration
are Synonymous' Chapter 5 in
Boros Alexander and Stuckless
Ross (Eds.) Social Aspects of
Deafness Volume 6

Conference: Sociology of Deafness, Gallaudet College,
Washington, 1982, pp:121-149

Lynas, Wendy

Integrating the Handicapped into
Ordinary Schools. A Study of Hearing
Impaired Pupils

Croom Helm, 1986

The British Deaf
Association

Raise the Standard. The Case for
Improving Deaf Children's Education

The British Deaf Association, 1985

Siedel, John V.

'The Points at which Deaf and Hearing
Worlds Intersect; a Dialectical
Analysis' in Higgins Paul and Nash
Jeff (Eds.) Social Aspects of
Deafness Volume 3

Conference: Sociology of Deafness, Gallaudet College,
Washington, 1982, pp:131-167

CHAPTER 12   'Lincoln and Spalding Respondents'

Friendships With "Hearing" People'

In groups with "hearing" people, respondents
find conversation impossible, or so difficult that they
take little part in the social life of "hearing" society
which requires intensive inter-personal communication
(p:234). The situation with individual friendships is
only slightly better.

Respondents were asked about their friendships
with "hearing" people; how they communicated and whether
they went out socially with them. It was known that deaf
people make close friendships and marriages within the
deaf social groups and respondents were asked whether
they had more deaf or "hearing" friends and with whom
they communicated more easily.

The difficulties involved in making friends
with "hearing" people are also considered in this
section, as well as the quality of friendships, taking
into account the hazards of lipreading spoken
conversation and lack of a shared cultural background
between deaf and "hearing" people.

It was found that Lincoln Deaf Club Members
had more deaf than "hearing" friends (table:66p:246)
and just over 85% found their deaf friends easier to
communicate with (p:246). Sainsbury (1986:p:218) in
her study 'Deaf Worlds' observes that deaf people's

friendships were more common 'with the deaf than with the hearing'.

table 66
Lincoln Deaf Club members: whether they have more deaf or "hearing" friends

	%	
31	(67.4)	more deaf than "hearing" friends
7	(15.2)	more "hearing" friends
8	(17.4)	about the same number of deaf and "hearing" friends
46	(100)	

Asked whether they found their deaf or "hearing" friends easier to communicate with, the majority of respondents (38 out of 44:86.4%) said 'deaf friends' and only one (2.5%) said the "hearing". Five (11.4%) respondents thought there was no difference between the two.

<u>Means Of Communication With "Hearing" Friends</u>

The means of communication with "hearing" friends in most cases was speech and lipreading, helped out occasionally with writing or gesture. In a small number of cases writing or gesture or a combination of the two were used without speech and lipreading. (table:67p:247).

table 67

Members of Lincoln Deaf Club: their means of
communication with "hearing" friends and neighbours

	%	
23	(53.5)	speech and lipreading
6	(14.0)	speech and lipreading; writing
9	(21.9)	speech and lipreading; gesture
2	(4.7)	writing
1	(2.3)	gesture
2	(4.7)	writing and gesture
43	(100)	3 did not answer

Frequency Of Going Out Socially With "Hearing" Friends

        The forty-six Lincoln Deaf Club Members

generally did not go out socially with hearing friends.

Thirty (66.7%) did not go out with them at all, whilst

four (8.9%) went out weekly,3 (6.7%) monthly and 8

(17.8%) annually or sometimes (45 answered the question).

Closeness Of Friendships With "Hearing" People

        Kyle & Allsop (1982:p:62) state that

respondents in the Avon study had little contact with

their "hearing" neighbours and some of the contact was

just acknowledgement. Jones (1982:p:165) found a similar

situation in South Humberside in relation to friends,

with only 9.6% of respondents in Grimsby and 15.1% in

Scunthorpe having more "hearing" than deaf friends.

Jones (1982:p:150) agrees about acknowledgement and

quotes a respondent as saying 'the hearing just say

"hello" and wave' and another, who had more "hearing"

than deaf friends commented 'but I go out one evening
with two deaf friends - we can Sign', indicating that,
because of the ease of communication, deaf friends were
special. In the present study, one respondent said
'have "hearing" friends: only "hello, hello"'; another
said 'people at work friendly, but not close'.

Jones (1982:pp:179-180) discusses the
difference between "friends" and being "friendly" and
suggests that South Humberside respondents are "friendly"
with "hearing" people and reserve "friendship" for deaf
people with whom they have ease of communication.
It might appear from the answers respondents give that
"hearing" people are being stereotyped in their reactions
to deaf people in social situations. As has already
been pointed out in the introduction to part 11, the
methodology was designed with deaf people's reactions
in mind, so "hearing" people's genuine attempts at
friendship are probably minimised, whilst the crucial
importance of the deaf-deaf social relationship is not
sufficiently emphasised.

Nonetheless, the overall impression is that
respondents are not equipped to communicate fluently
with most "hearing" people they meet and that friendship,
which carries a relationship into deeper conversational
waters, is difficult between deaf and "hearing" people.
It might be reasonable to add that most "hearing" people

are not equipped to communicate fluently with deaf people.

Home Visits Between Deaf And "Hearing" People

Despite the lack of fluent inter-personal communication, respondents appear to value the relationships they have with "hearing" people; and it is clear that they do not particularly avoid meeting "hearing" people in intimate "friendly" situations. In the present study, for instance, 4 (44.4%) of Spalding respondents had visited the homes of "hearing" friends in the 6 months prior to interview and within the month prior to interview 4 (44.4%) had had "hearing" friends to their own homes.

table 68

Spalding respondents: their last visit to the home of "hearing" friends

%

5 (55.6) none

1 (11.1) within the last month

2 (22.2) more than a month ago, but within the last 3 months

1 (11.1) more than 3 months ago, but within the last 6 months
_____
9 (100)

Kyle & Allsop (1982:p:67) state 'deaf people do not feel particularly shy of communication difficulty' and it is clear that almost half of Spalding respondents do not avoid the relatively intimate contact of home visits to and from "hearing" friends. As one respondent

said 'we can learn from each other: she (the "hearing" friend) can learn about deaf: deaf world is small, I like to meet outside deaf world: "hearing" friends keep me going'. A Lincoln Committee Member said 'but I have a lot of hearing friends: very nice people: known the lady next door 25 years: good friend'.

Difficulties Of Communication Limit Friendship

When Lincoln Committee Members were asked whether their closest friends were deaf or "hearing", three-quarters (13: 76.5%) replied "deaf" and the reason they gave was ease of communication. Only 3 (17.6%) said "hearing" and one (5.9%) said they could not choose between their deaf or "hearing" friends.

From table 69 (p:251) it can be seen that two-thirds (11: 64.7%) of respondents find it difficult to make friends with "hearing" people and their reasons all involve communication.

table 69

Lincoln committee members: whether they find it difficult to make friends with "hearing" people and if so, the reasons

```
          %
    5 (29.4) not difficult
    1 ( 5.9) difficult at first
    8 (47.1) difficult because of communication
    1 ( 5.9) difficult because hearing are doubtful
             about talking to deaf people
    1 ( 5.9) difficult because "hearing" are impatient
             with deaf people
    1 ( 5.9) difficult because communication in a
    _____ group is difficult
   17 (100)
```

Jones (1982:pp:270-226) discusses the quality of South Humberside respondents inter-personal communication with "hearing" people and starts by stating that though they do associate with "hearing" people, he questions the quality of their inter-action because of the communication difficulties. An indication of the poor quality of this inter-action is given by the fact that in areas of activity where respondents have choice (social activities, friendship, marriage) they prefer deaf people who use Sign Language. This state of affairs is true of respondents in the present study and Kyle & Allsop (1982:p:49) make a similar observation; 'the conclusion must be', they write, 'that speech predominates in the parental home simply because parents choose not to learn Sign but given the choice, deaf

people marry other deaf people and use Sign Language'.

Jones (1982:p:221) suggests that deaf people are likely to have difficulty making friends with "hearing" people, because the need to lipread and the difficulties inherent in lipreading will inhibit fluent inter-personal communication, by altering the flow of non-verbal communication normally expected between two people in conversation, and perhaps inhibiting or embarrassing the "hearing" person. He writes (1982:p:222) that in the formation of a relationship, the first meeting is important, with the exchange of non-verbal information particularly so, and anything which inhibits the free exchange of spoken and non-spoken information, including embarrassment, is likely to restrict the embryo relationship; it is unlikely to develop because of the difficulties of exchanging more complex information, should the problems of the first meeting be overcome.

There is also the question of cultural background (Jones:1982:p:223) to be considered in connection with friendships between deaf and "hearing" people, as it is known that two people in a conversation 'need to use words in the same way' (Argyle:1969:p:75). This is a problem met by respondents in the present study as they comment in a number of instances that "hearing" people use "hard" or "difficult" words; therefore it is likely that respondents' poor

understanding of English language will be an added factor in their difficulties in making friends with "hearing" people.

Sainsbury (1986:p:218) writes 'only a minority of deaf people achieved a position of parity in their relationship with hearing friends....and often would secure little even in the way of explanation of a small part of the conversational exchanges between the hearing.....'. This appears to be the case with respondents in the present study, though it is clear that within the framework of their limited ability to communicate with "hearing" people, they are not fearful of approaching them in a friendly manner.

It is noticeable in the two areas already discussed, social/recreational and friendship, that respondents have alternatives to "hearing" society (the deaf social group) in which they can operate as "normal" people, that is, without handicap; because with Sign Language as the accepted means of communication there is no impediment to the interchange of thoughts and ideas.

Summary

The majority of respondents have more deaf than "hearing" friends and they find communication with their deaf friends easier, the reason for this being that with "hearing" friends their main form of

communication is lipreading and speech, whilst among deaf people they use Sign Language. Going out socially with "hearing" friends was not common amongst respondents and it is likely that many deaf-"hearing" friendships are at a simple acknowledgement level. However, deaf people value their contacts with "hearing" people and in Spalding at least, deaf and "hearing" people exchanged home visits.

The reasons for difficulties in making friends with "hearing" people all centred round communication, though it is possible that lack of a mutually understood cultural background might be a contributory factor. Nevertheless, whatever the communication difficulties, it is evident that deaf people are not shy of approaching "hearing" people in a friendly manner. In some cases, respondents found it possible to have a particular "hearing" friend - probably someone who had made a special effort to communicate.

It can be seen that where deaf people have choice, they choose deaf friends because of ease of communication. The negative element in communication with "hearing" people is vividly evident here and the flawed nature of lipreading as a means of receiving spoken communication cannot be over-emphasised. However good the lipreader, they will have difficulty conversing with "hearing" people.

References

Sainsbury, Sally   <u>Deaf Worlds. A Study of
Integration, Segregation and
Disability</u>

     Hutchinson, 1986

Kyle, J.G.   <u>Deaf People and the Community.
&   Final Report to the Nuffield</u>
Allsop, L.   <u>Foundation</u>

     Bristol University. Typewritten. Unpublished, 1982

Jones, K   <u>The Social Effects of Deafness
from Birth or Early Childhood.
A Study of the Adult Deaf
Population of South Humberside</u>

     Typewritten. M.Phil. Thesis. Unpublished, 1982

Argyle, M.   <u>Social Interaction</u>

     Methuen, 1969

CHAPTER 13   'Lincoln Respondents' Inter-Personal

               Communication With Their Parental Families'

        It is noticeable in the two areas of respondents'
lives already discussed, social/recreational and
friendship, that they have alternatives within the deaf
social group in which they can operate as un-handicapped
people. With Sign Langauage as the accepted means of
communication, there is no impediment to the interchange
of thoughts and ideas. There is no alternative to their
parental families, however, and if the social interchanges
are unsatisfactory, respondents must accept this as a
flawed part of their lives. Respondents were questioned
about their parental families, not their married family
because it was known that all those married were married
to deaf people with whom there was no communication barrier
(table:7p:62)

        Communication within the deaf person's
parental family is important to his self-esteem and
self-picture and it is noted that when deaf people
eventually marry, they choose to have a marriage with
a Sign Language communication environment (table:7p:62).
Questions were asked about their means of communication
within their parental families, how they found out what
was going on at family social events and if they felt
separated in any way from their families.

Communication In The Parental Family

Kyle & Allsop (1982:p:48) found in Avon that speech and lipreading predominated as the means of communication in the parental homes of deaf people and Jones (1982:pp:208-209) found the same in South Humberside. The situation is similar in the present study.

table 70
Lincoln Deaf Club Members: how they communicate with their parents

	%	
24	(61.5)	speech and lipreading
10	(25.6)	speech and lipreading: gesture
3	(7.7)	speech and lipreading: Sign Language
1	(2.6)	speech and lipreading: writing
1	(2.6)	writing
39	(100)	7 did not answer

It appears that those who cannot hear spoken conversation have to rely upon lipreading for communication with their families (except in a few cases where family members, usually brothers and sisters, are deaf or can sign), though in some cases this is supplemented with writing, gesture and in three cases, Sign Language.

It is interesting that parents do not learn Sign Language (Kyle & Allsop:1982:p:49); although no specific questions were asked about parents ability to use Sign Language, it is clear from table 70 (p:257)

that few have this ability. It is also evident that
respondents do not find communication with their parental
families satisfactory.

Inadequate Communication As A Cause Of Separation Or
Exclusion From The Parental Family

Lincoln Committee Members were asked whether
they thought they could communicate fluently with their
families and whether they felt separated, excluded or
"left out" of their families because of poor communication.
Six (35.3%) thought they could communicate well with them
but of these only two (11.8%) said so without
qualification; one (5.9%) said they could communicate
well only with individual family members and three (17.6%)
thought that although they could communicate well with
their parental families, they were excluded or "left out"
because of their deafness. It is possible that these
respondents were thinking that communication with their
family was good compared to that with other "hearing"
people.

However, two-thirds (11: 64.7%) of respondents
thought they could not communicate fluently with their
families and four (23.5%) of these said they had feelings
of "separateness" because of this and were excluded from
family events, even though they were actually there at
the event. Nevertheless, they do try to find out what
is going on at family events, sometimes without success.
Half (53%) of the Lincoln Committee Members said they

258

could not follow what went on at family events, whilst

the others had a variety of ways of finding out.

Means Of Finding Out What Goes On At Family Events

table 71

Lincoln Committee Members: how they get to know what is
going on at family events such as weddings and family
parties

%

9 (53.0) cannot follow

2 (11.8) watch lips

3 (17.6) family will tell me
1 (5.9) follow book of service
1 (5.9) can hear - get to front
1 (5.9) partly with lipreading: ask
17 (100)

A family event seems likely to be a very

frustrating occasion for respondents, though they nearly

all have someone who will keep them in touch, in this

case a member of the family (table:72p:260).

However good the intermediary as an interpreter,

this cannot be a satisfactory solution for direct

participation in the ebb and flow of general conversation

and family gossip, which is an essential part of family

events and is likely to lower the self-esteem of

respondents who find themselves in a situation in which

they are handicapped. So it is natural that they should

feel separated from their parental families because of

lack of adequate communication (p:258), particularly as

the intermediary will not always relate events as they

are happening, resulting in the respondent not only getting

his information second hand, but late as well, probably

so late that he cannot be part of the transaction. One

respondent commented 'always with my daughter: I won't

go on my own: but she won't tell me what priest saying:

left out of this: when it's all over she tells me all

about it'. This respondent said that he managed well

one-to-one.

table 72

Lincoln Committee Members: whether "hearing" people tell
respondents what is going on at family events: if so,
who this is

	%	
3	(18.8)	no-one
5	(31.3)	sister
1	(6.3)	brother
1	(6.3)	not specified
1	(6.3)	mother
1	(6.3)	father
3	(18.8)	daughter
1	(6.3)	they all help
16	(100)	1 not applicable

Frustrations In Communication Lead To Withdrawal From Conversation At Family Events

Respondents' comments illustrate their

frustrations in the parental family situation:

1.'Uncle comes and talks with father: leaves me alone:

and family leave me alone'

2.'Cannot understand mother: sister signs for me'.

3.'They ("hearing" family) are afraid of the deaf'.

4.'They say "I'll tell you after": then two hour film in five minutes'.

5.'Three sisters they talk to each other: I'm left out: sisters don't come here, only for a reason'.

6. 'I can't understand in groups: shame myself for deaf'.

Therefore it comes as no surprise that 15 (88.2%) Lincoln Committee Members said that they withdrew from face-to-face communication at family events, preferring to keep in touch through "reported" information from a special person. One of the two who did not withdraw could hear enough to know what was going on and the other had a number of deaf relatives and they always got together at family gatherings. These two respondents' ability to be part of their families brings into sharp relief the plight of those who are so frustrated by their lack of communication that they have to withdraw.

Passing As "Hearing"

table 73

Lincoln Committee Members: whether they pretend they can follow what is going on at family events:

	%	
6	(37.5)	yes: they pretend they can follow
3	(18.8)	yes: sometimes
7	(43.8)	no: they do not pretend they can follow
16	(100)	1 not applicable

It is interesting that some respondents attempt
to "pass", that is they pretend to follow what is going
on, usually by laughing when other people do so. At
a wedding attended by several deaf people, the brother
of the bride, sitting prominently at the top table at
the reception, was seen by the present writer to laugh
with everyone else, even though he could not hear speech
and could not have known what was being said in the
formal speeches.

In his chapter on 'Encounters with the Hearing',
Higgins (1980:p:156) calls this 'pretense' and writes
'some deaf individuals pretend that they understand the
speaker's talk. The deaf smile in agreement and the
speaker may proceed unthinking'.

Nash & Nash (1981:pp:80-81) agree that this
is something deaf people do, calling the practice an
"adaptation". They say '....one adaptation to the
potential stigmatization of not hearing is to assume
an attitude in which one tries to behave as if he or
she can hear. The person thinks ahead about the nature
of interaction, guesses what a hearing person would
do or say and then acts on the basis of these guesses'.

Summary

Speech and lipreading predominate in the parental
families of respondents. They clearly do not find

communication satisfactory, feeling a sense of separation or exclusion because of the lack of fluent communication. In order to find out what is going on at family events, respondents use another family member as an intermediary but this, although helpful, has its limitations. Much of the time they withdraw from face-to-face communication, sometimes even pretending they could follow, perhaps because to draw attention to their exclusion, or to appear bored because they could not follow what was going on around them, might appear impolite, or cause embarrassment to "hearing" members of the family.

Lipreading is again seen as a poor vehicle for spoken communication and the parental family life of respondents, as expressed in their comments, appears to be full of frustrations.

References

Kyle, J.G.
&
Allsop, L.

Deaf People and the Community.
Final Report to the Nuffield
Foundation

    Bristol University. Typewritten. Unpublished, 1982

Jones, K.

The Social Effects of Deafness
from Birth or Early Childhood.
A Study of the Adult Deaf
Population of South Humberside

    Typewritten. M.Phil. Thesis. Unpublished, 1982

Higgins, Paul C.

Outsiders in a Hearing World

    Sage, 1980

Nash, Jeffrey E.
&
Nash, Anedith

Deafness in Society

    Lexington Books, 1981

CHAPTER 14   'Lincoln Respondents' Inter-personal

            Communication at Work'

        As in their parental family lives, respondents

have no alternative to the communication methods used

at work, so they must make do with the situation as it

is.

        It has already been noted that male respondents

were nearly all in the social class III manual or below

(table:11p:64). For the purpose of this section, all

respondents (male and female) who were working or had

worked, were questioned about their communication with

"hearing" people at work.

        Questions were asked about communication methods

and whether respondents used a "hearing" intermediary,

as they did in their parental families. Evidence of

problems at work was looked for and whether deafness stood

in the way of respondents' promotion prospects.

        Respondents were asked about being part of the

group at rest periods and dinner breaks and whether they

felt separated from their fellow workers because of limited

communication.

The Means Of Communication And Difficulties Encountered

At Work

        Once again it can be seen that respondents have

no alternative to speech and lipreading, which they

supplement with gesture, for communication with "hearing"

                            265

people, in this case, at work (table:74:below). As in the family, they make use of a "special" person to act as their communication intermediary (table:75:below).

table 74

Lincoln Deaf Club Members: those who were working or had worked: their means of communication at work

%

13 (38.2) speech and lipreading
10 (29.4) speech and lipreading: writing
 8 (23.5) speech and lipreading: gesture
 2 (5.9) speech and lipreading: gesture: writing
 1 (2.9) writing
34 (100)   3 did not answer
               9 not applicable

table 75

Lincoln Deaf Club Members: those who were working or had worked: whether they had a special "hearing" person to help them to communicate at work:

%

27 (75.0) yes
 1 (2.8) a partially deaf man helped with communication
 8 (22.2) no
36 (100)   1 did not answer
               9 not applicable

Respondents apparently did not have many problems at work. Their face-to-face communication was not always sufficient but evidently whatever communication problems arose were dealt with adequately by their special person. Lincoln Deaf Club Members were asked if they had ever

had a problem requiring the intervention of the social worker with deaf people; the majority, thirty-two (86.5%), said they had never had this sort of problem at work, whilst three (8.1%) said they needed the social worker with deaf people to help explain the job and two (5.4%) needed help when they were in dispute with their employer.

Following this up, Lincoln Committee Members were asked if their deafness caused difficulties for them at work. Three quarters of those who answered replied that they managed alright in spite of their deafness. In their Avon study, Kyle & Allsop (1982:pp:40-41) found that 71% of respondents questioned were happy with their jobs, though this compares with 80% of "hearing" people also questioned by them.

Respondents appear to have a positive attitude to work, in spite of communication difficulties and this is reflected by the deaf population in Avon where Kyle & Allsop (1982:p:42) write that their respondents positively rejected the suggestion that deaf people cannot work with "hearing" people.

table 76

Lincoln Committee Members: whether respondents' deafness made it difficult for them at work and if so, the reasons

	%	
8	(50.0)	no difficulties
2	(12.5)	no difficulties: because get used to the "hearing".
1	(6.3)	no difficulties because work with deaf clients
1	(6.3)	no difficulties because boss can fingerspell
3	(18.8)	difficulties: because of communication.
1	(6.3)	difficulties: because choice of work restricted
16	(100%)	1 did not answer

However, respondents seemed to be aware of limitations at work caused by their deafness, with over half thinking that they are unlikely to be promoted because of their communication difficulties(table:77p:269). This is probably a common experience: Kyle & Allsop (1982:p:41) found that there were few deaf people in supervisory roles in Avon, whilst Jones (1982:p:66) observed that South Humberside respondents had jobs which did not take them beyond social class III Manual and did not offer them supervisory status. Sainsbury (1986:p:57) points out that as many as 69% of her deaf population were, or had been, unskilled manual workers and concluded that in social

268

class terms the experience of deaf people differed

substantially from the population in general.

table 77

Lincoln Committee Members: whether they thought they could

be manager or foreman at work and if not, the reasons

```
       %
 9 (56.3) no: because of communication
 1 ( 6.3) no: don't want to be
 3 (18.8) perhaps: doubtful because of communication
 1 ( 6.3) perhaps: could be foreman, not manager
          because of communicatiion
 1 ( 6.3) yes: was a foreman
 1 ( 6.3) yes: no reason given
16 (100)          1 did not answer
```

Trade Union Membership And Attendance At Meetings

Eight out of seventeen Lincoln Committee Members

belonged to trades unions but five (62.5%) said they did

not attend because of lack of communication and two (25%)

although they attended, could not follow the proceedings.

The question to be asked here is 'why did they not ask

for an interpreter?' It is likely that they were not

aware that the social worker with deaf people would be

willing to interpret at this sort of event, perhaps because

of the time involved. It is interesting to note (British

Deaf News:1989:p:8) that the British Deaf Association

is now organising course for deaf people on 'How to Use

an Interpreter'. The trade union movement, political

meetings and similar situations are where deaf people

lack access and fail to gain information. What is more
(and this point is often ignored) they have a point of
view and a contribution to make which is lost without
an interpreter.

Communication At Dinner Breaks And Rest Periods

Finally, respondents were asked how they managed
to communicate with fellow workers at dinner breaks and
rest periods. Again, they did not avoid social contact
with "hearing" people (Kyle & Allsop:1982:p:67); they
generally sat with their fellow workers but once more
lipreading was an inadequate means of communication.

Respondents found that their fellow workers,
in common with other "hearing" people, spoke too quickly,
used difficult words and were generally difficult to
communicate with in a group; so they did other things
such as reading the newspaper, just sitting, joining in
the card games which require little communication, or
finding some individual to talk to. One respondent said
that the "hearing" tried to keep him in with what was
going on and would write down jokes for him.

It has already been observed that respondents
are not shy of mixing with "hearing" people (p:249). This
is also true of Lincoln Committee Members at work; fifteen
out of 16 (93.75%) sat with their fellow workers during
rest times and dinner breaks (one worked alone), though
only one claimed to properly follow what was being said
and he used a hearing aid.

Over half (9: 60%) of those who sat with the other workers could not follow what was going on in the conversation and the other 5 (33.3%) could only "partly" follow. Three of the respondents who could "partly" follow used a mixture of lipreading, writing and gesture, one relied on fellow workers to tell him what was going on and another said 'sometimes easy, sometimes difficult'.

The reasons respondents give for not being able to properly follow what is being said at rest times and dinner breaks at work are similar to those when in any sort of conversation with "hearing" people (table:60p:230).

table 78

Lincoln Committee Members: reasons why they could not properly understand what the "hearing" were talking about at dinner breaks and rest periods at work

	%	
1	(10.0)	because of difficult words
4	(40.0)	because too quick speech
5	(50.0)	because cannot follow in a group
10	(100)	7 did not answer

Clearly, most respondents (10: 83.3%) withdrew from the communication situation as they had done from parental family events (p:261), as table 79 (p:272) shows. Unfortunately, unlike their social/recreational lives, and in their choice of friends and marriage partners, where they can substitute deaf for "hearing", there is no alternative to the communication situation in the parental family or at work, so respondents have to accommodate as well as they can.

table 79

Lincoln Committee Members: what they do when the "hearing" are talking at dinner breaks and rest times at work

%

6	(50.0)	read newspaper
1	(8.3)	join in cards
1	(8.3)	watch them to try to find out what they say
2	(16.7)	sit on own
1	(8.3)	talk with deaf brother
1	(8.3)	find someone else to talk to on their own
12	(100)	1 not applicable
		4 did not answer

Respondents' Feelings Of Separation Or Exclusion Due To Poor Communication At Work

table 80

Lincoln Committee Members: whether they feel separated from the "hearing" at work because of lack of fluent communication

%

7	(43.8)	do not feel separated from fellow workers
7	(43.8)	feel separated from fellow workers
2	(12.5)	sometimes feel separated from fellow workers
16	(100)	1 not applicable

It was found in the Avon study (Kyle & Allsop: 1982:p:32) that 82% of deaf men respondents were unlikely to be involved in discussions at work; about half of the Lincoln Committee Members said they felt left out at work. One respondent commented 'boss talk to all: I wait: one

man write down tell me after: feel bad about this'.
Another said 'only spoke to me one to one', and another
complained 'I ask "hearing": he answers then drop me'
(appendix:5:p:687f).

As well as those who said they felt excluded,
it is possible that others had low expectations of any
communication situations involving "hearing" people and
set their sights correspondingly low. Bearing in mind
the unreliability of lipreading as a means of receiving
spoken communication and the consequent difficulties this
creates for respondents in relation to lack of promotion
prospects, not being able to follow what is said at dinner
breaks and rest times or at trade union meetings and the
necessity to use a special person to mediate for them
in situations requiring communication at work, it is
understandable that they should feel like this.

Summary
Once again respondents are seen to be in a
situation in which they are handicapped because of their
lack of fluent communication. The handicap is not confined
to the immediate communication situation. They are in
low status jobs, feel they are unlikely to be promoted
and cannot join in activities such as trade union meetings.
Whilst it is unrealistic to suggest that all respondents
could be in higher status jobs, it is reasonable to suppose
that they are handicapped by lack of opportunity. They

may not want to be involved with trade union activities; they may not have the skills or intellectual capacity for a higher paid job, but the fact of knowing they do not have the opportunity to make an attempt must be very frustrating for the thinking deaf person.

References

Kyle, J.G.   Deaf People and the Community.
&   Final Report to the Nuffield
Allsop, L.   Foundation

   Bristol University. Typewritten. Unpublished, 1982

Jones, K.   the Social Effects of Deafness
                    from Birth or Early Childhood.
                    A Study of the Adult Deaf
                    Population of South Humberside

   Typewritten. M.Phil. Thesis. Unpublished, 1982

Sainsbury, Sally   Deaf Worlds. A Study of
                    Integration, Segregation and
                    Disability

   Hutchinson, 1986

The British Deaf   'North West Learns How to Use
News. Report   an Interpreter'
                    The British Deaf News
                    April 1989 Vol.20(4) p:8

CHAPTER 15   'Discussion: Adaptations To Life In

"Hearing" Society: Sign Language'

This basic social adaptation made by deaf people
is considered here as a language for socialisation and
as the language of the deaf social group. The way in
which deaf people use Sign Language is described and it
is noted that there is a High and a Low form. It is
important to take account of the fact that research has
given validity to Sign Language (p:428f), because on this
recent acceptance hinge many of the changes in social
welfare affecting deaf people.

A Language For Socialisation

One of the features of Sign Language is that it is not
passed from parents to child (Deuchar:1978:pp:70-71).
Hynes (1988:p:14) writes that 'the vast majority of
profoundly deaf children have hearing parents, very few
of whom are fluent in sign language' and Vernon
(1968:p:557) amplifies this by suggesting that because
parents cannot communicate fluently with their deaf
children 'information on ethics, how to get along in the
world, on the importance of education, on career planning,
on ad infinitium which parents should provide children,
deaf youth do not get'. Vernon (1968:p:557) concludes
that this lack of parent-child communication is devastating
psychologically and sociologically.

In effect, the deaf child is unlikely to be

able to learn "hearing" culture through the medium of the family, as "hearing" children do. Lunde (Stokoe:1978:p:18) writes that those becoming deaf in early life do not pass through the normal experience of socialisation. As Nobbs, Hine and Flemming (1981:p:51) explain 'the child will learn the culture of his society through the socialisation process - first through family, by learning language'. So the deaf child does not usually become exposed to Sign Language until he or she starts at residential school for the deaf, where this means of communication gives deaf children 'access to each others minds and thoughts' (Jones:1982:p.301), 'without the restriction of the special handicap imposed in their relation with hearing groups' (Lunde:1978:p.22).

Thus the acquisition of Sign Language, even though available only within a limited group, marks the release of deaf people from part, at least, of the total restriction imposed by deafness and allows them to become social beings (Jones:1982:p.301). An alternative process of socialisation is now available to those children who attend residential schools for the deaf, based upon Sign Language as the means of inter-personal communication; and the deaf group, first at school, then later, in the adult group, as the basis for group membership (Jones:1982:p.376).

The Language Of The Deaf Social Group

Sign Language is recognised as the means of

inter-personal communication of deaf social groups in the United Kingdom and its use by individual deaf people is taken as one of the main indications of membership of the deaf social groups (Sainsbury (1986:p:14), Jones (1982:p:239), Woll & Lawson (1982:p:230). The "hearing" person, coming upon a deaf social group for the first time, is likely to find Sign Language the most impressive feature and Brien (1981:p:p4) suggests a definition of deaf "culture" which has it as the centrepiece - 'a group of persons who share a common language which provides the basis for group cohesion and identity'. It certainly appears to be the case that Sign Language gives the deaf social group its cohesion, as would the language of any other group: Klinsberg (1966:p:157), writing of the importance of language and communication in the development and control of behaviour, suggests that 'it serves as a cohesive force uniting human groups'.

From the use of Sign Language flow all the benefits of socialisation; social-psychological satisfactions, friendship and marriage, group participation; what might reasonably be described as a whole cultural alternative.

Diglosia In British Sign Language

In his description of British Sign Language Jones (1982:pp:255-256) notes the existence of a continuum in the Sign Language use of the South Humberside deaf population, from fluent Signed English to very simple

278

but functional Sign Language. Sixty percent of the South Humberside deaf population used British Sign Language (Jones:1982:pp:238-239) and Jones suggests that whilst most were mature users who communicated fluently, a small minority, mainly young people, were "immature" communicators and 'noticeably less easy to communicate with on the subject matter of the interview'.

Deuchar (1978:p:9) suggests that there are two forms (diglossia) of Sign Language in use by deaf people; she calls these High and Low. Jones (1982:pp:254:255) explains that High is no more than ordinary English signed and fingerspelled in grammatical sequence, whilst Low is the "native" language of the deaf person, learned from his peers at schools for the deaf. Deuchar's High form of Sign Language would now be termed Sign Supported English, as it is known that whilst deaf people using this form of communication would speak or mouth English, they are unlikely to sign or fingerspell each word; the signs would, in fact, be simply helping out lipreading.
Deuchar's Low form is now known as British Sign Language.

There must, however, be some question mark still over the purity of British Sign Language as used in the various deaf clubs and social gatherings throughout the United Kingdom, though this is not to deny its authenticity as a language in its own right. There are considerable regional variations, mainly originating from the schools for the deaf, where successive generations of deaf children

still learn it.

It is likely that with the advent of such organisations as the British Sign Language Training Agency, which brings together deaf people from throughout The United Kingdom to teach them how to teach British Sign Language to "hearing" people (p:422), there will be much discussion of the various signs and an eventual move towards conformity. Already it is possible to see signs used in deaf clubs, which were not in common use before the start of the television programme for deaf people 'See Hear' on BBC and other programmes on local ITV channels.

It must also be remarked upon that there was a considerable amount of English used by respondents in the present study who were not using Sign Supported English. Conrad (1979:p:317) suggests that deaf people use a pidgin English, part vernacular and part English. However, this might have been used because the respondents knew they were being interviewed by someone who knew English. It might also be, as Jones (1982:p:257) suggests, because of the influence of an "oral" education upon children in schools for the deaf, 'some deaf people might have more English language than others and this will be evident in their signed communication'.

However, it was estimated that in Lincoln and Spalding areas respondents mainly used British Sign Language. Although a small number used Sign Supported

English in the interview, it was observed that nearly all of these could also do British Sign Language (table:8p:63).

The Performance Of Sign Language

Respondents in Lincoln and Spalding all attended schools for the deaf and all used Sign Language (table:4 p:61 & table:8p:63). Only a few were thought not to be able to understand British Sign Language. A number of respondents who used Sign Supported English could also understand British Sign Language. In the same way that Jones (1982:pp:252-253) observes in South Humberside, respondents in Lincoln and Spalding were seen to use signs or gestures at the same time as lip movements and they were generally silent when they transmitted messages. When receiving signed communication they concentrated their gaze on the face of the signer. They were using a "combined" method of visual communication, which would not be complete without any one of the component parts - lipreading, signs, fingerspelling and what Firth (1966:p:113) describes as 'subliminal attitudes and facial expressions....which go half-way to express his (the deaf person's) meaning'.

A Language In Its Own Right

Perhaps the most important contribution to the sociological understanding of deafness and deaf people in recent years is that of the linguists, who have shown that national Sign Languages such as those in Europe, America and the United Kingdom have linguistic integrity,

standing out from the spoken national languages by having their own grammar and syntactic sequence.

This was not fully realised until the pioneering work of William Stokoe in the United States of America in the 1960s and 1970s. Bellugi (1976:pp:2-3) was able to write in 1976 'we are finding that there is a very rich grammar and that it is based on interesting kinds of principles that are perfectly suited to a visual language'.

Following the work on American Sign Language, researchers in Bristol, Edinburgh and Durham Universities examined British Sign Language '....and found it was indeed a language and one of greater complexity than had ever been thought' (Ladd:Miles:1988:pp:40-41). Kyle & Woll (1985:pp:27-28) write that 'sign language certainly has a grammar, but it is unlike the grammar of English although many features of sign language structure are found in other spoken languages': and they explain (1985:pp:28-29) that a spoken language is made up of building blocks, such as the letters /p/i/n/, which have no meaning on their own, but go to make up the word "pin". They suggest the building blocks of Sign Language are now being recognised as such features as facial expression, lip patterns, signer's-gaze, the body posture, the shoulders and the head. Just as spoken words can be broken into component parts, so signs can be shown to have similar complex components (1985:p.29).

Summary

The major adaptation which transforms deaf people from non-communicating and therefore non-social, to social human beings, is Sign Language. Created by deaf people but stigmatised and repressed by educationalists (Ladd: Miles:1988:pp:27-28 and Conrad 1979:p:317) it has only recently started to be properly understood; because deaf children cannot hear, they are unlikely to benefit properly from the normal process of socialisation. It is through Sign Language, usually at a school for the deaf, that they take part in an alternative socialisation process (Jones:1982:p:298).

This Sign Language then becomes the method by which deaf adults communicate in the deaf clubs and it is the crucial factor in the cohesiveness of the deaf social group, or deaf "community" as it is known. In the deaf clubs Sign Language is used usually in the form of the national language of deaf people, known as British Sign Language. However, it has been noted (Deuchar:1978:p:9) that there is a continuum of use, from British Sign Language through to the signing of English Language, either as Sign Supported English or more rarely, as English signed and fingerspelled word for word.

Research initiated by William Stokoe in the United States of America has shown that the various national Sign Languages have their own grammar and can be thought of as languages in their own right. This

alternative language is the vehicle of deaf people's
adaptations where there is an element of choice, as in
their social life; and where there is no choice, through
communication intermediaries as in the parental family,
at work, or with officials in their everyday lives. These
adaptations are discussed in the ensuing chapters.

References

Deuchar, Margaret

Diglossia in British Sign Language

Typewritten. Ph.D. Thesis. Unpublished, 1978

Hynes, David

Social Work with Deaf People

Social Work Monographs. University of East
Anglia, 1988

Vernon, McCay

'Sociological and Psychological
Factors Associated with Hearing
Loss'
Journal of Speech and Hearing
Research
1969 Vol.12(3) pp:541-563

Lunde, Dr. Anders

Chapter 2 in Stokoe, William C.
Sign Language Structure

Linstock Press inc., 1978. pp:16-24

Nobbs, Jack,
Hine, Bob
&
Flemming, Margaret

Sociology

Macmillan Education, 1981

Jones, K.

The Social Effects of Deafness
from Birth or Early Childhood.
A Study of the Adult Deaf
Population of South Humberside

Typewritten. M.Phil. Thesis. Unpublished, 1982

Sainsbury, Sally

Deaf Worlds. A Study of
Integration, Segregation and
Disability

Hutchinson, 1986

Woll, Bencie
&
Lawson, Lilian

'British Sign Language' Chapter
21 in Hangen Einar, McClure J.
Derrick & Thompson Derick (Eds.)
Minority Languages Today

Edinburgh University Press, 1981, pp:218-234

Brien, David   'Is There A Deaf Culture Available
             to the Young Deaf Person'

  Proceedings. Study Weekend. National Council of
  Social Workers with the Deaf. Loughborough,
  1981. pp:1-24

Klinsberg, Otto   Social Psychology

  Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1966

Conrad, R.   The Deaf School Child

  Harper and Row, 1979

Firth, The Rev.   The Plate Glass Prison
George C.

  Royal National Institute for the Deaf and George
  Firth, 1966

Bellugi, Dr. Ursula Attitudes Towards Sign Language.
            Is There Need for a Change?

  Pamphlet. The British Deaf Association, 1976

Ladd, Paddy   Chapter 2 in Miles, Dorothy
           British Sign Language. A Beginners
           Guide

  BBC Books, 1988, pp:27-43

Kyle, J.G.   Sign Language. The Study of Deaf
&   People and Their Language
Woll, B.

  Cambridge University Press, 1985

CHAPTER 16   'Discussion: Adaptations To Life In "Hearing"
Society: The Deaf Social Group'

Whilst it is true that Sign Language is a
convenient means of communication between two or more
deaf individuals, it is much more than that; it is the
foundation of an alternative way of life for those who
experience childhood deafness which is described in the
literature as deaf "community" and deaf "culture" (Lunde:
Stokoe:1978:p:18).

Although the deaf clubs are focal points for
deaf social activity, the value of their "deaf" social
life permeates all aspects of deaf people's lives. Through
friendship and marriage to deaf people and through the
self-esteem gained from deaf group participation, the
alternative process of socialisation, started in schools
for the deaf, can be seen to continue into deaf people's
adult lives.

Deaf Clubs

The deaf club is the hub of the deaf social
group and there are approximately 217 of them in Great
Britain (BDA 1988). Ladd (Miles 1988:p:30) writes that
'by 1880, there was a strong network of deaf clubs (then
called Missions) throughout the United Kingdom which were
often set up by deaf people who had raised the money to
buy the buildings. By the end of the century, this growth
had spread to the smaller towns........'.

It is probable (Jones:1982:p:250f) that Sign
Language as it is known today was created in the schools
for the deaf during the early part of the nineteenth
century and it is interesting to find that deaf clubs
came shortly after the establishment of the schools,
probably because deaf children, having enjoyed unhindered
communication with their deaf fellows and having made
close friendships, wanted to continue the fellowship into
adult life (Sutcliffe:undated:pp:1-2).

There is little doubt that the early deaf clubs
had a strong religious leaning, witness Ladd's remark
above (p:287) that they were called "Missions". Lysons
(1979:p:2) suggests that in addition to deaf people wanting
to meet others like themselves, the second characteristic
in the formation of the first deaf clubs was the
intervention of a person motivated by 'compassion,
evangelical zeal and charitable concern' who obtained
premises where deaf people could hold religious services.

Attendance At The Deaf Club And Its Importance To
Respondents

The findings (p:229f) show that respondents
have difficulty communicating with "hearing" people and
that they do not generally take part in social/recreational
activities with them. As Vernon & Fain (1975:p:84)
put it, 'as one becomes involved in this area (recreation
for deaf people) it becomes apparent that the absence
of hearing is one of the most devastating of all

handicapping conditions'. However, examination of deaf people's social lives reveals that 'deafness is a viable social existence' (Nash & Nash 1981:p:85).

Attendance at the deaf club is important to respondents (table:81:p:290) and this is similar to Jones' deaf population in South Humberside, where 'the Social Centres for the Deaf are the focal points for the social life of the deaf population', with 60% in each area (Grimsby and Scunthorpe) attending at least once a week and just under 90% attending once a month (Jones 1982:p:108). Kyle & Woll (1985:p:11) also remark that the deaf club is the focus of what they call the deaf "community", whilst Kyle & Allsop (1982:p:164) report that 58% of the deaf population of Avon go to the deaf club once a week or more.

In Lincoln, where the deaf club is open for general social activities once a week, 22 (47.8%) respondents attend weekly. At the main social evening, once a fortnight, 35 (76.1%) can be found there (table: 12:p:64). In Spalding, where the deaf club meets once a fortnight, all respondents attended whenever it was open (table:14:p:65).

The deaf club is an important part of respondents' lives. It is a place where they can be "social" in an un-handicapped way; in the deaf club, to be deaf is "normal". Jones (1982:p:274) suggests that 'a person's need for affiliation is met in groups of one

sort or another' and quotes Homans (1950:pp:713-714) as
asserting that if there is one truth that modern psychology
has established it is that 'an isolated individual is
sick'. Bearing in mind the fact that deaf people have
difficulty communicating with "hearing" people at "hearing"
social activities (p:238), in their parental families
(p:258) and at work (p:265f), all situations which would
normally provide opportunity for group membership, it
is important to understand that at the deaf club or in
any gathering of deaf people, they are not excluded.
By creating the deaf social group deaf people are
responding to a natural need to belong to a group in which
there is fluent inter-personal communication.

The Lincoln Committee Members all said that
the deaf club was important to them and they gave
friendship as the main reason for this (table:81 below).

table 81

Lincoln Deaf Club Members: Whether the deaf club is
important to them and if so, why

%

17 (100) yes: friendship

8 (47.1) yes: activities

8 (47.1) yes: opportunity to help

6 (35.3) yes: communication
17 (100) Note: some of the respondents gave
more than one answer.

Although only 8 (47.1%) respondents said that
opportunity to help was one of the reasons for the deaf

club being important to them, all belonged to the committee
and were exercising the skill of leadership (amongst
others), an opportunity not open to them in "hearing"
society.

Friendship And Marriage

In South Humberside just over 90% of the deaf
population gave their main reason for attending the deaf
clubs as 'Sign Language and company' (Jones 1982:p:111)
and Lincoln Committee Members answered in the same way
by giving 'friendship' as their main reason (table:81p:
290).

Friendships with other deaf people are more
frequent (Sainsbury 1986:p:220). In South Humberside
Jones (1982:pp:163-165) found that over half the
respondents had more deaf than "hearing" friends, and
in the case of Lincoln Deaf Club Members, 31 (67.4%) had
more deaf than "hearing" friends (table:66p:246) a further
8 (17.4%) respondents claimed about the same number of
deaf and "hearing" friends.

On the question of communication the majority
(38:86.4%) of respondents said that it was easier to
communicate with their deaf friends (p:246). Thirty four
(89.5% of those who answered) respondents saying this
was because of Sign Language and 4 (10.5% of those who
answered) saying it was because they found difficulty
in understanding "hearing" people.

First Meeting With Deaf Friends

Most respondents met their deaf friends at school
or at the deaf club. This is not unexpected in view of
the fact that deaf people usually attend a residential
school for the deaf and then join the local deaf club,
most of whose members will have attended the same school.

table 82
Lincoln Deaf Club Members: where they first met their
deaf friends

	%	
31	(68.9)	at school for the deaf
10	(22.2)	at deaf club
1	(2.2)	at deaf college
1	(2.2)	at a friend's house
2	(4.4)	at a neighbour's home
45	(100)	1 did not answer

These friendships are clearly important to deaf
people and they go towards creating what Woll & Lawson
(1981:p:230) call 'a cohesive and supportive community'.
It is evident from the generally negative tone of the
comments made by respondents about friendships with
"hearing" people (appendix:5:p:688) that their
relationships were always limited by the inadequacies
of communication. Respondents sometimes have a close
friendship with one particular "hearing" person (p:302f),
though they are more likely to be restricted to terms
of friendly greetings or simply acknowledgement
(p:247).

Friendship And Marriage With Deaf People

It is quite a different matter in their friendships with other deaf people. Spalding respondents were very positive in their comments (appendix:5:p:693); 'I think more of deaf because of communication'; 'a few of us meet for coffee; easy to talk to deaf'; 'deaf friends are my way of life'. Comments such as these are typical of the way deaf people talk about their deaf friendships and the warmth of greetings and goodbyes at the deaf club illustrates vividly the genuineness of the fellowship. One respondent, giving his reason for having deaf friends said 'because sign: different talk from the "hearing"'. Nash & Nash (1981:p:49) writing of the linguistic dimension to belonging, suggest that 'sharing a language can engender a strong feeling of relationship'. This is much in evidence amongst the deaf populations of Lincoln and Spalding.

Not only do Lincoln Deaf Club Members have deaf friends, they usually marry other deaf people who use Sign Language. Of the 24 (52.2%) respondents married and two engaged, all were to other deaf people (table:7:p:62). This is a feature of deaf Sign Language users. In Avon, Kyle & Allsop (1982:p:25) note that 92% were married to other deaf people and Jones (1982:p:168) makes a similar observation. Going into the matter in more detail, Jones (1982:p:173) found that 87.9% of respondents in Grimsby and 61.5% in Scunthorpe married other deaf people for 'company' or 'ease of communication'. Jones (1982:p:186)

then suggests that deaf people in these circumstances have complementarity of needs, a similarity of attitudes and characteristics and a degree of compatibility, which the shared backgrounds of respondents might provide. Thus it can be seen that the deaf social group has as its cohesive force not only friendships, but marriage with members as well.

Opportunity To Help

Eight (47.1%) respondents put 'opportunity to help' as one of the reasons the deaf club was important to them; in fact all were or had been of service to the deaf club by reason of being past or present members of the committee of Lincoln deaf club. No respondents from Lincoln deaf club or Spalding were on committees of "hearing" organisations (p:234) and bearing in mind respondents' comments on group communication with "hearing" people (p:221), it is most unlikely that they could operate in a "hearing" committee situation.

There are also other opportunities for respondents to be of service in Lincoln deaf club (appendix:2p:645). The youth club has deaf youth leaders and there is a group of voluntary visitors who minister to sick and elderly deaf people; where a deaf person has a routine visit to hospital which does not require a Sign Language interpreter, one of the voluntary workers may drive him or her to and from their appointment. A deaf person is a lay-reader and regularly takes church

services as well as doing pastoral visits (appendix:2:
p:666).

Activities

All eight respondents who cited 'activities'
as one of the reasons why the deaf club was important
to them, put this reason last. Deuchar (1978:p:52) writes
that 'the main activity of the (deaf) club is conversation'
and Firth (1966:p:94) writes that 'the main business of
an Institute for the Deaf is talk'. The comments of some
of the Spalding respondents bear this out; they said 'good
for the deaf, so they can meet people and chat' and 'can
meet people: learn about them: recipes and things: can't
go to cookery class so learn from deaf friends'. Another
simply commented 'talk club good' (appendix:5:p:692).
These sentiments are similar to those expressed by the
deaf population of South Humberside (Jones 1982:
pp:110-111) whose reasons for going to the deaf clubs
were 'company' and 'signs'.

Starved of fluent, unhindered communication
with "hearing" people, it is natural that deaf people
should want to converse. There are activities at the
deaf club of course; a drama club, a youth club, indoor
games, indoor games in the "hearing" leagues for darts
and snooker and "special" events as well as a regular
bingo session (appendix:2:p:650f); but it is the fellowship
which deaf people seem to emphasise when discussing their
deafness and the deaf club and this is no doubt reasonable

enough bearing in mind the loneliness and frustration
they must sometimes feel when in the presence of "hearing"
people.

Positive Self-Image And Acceptance Of Deafness

In particular, respondents are able to build
a positive self-image through gaining self-esteem in the
group life of the deaf club and the deaf social group.
Group membership can reduce anxiety, provide opportunity
for training, support, intimacy and emotional response
and people can check their opinions against those of others
and they can test out behaviour. Guidance, friendship,
power, admiration, status and achievement are all to be
found in group membership (Jones 1982:p:274). The basis
of all this is communication, as Meyers & Meyers (1982:p:2)
make clear - 'it (communication) is the crucial process
through which you become who you are and through which
you relate to others'.

This social adaptation is essential to the mental
well-being of respondents. In "hearing" society they
cope because the self-esteem engendered in the deaf social
group carries them through situations implicit in the
comment by a deaf man about how he is treated at work:
'boss talk to all: I wait: one man write down tell me
after: feel bad about this'; or the other who said 'I
ask "hearing": he answers, then drops me' (appendix:5:
p:688). Jones (1982:p:307) writes 'unable to speak well;
appearing slow because of the difficulties of lipreading;

with a low reading age making the reading of instructions difficult; unable to play many civic roles: debarred from certain jobs, usually in a manual job and rarely in a position of responsibility at work; their parents able to communicate with their children better than they can; and requiring an interpreter if they want to consult a solicitor, doctor or other adviser; these are all obstacles to the development of self-esteem'.

In fact, respondents achieve a poise and self-possession which might be thought unusual in view of the communication difficulties and assaults on their self-esteem they experience in their parental families and in "hearing" society generally. In his study of the deaf community of South Humberside, Jones (1982:pp:351-358) asked respondents what was it like to be deaf. They mentioned deaf friends or the deaf group in a positive way in nearly all their answers. He concludes that respondents recognise and accept their "deafness" and have come to terms with it.

Similarly, when asked in the present study 'does your deafness make life difficult for you and if so, how?' respondents were positive in their attitudes. Thirty (69.8%) replied "no" and of the 13 (23.3%) who replied "yes" all their complaints were about communication (table:13:p:64).

Summary

It can be seen that through the use of Sign
Language, originally created by deaf people, members of
the deaf social group are able to adapt to lead relatively
"normal" social lives, in that they do all the things
"hearing" people do but use Sign Language instead of speech
and hearing.

The deaf club is the hub of deaf people's social
lives, but it is clearly more than just a club; friends,
marriage, drama, indoor games, group activities,
opportunity to serve, all go to make up the deaf way of
life. It is evident from their remarks (appendix:5:p:
693f) that respondents accept their deafness. To a large
extent this is because of the fellowship they experience
with other deaf people and the positive self-image they
create through social inter-action with other deaf people
in an unhandicapped communication environment.

Kyle & Allsop (1982:p:7) found a similar state
of affairs in Avon, which affected them sufficiently to
write 'it is perhaps strange to say that this community
does not consider itself lonely or isolated in a hearing
person's understanding of the term and they consider their
social life to be at least as good as hearing people's'.
As Sainsbury (1986:p:14) remarks, 'the deaf community,
identified by the use of Sign Language, meets their most
important personal requirements'. It should perhaps be
noted at this point that there is probably not any modern

"hearing" institution comparable to the deaf club, which
encompasses so many activities and organisations under
one roof.

In this "social" area of their lives deaf people
apparently have a 'viable'alternative (p:289) to "hearing"
society and it is evident that they exercise that choice
in a positive way. However, in their relations with
"hearing" people as individuals in the parental family,
at work and in "official" situations, they have no such
choice. Their adaptation to this situation through the
use of communication intermediaries is examined in the
next chapter.

References

Lunde, Dr. Anders   Chapter 2 in Stokoe, William C.
                           Sign Language Structure

    Linstock Press Inc., 1973, pp:16-24

The British Deaf   Directory and Information
Association

    The British Deaf Association, 1988

Ladd, Paddy   Chapter 2 in Miles, Dorothy
                          British Sign Language. A Beginners
                          Guide

    BBC Books, 1988, pp:27-43

Sutcliffe, The Rev.   The Origins and Development of
T.H. M.A.   Missions to the Deaf and Dumb

    Typewritten, Undated

Lysons, Kenneth   The Development of Local Voluntary
M.A. M.Ed. Ph.D.   Societies for Adult Deaf Persons
                          in England

    Pamphlet. The British Deaf Association, 1979

Vernon, McCay   'Recreation and the Unique
&   Problems of Early Profound
Fain, Gerald S.   Deafness'
                          Therapeutic Recreational Journal
                          1979 Vol.9(3) pp:83-88

Nash, Jeffrey   Deafness in Society
&
Nash, Anedith

    Lexington Books, 1981

Jones, K.   The Social Effects of Deafness
                          from Birth or Early Childhood.
                          A Study of the Adult Deaf
                          Population of South Humberside

    Typewritten. M.Phil. Thesis. Unpublished, 1982

Kyle, J.G.   Sign Language. The Study of Deaf
&   People and Their Language
Woll, B.

    Cambridge University Press, 1985

Kyle, J.G.   Deaf People and the Community.
&   Final Report to the Nuffield
Allsop, L.   Foundation

    Bristol University. Typewritten. Unpublished, 1982

Sainsbury, Sally   Deaf Worlds. A Study of
                             Integration, Segregation and
                             Disability

    Hutchinson, 1986

Deuchar, Margaret   Diglossia in British Sign Language

    Typewritten. Ph.D. Thesis. Unpublished, 1978

Firth, The Rev.   The Plate Glass Prison
George C.

    Royal National Institute for the Deaf and George
    Firth, 1966

Meyers, Gail E.   The Dynamics of Human Communication
&
Meyers, Michele Toleda

    McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1980

CHAPTER 17   'Discussion: Adaptations To Life In "Hearing"

               Society: The "Hearing" Person As Communication

               Intermediary'

It has been established that respondents have

difficulty in communicating with "hearing" people in groups

(p:221) and with "hearing" individuals (p:230). Three

special features arise from this situation; in

circumstances in which deaf and "hearing" individuals

meet regularly, it is possible for them to "get used"

to each other; deaf and "hearing" people, where they are

able to establish some communication, make one to one

relationships; respondents use "hearing" people as

communication intermediaries.

     First, "getting used" to each other; talking

about communication at work respondents said 'get used';

'sometimes catch something on my mate's lips because I

know his lips: my mate understands my voice'; 'if "hearing"

met deaf before no problem: man at work easy because worked

with a deaf man before' (appendix:5:p:689).

     Second, respondents make one to one relationships

with "hearing" people; this is bound up with the first

feature in that when a deaf and a "hearing" person

eventually "get used" to each other, they can build on

this to form a relationship. Again, comments made by

deaf people illustrate this (appendix:5:p:686f). For

example, the respondent who felt left out at family events

said 'I manage well one to one' and another commented
'one "hearing" friend: can't lipread more than one, it's
hard, quick talk'. A respondents who went to a "hearing"
licensed social club remarked 'one special, easy to talk
at social club: others difficult', and another said 'have
a special ("hearing") friend; can lipread'.

Third, respondents are seen to use particular
"hearing" people as communication mediators; this is
probably an extension of the first two features. They
do this in the family, at work and in more formal settings
in their daily lives (table:72:p:260 & table:75:p:266).

Jones, a psychologist and himself deaf, writes
of his experience of "hearing" people "getting used" to
him (Montgomery:1981:pp:105-106). 'I have many friends
with whom I have no communication problems. Every one
of them follows the same pattern of interaction between
myself and themselves. In the first place, there is the
usual non-communicative period with all its usual tension
and so on. Gradually, there is the emergence of real
communication between ourselves. This is what I call
the "tuning-in" period. This can vary from one person
to another, anything from half an hour to two weeks.
Occasionally there are some who will never understand
me because they are not prepared to change their
strategies. Every one of my friends has asked me the
same question, "Chris, your speech has improved". What,
my speech....improved in two weeks... no, never. It is

not the improvement of speech but the improvement of their own perception of my speech'. Jones goes on to say that there is a need for research in this area of deaf-"hearing" inter-action.

The matter of the communication intermediary will be examined together with the views of deaf people on what their "welfare" needs are. The referrals of deaf people to specialist agencies for the social welfare of deaf people will also be considered.

The Communication Intermediary In The Parental Family

Although it has been seen that respondents have difficulty in following what is going on at family events and tend to withdraw or sometimes even pretend they can understand when they cannot (p:261f), the majority of Lincoln Deaf Committee Members said they used another family member to keep them in touch with events. Even though it did not stop them feeling excluded from their families (p:258) indeed, it might have reinforced their feelings of separation, it would doubtless make family events more tolerable if they were able to have some idea of what was going on. However, respondents' comments show that this sort of third party mediation is not particularly satisfactory (appendix:5:p:686f). One respondent, for example, said 'always with my daughter, I won't go on my own: but she won't tell me what is said: left out of this: when it's all over she tells me all about it'. Another commented ruefully, 'they say, I'll

tell you after, then tell me two hour film in five minutes.

Ford (1988:p:29) writes that the use of a
relative or a friend to interpret, 'making do' and 'getting
by', are options which 'is the harsh reality for most
deaf people'. He then outlines the situation: 'deaf adults
with their own families have had to take their parents
along to job interviews; deaf parents with hearing children
have had to rely on their children to enable them to
communicate with teacher, doctors, careers advisors or
sometimes have had to use their children to interpret
on private, personal matters of health, finance etc.'.
Ford concludes 'deaf people have had to accept incomplete
and inadequate communication of vital information about
themselves and their lives because interpreters or other
forms of communicat.ion service were not available'.

The fact that volunteers are helping deaf people
to communicate in everyday situations and that there is
a shortage of interpreters for official interpreting is
noticed by Sainsbury (1986:p:106), who says that 'the
degree to which deaf people achieve integration in the
hearing community must be determined, in part, by the
availability of interpreters for every facet of life'.

However, this did not prevent respondents from
asking family members for help or advice with practical
and personal problems. Just under two-thirds go to family
members for help and less than a third use the social
worker with deaf people.

table 83

Lincoln Committee Members: whether "hearing" family members
tell respondents what is going on at family events

	%	
3	(18.8)	no one
5	(31.3)	sister
3	(18.8)	daughter
1	(6.3)	brother
1	(6.3)	not specified
1	(6.3)	mother
1	(6.3)	father
1	(6.3)	they all help
16	(100)	1 not applicable

table 84

Lincoln Deaf Club Members: who they would go to with a
practical problem

	%	
1	(2.2)	no one
29	(63.0)	a relative
14	(30.4)	social worker with deaf people
1	(2.2)	a "hearing" friend
1	(2.2)	a deaf friend
46	(100)	

table 85

Lincoln Deaf Club Members: who they would go to with a
personal problem

	%	
2	(4.5)	no one
26	(59.1)	a relative
15	(34.1)	social worker with deaf people
1	(2.3)	a deaf friend
44	(100)	2 did not answer

Considerable reliance is placed by respondents
upon the family for help with everyday practical and
personal problems and it is interesting to speculate
whether this dependence is a carry-over from childhood.
Sainsbury (1986:p:191) writes 'although they (deaf people)
wish to shrug off the protectiveness of parents, many
nevertheless needed a source of advice on such subjects
as changing jobs, setting up a business, the best time
to start a family, and the way to ensure that buying a
house or a car was a sound investment'. She found that
much of this advice came from either "hearing" or deaf
friends but this was not the case with Lincoln respondents,
though doubtless they talk over problems with deaf friends,
perhaps only bringing them to family or the social worker
with deaf people when they have been unable to resolve
them in any other way.

The Communication Intermediary At Respondents' Work

Lincoln deaf club members used a special
"hearing" person at work to help them with communication

(table:86 below) and it appears that this is sufficient, because the services of the social worker with deaf people were rarely used as interpreter (table:87 below).

table 86

Lincoln Deaf Club Members: whether they use a "hearing" friend at work to help them with communication and if not, how they managed.

	%	
27	(73.0)	yes
4	(10.8)	used their hearing/lipreading
4	(10.8)	written notes
1	(2.7)	a partially hearing man interprets
1	(2.7)	work alone
37	(100)	9 did not answer

table 87

Lincoln Deaf Club Members: whether they ever had difficulties at work requiring the intervention of the social worker with deaf people

	%	
32	(86.5)	no
3	(8.1)	yes: to explain the job
2	(5.4)	yes: disputes
37	(100)	9 did not answer

The communication level of the special "hearing" friends at work is probably not very good and it is likely that their way of dealing with deaf people, though done with goodwill, does not help the deaf person's self-esteem. As one respondent remarked (appendix:5:p:687) 'feel bad about this', after being told to wait to learn what the boss was telling his workmates. This was seen to be the

case with family communication help as well
(appendix:5:p:686).

No questions were asked about the way in which
these special "hearing" people communicated with
respondents, but it is most likely that they were people
who found that respondents could understand them in a
limited way if they took some trouble and observed
elementary rules such as ensuring their mouth was clearly
visible, speaking slowly and couching their message in
simple and precise terms. They have probably learned
some Sign Language from the deaf person involved and make
intelligent use of gesture; they may also have learned
to fingerspell. Above all they will have been "friendly"
with the deaf person and inspired some element of
confidence in their communication ability, even if it
is only that they appear patient and prepared to take
trouble over helping the deaf person to understand what
is being said.

Unfortunately, this communication help does
not extend to trade union meetings (p:269) perhaps because
this sort of communication is beyond the abilities of
the special "hearing" person at work. The examples of
the daughter who did not interpret for the priest (p:304)
and the man who had to wait till after his boss had
addressed his workmates (p:308) illustrate that
simultaneous verbatim Sign Language interpreting is a
considerable skill not held by communicators at this level.

Interpreting In Official Or Formal Situations

In all formal or official communication
situations, such as with the doctor, or at a driving test
(as opposed to the informal setting of the parental family
gathering, or at work), about which they were asked,
respondents were more likely to use the social worker
with deaf people than a relative as interpreter, except
in the case of the doctor, where they are equally divided,
though it is interesting that a large proportion go to
the doctor alone and in all other situations some
respondents go without an interpreter or communicatator
(table:88p:311). The social worker with deaf people might
be preferred because of his greater skill with Sign
Language, or his ability to interpret simultaneously what
is being said by the "hearing" person; at the same time
he is better able to explain what the deaf person wants
to say. He might also be preferred because it is known
that he is familiar with such situations and will actually
guide the deaf person through the procedure. One deaf
person remarked to the interviewer that he would either
go alone or with a family member to the doctor but would
ask the social worker with deaf people to accompany him
'if it's something serious like hospital'.

A disturbing feature of the findings is that
when asked about attendance at school open evenings, none
of those who had children attended with a Sign Language
interpreter, though it is known that this has been done

in other areas of the county. No questions were asked
about the reasons why particular people were asked to
help with communication but in conversation with the
interviewer two respondents said they did not know the
service was available; 'the "welfare" closes at 5 o'clock
doesn't it?' they remarked. The same could be said of
trade union meetings, where respondents did not go because
they could not follow the proceedings. A recent innovation
are the courses set up to advise deaf people how to make
use of Sign Language interpreters (p:490). In effect
these are "awareness" courses, explaining how and where
to find an interpreter, how to make the best use of one
in certain situations and how to extend your activities
in "hearing" society by using one.

table 88

Lincoln Deaf Club Members: who interprets for them or
whether they go alone, by the various situations in which
they need communication help

Service	Interpreter			
	Alone	Soc.Worker	Relative	Total
	%	%	%	%
Doctor	44.2	27.9	27.9	100
Hospital	12.5	56.3	31.3	100
Court	25.00	58.3	16.7	100
Optician	25.00	58.3	16.7	100
Driving Test	52.9	35.3	11.8	100
Job Centre	16.7	66.7	16.7	100

Respondents' View Of "Deaf Welfare" As Communication
Help"

Evidently, respondents depend upon
intermediaries, usually family members or workmates, for
in informal settings
much of their everyday communication help; and it is clear
that they think the main purpose of "welfare", as the
social service department's services to deaf people are
colloquially known to Lincoln deaf people, is to help
with communication, as can be seen in table 89 (below),
where all respondents put Sign Language interpreting as
their first choice.

table 89

Lincoln Committee Members: how they think "deaf welfare"
could help them.

```
                        %
            17 (100  )  by providing interpreters
            12 ( 70.6)  by helping with problems
            10 ( 58.8)  by helping with work
             1 (  5.9)  by helping with telephone calls
             1 (  5.9)  by helping with reading
                           and writing letters
             2 ( 11.8)  by helping with deaf club
            17 (100)
```

Note: some respondents gave more than one answer.

(Respondents' comments relative to table 89 above are

given in appendix:5:p:689f).

Help with work also features strongly, with

10 (58.8%) respondents having this as their _third_ choice

and in fact it will be seen (p:101f) that this has been

one of the major responsibilities of the social worker

with deaf people over the years; in fact it still is,

with 78.9% of social workers stating they are expected

to do employment work in conjunction with careers officers

and disablement resettlement officers (table:45p:186).

This sort of work has a high content of inter-personal

communication.

A considerable proportion (70.6%) expect the

"deaf welfare" to help with "problems" but only 2 (11.8%)

respondents mentioned help with the deaf club. Kyle and

Allsop (1982:p:109) also found that deaf people felt their

main call on the social worker with deaf people was that

of interpreting; 'someone representing in sign what a

hearing person had just said'; The Royal Association for

Deaf People report (1986-87:p:35) states 'a traditional

function of all workers with deaf and deaf-blind people

has been to act as interpreters on their behalf'.

Referrals To Specialist Social Welfare Agencies For Deaf
People

Not only do deaf people think "deaf welfare"

is there to help them with communication (table:89p:312),

it is apparent from their referrals that they use the

service primarily for this purpose (table:90:p:314).

The figures in brackets in table 91 (p:315) show that

over 80% of referrals in each area involve communication;

greater detail of these referrals is given in appendix

3 (p:673f). It is noteworthy that as

table 90

Referrals made by or on behalf of deaf people in Derby, Birmingham, Lincoln and North Lincolnshire to agencies providing specialist social welfare services to deaf people.

	DERBY		BIRMINGHAM		LINCOLN & N.LINCS.	
	Number of Referrals	%	Number of Referrals	%	Number of Referrals	%
Telephone	83	18.5	65	20.2	66	44.9
General	192	42.8	131	40.8	17	11.6
Forms	39	8.7	17	5.3	7	4.8
Letters	65	14.5	7	2.2	4	2.7
Sign Language Interpreting	22	4.9	49	15.3	49	33.3
Casework	48	10.7	52	16.2	4	2.7
	449	100	321	100	147	100

table 91

Referrals made by or on behalf of deaf people in Derby, Birmingham, and Lincoln & North Lincolnshire to agencies providing specialist social welfare services to deaf people in selected categories.

	DERBY		BIRMINGHAM		LINCOLN & N.LINCS.	
	Number of Referrals	%	Number of Referrals	%	Number of Referrals	%
All General Communication	379	84.4	220	68.5	94	64.0
Sign Language Interpreting	22 (401)	4.9 (89.3)	49 (269)	15.3 (83.8)	49 (143)	33.3 (97.3)
Casework	48	10.7	52	16.2	4	2.7
	449	100	321	100	151	100

well as the referrals to the specialist agencies, deaf people, on the evidence of the Lincoln respondents, also use other "hearing" people as voluntary communication intermediaries (table:88:p:311).

There has not been any attempt to assess the volume or frequency of referrals because it was considered important to this study to establish whether or not deaf people had communication problems and if so, what sort they were. The survey of referrals was carried out in three geographical areas, the agencies being asked to note all their referrals over a given period (appendix:3: p:673). What becomes clear is that the sorts of problems which deaf people refer to specialist agencies for deaf people are mainly to do with inter-personal communication in the family, at work and also sometimes with officials (table:90:p:314); also, in Lincoln at least, they take their problems more often to family members than the social worker with deaf people (table:84:p:306 & table:85:p:307).

Casework

The referrals covered the following areas of activity: mental health, family, marriage, health, child care, housing, employment, residential placement, adolescent problems and general personal relationships, collectively referred to as casework.

These cover most of the areas of people's lives but it is not certain that a "hearing" person would go to a social worker for help in all the situations

mentioned. Lack of choice is one of the limitations

imposed by deafness. Jones (1982:p:327) writes 'cut off

from the mainstream of life in the community due to lack

of fluent inter-personal communication, respondents

therefore have no direct access to professional help'.

A "hearing" person could consult a local priest (with

a choice of denominations), youth leader, marriage guidance

counsellor, health visitor, doctor, community worker,

social worker, as well as neighbours. Deaf people's

sources of help and advice are limited to family, deaf

friends and the social worker with deaf people (tables:84

& 85 p:306f). The alternative to the case worker with

communication skills would be access to mainstream social

work services through a Sign Language interpreter; however,

it is not known how many of the avenues of help would

be closed to deaf people because they might not know of

their existence. This alternative is discussed later

(p:583).

Sign Language Interpreting

Clearly, in certain situations, some deaf people

need communication help (though it must be borne in mind

that the "hearing" individual or group of people with

whom they are communicating also need help). It is

apparent from the evidence of Lincoln respondents (table:88

p:311) that deaf people do not always use an official

Sign Language interpreter. The list of interpreting

situations shows that the official interpreter is most

likely to be used in formal situations and this is also shown in the evidence of Lincoln respondents (table:88: p:311). The Sign Language interpreting referrals in the survey were in the following situations: doctor, hospital, physiotherapist, insurance, department of health & social security, housing, police, solicitor, employment, psychiatrist, court, further education and a meeting. It is remarkable that all but two of these are one-to-one situations; it has already been noted that Lincoln respondents did not attend trade union meetings because they could not follow the proceedings (p:269). It is this kind of access which deaf people are now asking for; the example already given is of the deaf man who serves on his local community council (p:236).

It is reasonable to suppose that there are many situations in which deaf people manage well with only a small amount of help with telephone calls, letters and form filling. In these situations, interviews with "hearing" people might be dispensed with (although they might have been advantageous - another disadvantage of deafness). The Sign Language interpreter in the formal setting will give accuracy and fluency - as one respondent said 'if doctor, on my own; if important like hospital I have an interpreter'. Even though a deaf person might have clear speech and good English, the inadequacies of lipreading (p:221f) are such that detailed information could be missed or mistaken and the transaction could

be stilted and without fluency, thus limiting it's
usefulness.

A small informal survey in the West Midlands
with six local authority social services departments
(Birmingham, Derbyshire, Northamptonshire, Walsall,
Warwickshire) (Grew:1988) shows that the areas most in
demand during a three month period were medical and
psychiatric 243 hours, employment 115 hours, education
(probably further education) 89 hours, legal 50 hours,
meetings 49 hours. With the exception of meetings, these
are all Sign Language situations similar to those noted
in this study (appendix:3:p:673f). The inclusion of
interpretation at meetings is a welcome extension to deaf
people's access to "hearing" society. It is also
noteworthy that there was 16 hours of interpreting for
'church, weddings, funerals and services', an area of
the family lives of deaf people where they would usually
have to rely upon family. In the case of their own
weddings it is likely that deaf people would ask for an
interpreter, though family pressures can be strongly
against this, as in the case of the deaf couple married
without an interpreter because the bridegroom's father
did not want the ceremony to be turned into a 'bloody
circus'.

The 1986-87 annual report of the Royal
Association in Aid of the Deaf (1987:p:35) gives percentage
proportions of the year's sign language interpreting work

and the highest figures are for health (28.7%) and daily

living (27.0%). These are followed by legal (12.9%),

employment (12.0%) and welfare rights (9.1%). Education

(4.0%), pastoral care (3.2%) and social functions (3.1%)

make up the list. These correspond closely with the

figures for this /present survey and the Midlands survey mentioned

above.

General Communication Help

This is the largest area of referral. Although

Sign Language interpreting is treated as a separate

category, it has to be pointed out that all the help in

the general category is linked to communication and the

difficulties faced by deaf people in gathering information.

Telephone calls require speech and hearing, forms and

letters need a knowledge of written English language.

Whilst some deaf people might be able to make themselves

understood with poor English through written notes, this

might not be sufficient to understand a formal letter

or to complete an official form. It is necessary for

the person helping the deaf person in this way to be able

to communicate fluently in Sign Language.

The list of help shows a broad area of activity;

medical, general welfare, legal, education, employment

and domestic (greater detail is given in appendix:3:p:673).

It should be emphasised at this point that these services

are provided by people whose basic qualification is that

of professional social worker and whose level of Sign

Language skill, although better than most family members and special helpers at deaf people's work, is not necessarily that high (p:159f).

Summary

As well as opening up a deaf social/recreational environment through the creation of Sign Language, deaf people also use it to gain access to what is going on in "hearing" society or when they want to take advantage of the various services available which are run by "hearing" people.

In the family and at work it can be seen that volunteer communication intermediaries are used, though the standard of the "interpreting" is not satisfactory in most cases. For more official services such as going to the doctor or to hospital, respondents are more likely to use a professional person who can use Sign Language, though some prefer to go with a family member or, in some cases, alone.

Respondents expect a service of "interpretation" from social workers with deaf people and the survey of referrals shows that they use the services of the specialist agencies primarily for that purpose with more than 80% of referrals being for communication of one sort or another.

References

Jones, Christopher   'Deaf Hearing Interaction' Chapter
                            10 in <u>Montgomery</u>, George <u>The</u>
                            <u>Integration and Disintegration</u>
                            <u>of the Deaf in Society</u>

    Scottish Workshop Publications, 1981, pp:103-111

Ford, Kevin   <u>Starting to Communicate. A Report</u>
                            <u>on the Feasibility of a</u>
                            <u>Comprehensive Independent</u>
                            <u>Communication Service for People</u>
                            <u>in Derbyshire</u>

    Communication Unlimited Management Committee, 1988

Sainsbury, Sally   <u>Deaf worlds. A Study of</u>
                            <u>Integration, Segregation and</u>
                            <u>Disability</u>

    Hutchinson, 1986

Kyle, J.G.   <u>Deaf People and the Community.</u>
&   <u>Final Report to the Nuffield</u>
Allsop, L.   <u>Foundation</u>

    Bristol University. Typewritten. Unpublished, 1982

The Royal   <u>The Jig-Saw of Care. 1986/1987</u>
Association for   <u>Annual Report</u>
Deaf People

    The Royal Association for Deaf People, 1987

Jones, K.   <u>The Social Effects of Deafness</u>
                            <u>from Birth or early Childhood.</u>
                            <u>A Study of the Adult Deaf</u>
                            <u>Population of South Humberside</u>

    Typewritten. M.Phil. Thesis. Unpublished, 1982

Grew, Sheila   <u>Interpreting Provision. Analysis</u>
                            <u>of Six Local Authority Areas</u>
                            <u>Involved in Research from 1st</u>
                            <u>January to 31st March 1988</u>

    Typewritten. Unpublished, 1988

Deaf respondents' relations with "hearing" society are seen to be limited by their inability to hear, and the apparent refusal of "hearing" individuals to use Sign Language. So they are excluded from intimate fellowship in "hearing" society. Their response is to adapt to this situation by substitution of deaf for "hearing" where they have choice, and by accommodating through communication intermediaries when they are involved with "hearing" people.

The outcome of deaf people's choice of deaf fellowship is that they have created something more than just deaf clubs. The network of relationships and organisations make up what has become known as the deaf "community", and it is suggested (or, more generally, assumed) that this "community" has its own "culture".

One feature stands out in the literature and when meeting deaf people; they need fellowship and they find it in the company of others who can communicate as they do.

The phenomenon of what is known as the deaf "community" is considered under 3 main headings; general characteristics, membership, and shared characteristics of its members.

It is evident from the findings and
subsequent discussion (p:234f) that respondents in
this study are so deaf as to have to rely upon
lipreading to receive spoken communication in
inter-personal communication with "hearing" people
and have a great need for fellowship with other deaf
people (p:287f). They marry other deaf people (table:
7:p:62) and Sign Language is their most fluent means
of inter-personal communication (table:8:p:63).
It will have been noted that respondents appear to
identify themselves as deaf, and the cohesiveness
of the deaf social groups in general has been remarked
upon (p:292).

Jones (1982:p:358) writes 'it is evident
that the importance of human relationships is a strong
element in the deaf groups in South Humberside'.
The same could be said of many groups of people,
deaf or "hearing"; the difference with the deaf group
being that they are denied the full satisfactions
of fellowship with the rest of society because of
the difficulties of inter-personal communication;
so fellowship with other deaf people who use Sign
Language assumes greater importance.

A.The Characteristics Of The Deaf "Community"

1)Introduction: There are a number of characteristics
which can be identified with the deaf "community";

these include deafness, self-identification, Sign
Language use by members; the need to meet and
attendance at deaf clubs; inter-marriage of members;
sharing of common goals; the geographical location
of groups of deaf people. However, in spite of this
lengthy list, Kyle and Woll (1985:pp:22-23), in
reviewing the characteristics of the British deaf
"community" comment that there are severe difficulties
in characterising it. 'It involves a shared language;
it involves hearing loss; it involves social
interaction and political relations; but all of these
inter-relate and interact with attitudes towards
other deaf people'. They continue, 'their desire
to be together is the strength of their community'.

It is clear from the literature that the
need to meet other deaf people is one of the
outstanding features of the deaf "community". Closely
allied to this is the fact of Sign Language, which,
in turn, is allied to the inability to hear, and
is the most obvious alternative to hearing and speech
as a means of inter-personal communication. All
of these indicate a wish on the part of deaf people
to identify themselves as "deaf", demonstrating
acceptance of their "deafness".

Sainsbury (1986:p:182) quotes Padden and
Markowicz as stating that the deaf "community" is
'....an ethnic group with its own language and

culture', the characteristics being language, general style of life and basic value orientation. Ladd (Miles:1988:pp:34-36) describes a deaf "community" with characteristics of Sign Language, deaf clubs, and with members who attended schools for the deaf. Fluent use of British Sign Language is mentioned by Woll and Lawson (1981:p:230) as the principal identifying characteristic of the deaf "community"; they add that members have attended schools for the deaf, that over 90% marry within the community, and that they are drawn together for sporting and social activities.

A deaf community, according to Padden (Baker and Battinson:1982:p:92) is 'a group of deaf people who live in a particular location, share the common goals of its members, and in various ways work towards achieving these goals'. She lists the characteristics as location, language, and common goals. Discussing Padden's statement in relation to his own findings in South Humberside (Jones:1982:p:346) concludes that the deaf population there could be said to live in a particular location in as much as both deaf clubs serve particular geographical areas; respondents inter-act socially, choose their marriage partners from amongst other respondents, and share a common language; thus it might be reasonable to use the term "community" in describing them.

At this juncture it is possible to observe that respondents in Lincoln and Spalding share characteristics mentioned in the literature, in that they use Sign Language, attended schools for the deaf, attend deaf clubs, and inter-marry (p:61f). 2)<u>Membership An Achieved Status:</u> It is not sufficient simply to be deaf to be a member of the deaf "community". Higgins (1980:p:38) writes that membership has to be achieved through identification with the deaf world, shared experiences that come of being hearing impaired, and participation in the community's activities. 'Without all three characteristics, one cannot be nor would one choose to be a member of the deaf community' he concludes. Nash and Nash (1981:p:100) make a similar point in writing 'most deaf people of course have hearing parents. Perforce they are not ascribed a membership in the community of the deaf but must achieve that acceptance chiefly through demonstration of sign language skills and the expression of proper attitudes and knowledge about everyday problems. That is, they must know what it means to be deaf according to an adult version of common-sense knowledge and must express themselves within an approved medium.'

There is agreement from Benderly (1980:p:12) about this aspect of the deaf "community", who says

that only 10% of deaf people are born to deaf parents
and are thus able to grow up "culturally" deaf; most
deaf children 'must learn to be the adults they become
from others, in other places, and often without their
parents' knowledge and approval'. She continues
(1980:p:13), 'this strange and melancholy circumstance
reverberates through the entire life and history
of deaf people all over the world'.

Sadly, over the years parents have failed
to heed the advice of Laurent Clerc, the deaf teacher
of the deaf who accompanied Thomas Gallaudet to
America in 1816 to help found deaf education in that
country. Lane (1988:pp:264-265) quotes Clerc as
exhorting parents thus - 'parents, seek out the deaf
parents in your community. Ask their help in learning
sign. Encourage your child to play with theirs so
he may make rapid progress in language. Not only
will you and your child continue to grow as you
continue to communicate, but you will gain much of
great value, a second tongue, a second set of friends,
a deeper insight into the variety and richness of
the human condition'. He goes on to ask whether,
instead, they will 'heed the oralists who say "your
child is not deaf, he just cannot hear"; who use
your increasing guilt to whip you into a frenzy of
denial: force the child to speak, never sign;
struggle, labour, persevere - or plead guilty. But

having a deaf child is not a crime. Refusing to
communicate with him is. That is an abuse of your
child as surely as if you walled him up in an attic
room'.

Kyle (1985:p:139) explains the problem
for present day deaf children; 'the complicating
factor is that 90% of deaf children are born to
hearing parents and 90% of deaf parents have hearing
children. If deafness produces a culture it is not
like that of hearing minority communities, where
ethnic identity is passed on within families. The
deaf child's future therefore lies in the context
of parental aspirations for community membership.
Deaf children, because their parents are hearing,
often have the highest priority placed on their
acquisition of hearing-like behaviour'.

It is evident that self-identification
as "deaf" is important, because without this the
deaf person does not achieve membership of the deaf
"community". The crucial role of the residential
school for the deaf also becomes apparent, because,
despite 'parental aspirations for community
membership', deaf children are most likely to grow
into the adaptations of deaf adults. Beyond the
close control of their parents, they are in a "deaf"
environment - the deaf peer group, significant others,
role models and so on, with the addition of fluent

inter-personal communication with Sign Language.

3)<u>Deafness The Common Factor</u>: The fact that deafness is the common factor, and the most obvious characteristic of the deaf "community" is mentioned by Benderly (1980:p:12) who says 'unlike other disabled people, those who identify themselves as deaf form a true society, a genuine cultural group'. She also reinforces the points made later (p:324f) about deaf "community" members sharing a particular identity because of their distinctive communication and life experience. Boros and Stuckless (1882:p:21) agree about shared deafness, but sound a warning about using the ethnic model, writing that although the deaf community has much in common with ethnic minorities, their commonality should not be over stated. They write 'identity as a minority stems from deafness, which sets them apart not only from ethnic minorities, but also from those with other disabilities'. Benderly (1980:p:12) agrees that 'of all the physical disabilities deafness is the only one that makes its members part of a natural community'.

Brien (1981:pp:24-25) does not care for the ethnic minority idea either, saying that there is in the deaf community little deaf history, or feel for history, and the importance placed upon school experience and late entry to the community

are other characteristics not usually associated with ethnicity. He writes 'the differences which characterise the deaf experience are such that it would seem the deaf constitute a category on their own'.

4)Location: Location was mentioned by Padden (p:326) as a characteristic of the deaf "community", and it is true that deaf people meet in deaf clubs which serve geographical areas. However, that point should be qualified because, as Kyle and Woll state (1985:pp:9-10) 'the community of the deaf is unusual in many respects, since it does not form a geographical nucleus. Deaf people do not live in the same street or area of town. They do not all work in the same places....in some parts of the U.K. they meet only once or twice a week and they spend most of their time in a hearing world. This produces a community pattern which is rather fragmented in the time spent together but extremely closely bonded in the friendship of the members'. So the deaf "community" has no territorial identity, but inter-action is geographically based (presumably because of allegiance to particular deaf clubs), and based on the need to meet (Nash and Nash:1981:p: 101).

It should also be added that recently deaf people who might not previously have been willing

to acknowledge their deafness openly, have been doing so. This is not mentioned in the literature, but was noted in the course of preparing this study, amongst ex-pupils of Mary Hare Grammar School (for deaf children). Ladd (Miles:1988:p:28) suggests that ex-pupils of this school living in Scotland do not attend deaf clubs. However, it is possible that they come together outside the deaf clubs, as other ex-pupils were observed doing (p:362f). These deaf people probably exhibit characteristics similar to deaf club attenders; certainly they use Sign Language and have a need to meet others like themselves.

5) Deaf People Cannot Assimilate Into The Majority Culture: one final characteristic, not often mentioned, but of great importance, is that deaf people, unlike other minority groups, do not have the ability to assimilate into the majority culture by acquiring the language for conversation. They cannot do this (it can sometimes be learned in its written form, but even this is difficult (Conrad:1979:p:140)) because their deafness limits them to lipreading, so however well they understand English, they cannot use it for fluent inter-personal communication. As Ladd (Miles: 1988:p:34) says, deaf people 'have no other reasonable means of communication' except Sign Language. Kyle and Woll

(1985:p:259) write 'the one aspect of minority groups'
change which is at present unavailable to deaf people
is the adoption of spoken language: that is, unlike
other groups, they do not acquire a substitute mother
tongue for their own language'.

Thus what is known as the deaf "community"
is characterised by, in particular, the deafness
of its members, the use of Sign Language, the fact
that membership is not ascribed, but achieved, and
deaf people having to identify themselves as "deaf"
to belong. The desire to be together and the
friendship of members is also a strong characteristic,
with deaf people meeting in deaf clubs and elsewhere.
In addition, it is impossible for members of the
deaf "community" to acquire the language of the
dominant culture to use for everyday inter-personal
communication with "hearing" people.

B.Membership Of The Deaf "Community"

To members of the deaf "community" deafness
is part of their personalities. Given the choice,
they would probably have preferred to have been
"hearing", but they have grown up with deafness,
have accepted it, and have adapted to living in
"hearing" society without being able to hear (p:347f).
Kyle and Woll (1985:p:6) express this in terms of
attitudinal deafness, suggesting that it is the key
to membership of the deaf community. They have

a reservation, however, (1985:p: 21), '....the
expression of choice within the community, or need
to share information and communication is not, "I
want to be deaf" but rather "I am a deaf person and
wish to be in contact with other deaf people who
share my language"'.

Attitudinal deafness is highlighted by
Woll and Lawson (1981:p:231) who say that 'self
identification as deaf is therefore crucial in
determining membership of the deaf community, and
this attitudinal deafness can always be matched by
appropriate language use'. These two writers suggest
that four main factors relate to membership of the
American deaf community and say they are equally
applicable to the United Kingdom: they are,
self-identification as deaf, language use, endogamous
marriage patterns, and numerous national, regional,
and local organisations and social structures.

Lysons (1965:p:238) touches upon attitudinal
deafness when he says that some deaf people regard
themselves as a distinct class, and speak of hard
of hearing people as 'not the real deaf', whilst
Jones (1982: pp: 351-357) writes of deaf people
accepting their 'deaf'-ness.

Another writer who mentions features of
membership of the deaf "community" is Sullivan (1952:
p:15), who suggests that deafness in early youth,

attendance at a school for the deaf, and the use of manual communication are all prerequisites to membership.

It has already been mentioned that membership of the deaf "community" is achieved rather than ascribed (p:327f), and this is implicit in the fact that those seeking membership identify themselves as deaf in certain ways, primarily by using Sign Language and mixing socially with other deaf people. It is clear that self-identification as deaf is a most important feature of the deaf "community".

C. <u>Shared Characteristics Of Members Of The Deaf "Community"</u>

1) <u>Hearing Loss From Birth Or Early Childhood</u>: the principal characteristic shared by members of the deaf "community" is childhood deafness. In their Avon study Kyle and Allsop (1982:p:33) found that all their respondents had a serious hearing loss and 79% were profoundly deaf. 72.6% of the deaf population of Avon were deaf from birth and only 6.8% became deaf after the age of 8 years (Kyle and Allsop:1982:p:22). This was equally true of the deaf population of South Humberside (Jones:1982: pp:336-337), where only a relatively few respondents could hear the interviewer's voice, and 58.5% in Grimsby area and 62.3% in Scunthorpe area had no useful hearing; and (Jones: 1982:p:56) 77.4% of

respondents in Grimsby area and 65.5% in Scunthorpe area became deaf before the age of 4 years. In the present study the majority of respondents could not hear speech (table:9:p:63) and became deaf in childhood or were born deaf (table:2:p:61).

If deaf people are going to fully adapt to life without hearing and properly internalise their "deaf" self-image, it is necessary that this process should begin at as early an age as possible. This will make the achievement of membership of the deaf "community" easier because of the gradual nature of the process, and the immersion of the deaf person in a deaf environment (at a school for the deaf) at an early, and impressionable, age.

2)Sign Language: it is generally agreed that Sign Language is the means of communication of the deaf "community". In most cases writers refer to it as the language of the deaf "community", but care must be taken to differentiate between British Sign Language which is now recognised as a language in its own right (p:428f), and Sign Supported English, which, although it displays features of British Sign Language, is predominantly English. It is generally assumed, but not proved, that British Sign Language is mostly used in the deaf clubs. All the respondents in Lincoln and Spalding used Sign Language (table:8:p: 63 & table:18:p:66).

3)<u>Common Educational Background:</u> linked with childhood
acquired deafness is education at a school for the
deaf (usually residential). This is mentioned by
Woll and Lawson (1981:p:239), and Jones (1982:pp:
351-352) found it to be one of the features of the
deaf population of South Humberside. In Avon (Kyle
and Allsop:1982:p:25) 74% of respondents attended
schools for the deaf. This is also a feature of
respondents in the present study (table:4p:61).

4)<u>Shared Social Life:</u> deaf people are drawn together
by numerous sporting events as well as social
activities and such things as school reunions,
according to Woll and Lawson (1981:p:230), and as
a result 'the deaf have formed a cohesive and
supportive community'. Most writers on the deaf
"community" remark on the evident need of deaf people
to come together for social reasons; Nash and Nash
(1981:p:104) note 'indeed, when one becomes immersed
in the literature of the deaf community, an image
appears of that community as stable, remarkably
tenacious, independent, and above all vital'. Higgins
(1980:p:47) includes in his observations marriage
(to other deaf people), friendships, acquaintances,
parties, clubs, and religious organisations amongst
those things he thinks make up a deaf "community".
Kyle and Woll (1985:p:19) write that deaf people's
home and social life reflect the choice of deaf

identity.

In the two United Kingdom studies of deaf "communities" Kyle and Allsop (1982:p:64) found that in Avon 58% of deaf people went to the deaf club once a week or more, and in South Humberside Jones (1982:p:109) shows that 69.8% of deaf people in Grimsby area and 67% in Scunthorpe area attended the deaf club weekly. In the present study all respondents attended the deaf clubs in Lincoln and Spalding regularly (table:12:p:64 & table:14:p:65).

5)Marriage With Other Members Of The Deaf "Community": members of the deaf "community" generally inter-marry. Higgins (1980:p:47) mentions this, and Schein and Delk (1974:p:41) write that 'in choosing a marriage partner, the majority of deaf persons favour a deaf partner'. 79.5% of Schein and Delk's respondents were married to other deaf people. In Woll and Lawson's (1981:p:230) estimation over 90% of the deaf "community" marry within the "community", and Kyle and Allsop (1982:p:25) found that of their married respondents, 92% married a deaf person.

There was a similar picture in South Humberside (Jones:1982:p:170), with 85.7% of respondents in Grimsby area and 92.1% in Scunthorpe area married to other deaf people. Lincoln respondents in the present study who were married

are seen to be married to other deaf people (table:7: p:62).

6)<u>Low Economic Status:</u> 'deaf people are likely to have factory jobs, be supervised by hearing people, and have considerably less chance of promotion than hearing people' suggest Kyle and Woll (1985:p:18). They continue, 'deaf people mainly work with large numbers of hearing people in lower paid jobs'. It seems to be true of the deaf "community" in general that they are likely to experience low economic status.

In reviewing the literature Jones (1982: pp:66-69) found that it is accepted that deaf people have a restricted range of employment, and he suggests that the causes are lack of educational qualifications, poor inter-personal communication, and in some cases difficulty in passing medical examinations because of their deafness. In the present study Lincoln male respondents were nearly all in social class III Manual (table:11p:64) or below, and a number of Lincoln respondents thought they were unlikely to be promoted because of their deafness (table:77p:269).

Sainsbury (1986:p:57) is another writer who notices social class in particular in relation to deaf people, pointing out that 'in general the social class distribution of deaf people reflected

the job opportunities and training offered to them'. As many as 69% were or had been unskilled manual workers and another 19% skilled manual workers; she writes, 'in social class terms, then, the experience of the deaf differs substantially from the population in general'.

In Avon (Kyle and Allsop:1982:p:36) the largest proportion of deaf people were in social classes III Manual and IV, and in South Humberside (Jones: 1982:pp:66-69) the situation was similar, with all respondents except one in social class III Manual or below. Higgins (1980:p:49) writes 'the range of class within the deaf community is truncated'. It would seem that this truncation is bound up with employment, and employment with education and training. This is clearly an area where deaf people need access to training, but even before that they need an education which prepares them to take advantage of employment training.

7)<u>Shared Life Experience</u>: 'navigation in a hearing world' is how Higgins (1980:p:42) explains the shared experience of members of the deaf "community". These are not matters usually mentioned in the literature, but it is clear that because of their deafness deaf people might reasonably be termed "marginal" members of society. As Jones (1982:p:317) puts it 'they are peripheral members of society, and it leaves

them without opportunity for engaging in any sort
of group activity, whether general-social, sporting,
or cultural, in which interpersonal communication
plays a part'. The fact is that deaf people cannot
be assimilated into "hearing" society - it is not
a choice they can make due to the unreliability of
lipreading for receiving spoken communication.

Yet deaf people must be involved with
"hearing" society, at work and in other matters of
everyday living; this is the paradoxical situation
they are in. Jones (1982:p:350) suggests that this
negative element of deaf people's experience, or
set of experiences, stems from their inability to
communicate fluently with "hearing" people, whilst
Nash and Nash (1981:p:90) write that 'marginal
adaptations represent the situation of many deaf
people....'.

Summary

Deaf people can be seen to have numerous
characteristics in common which suggest they might
be considered a "community". Membership of the
"community" has to be achieved, deafness is a common
factor, members tend to meet on a geographical basis,
and it is difficult for members to assimilate into
"hearing" society because they cannot acquire the
national language for conversation.

Membership of the deaf "community" depends very much upon the attitudes of deaf people, because it has to be achieved. This raises the question of communication in the home, and the socialisation and acculturation of the deaf child, which in turn raises the question of parent counselling. These matters are crucially important, and it is because of this that a "philosophy" of deafness is necessary.

It is seen that members of the deaf "community" have a number of characteristics in common: they experienced childhood deafness, use Sign Language, attended schools for the deaf, come together for social/recreational activities, inter-marry, have low economic status, and generally have common experiences of life in "hearing" society.

Nevertheless, deaf people have to be involved with "hearing" people in their everyday lives, so it becomes apparent that they need to reduce their "marginality", particularly in the areas of education, employment and training, as well as in the parental family. It is clear that deaf people cannot achieve this through lipreading (p:220f), so that the matter of communication mediation, or Sign Language interpreting as it is usually known, assumes great importance. It might also be suggested at this stage that the deaf "community" is probably

not sufficient unto itself, and it does not seem incompatible with a deaf sub-culture for deaf people to reduce their marginal status where possible. This is more fully discussed in the next chapter.

The need which stands out above all is that of a fluent means of two way inter-personal communication. It is also apparent that deaf people have a great social hunger, and their social life in the deaf clubs and elsewhere is very important to them.

It is seen that deaf respondents in this study share the characteristics of the deaf people described in the literature. It is now necessary to consider whether the concept of "community" is appropriate to this group of people who clearly have a communication handicap when relating to "hearing" society, and whether the adaptations they make are cultural or sub-cultural.

References

Jones, K.   The Social Effects of Deafness
                             from Birth or Early Childhood.
                             A Study of the Adult Deaf
                             Population of South Humberside

   Typewritten. M.Phil. Thesis. Unpublished, 1982

Kyle, J.G.   Sign Language. The Study
&   of Deaf People and Their
Woll, B.   Language

   Cambridge University Press, 1985

Sainsbury, Sally   Deaf Worlds. A Study of
                             Integration, Segregation
                             and Disability

   Hutchinson, 1986

Ladd, Paddy.   Chapter 2 in Miles, Dorothy
                             British Sign Language. A
                             Beginner's Guide

   BBC Books, 1988, pp:27-43

Woll, Bencie   'British Sign Language'
&   Chapter 21 in Hangen, E.,
Lawson, Lilian   McClure, J.D. and Thompson,
                             D. Minority Languages Today

   Edinburgh University Press, 1981, pp:218-234

Padden, Carol   Chapter 3 in Baker, Charlotte
                             and Battinson, Robbin (Eds.)
                             'Sign Language and the Deaf
                             Community'
                             The Deaf Community and the
                             Culture of Deaf People

   National Association of the Deaf,1980,
   pp:89-103

Higgins, Paul C.   Outsiders in a Hearing World

   Sage, 1980

Nash, Jeffrey E.   Deafness in Society
&
Nash, Anedith

   Lexington Books, 1981

Benderly, B.L.   Dancing Without Music

    Anchor Press/Doubleday, 1980

Lane, Harlan   When the Mind Hears. A
                          History of the Deaf

    Penguin Books, 1988

Kyle, J.G.   'Deaf People. Assessing
                          the Community or the Handicap'
                          Bulletin of the British
                          Psychological Society
                          1985, (38) pp:137-141

Boros, Alexander   'The Dynamics of Social Lag
&   Amongst Deaf People' in
Stuckless, Ross   Boros, Alexander and
                          Stuckless, Ross (Eds.)
                          Social Aspects of Deafness
                          Volume 6

    Conference: Sociology of Deafness, Gallaudet
College, Washington, 1982, pp:17-45

Brien, David   'Is There a Deaf Culture
                          Available to the Young Deaf
                          Person'

    Proceedings. Study Weekend. National Council
of Social Workers with the Deaf. Loughborough,
1981 pp:1-24

Ladd, Paddy   Chapter 2 in Miles, Dorothy
                          British Sign Language. A
                          Beginner's Guide

    BBC Books, 1988 pp:27-43

Conrad, R   The Deaf School Child

    Harper and Row, 1979

Lysons, Clifford   Some Aspects of the Historical
Kenneth   Development and Present
                          Organisation of Voluntary
                          Welfare Societies for Adult
                          Deaf Persons in England
                          1840-1963

    Typewritten. M.A. Thesis. Unpublished, 1965

Sullivan, Frank B.   'The Deaf Population in the
                         United States'
                         National Symposium on the
                         Deaf. Driving and
                         Employability

    United States Department of Health, Education
    and Welfare, 1962, pp:13-21

Kyle, J.G.   Deaf People and the Community.
&   Final Report to the Nuffield
Allsop, L.   Foundation

    Bristol University. Typewritten. Unpublished,
    1982

Schein, Jerome D.   The Deaf Population of the
&   United States
Delk, Marcus T. Jnr.

    National Association of the Deaf, 1974

CHAPTER 19   'Deaf People's Sub-Cultural Adaptations'

Social inter-action with other deaf people
appears to be very important to the social well-being
of those who are born deaf, or who become deaf in
early childhood. This inter-action, based on the use
of Sign Language, usually begins at residential
schools for the deaf, with little contribution from
adults, and sometimes discouragement from teachers
and parents (p:283). It is important that the
benefits of this inter-action should be understood,
so that parents and educators can include awareness
of the social-psychological needs of deaf people in
the socialisation and acculturation of the deaf child.

Deaf "Community" Or Social Group

There is little discussion about the
sociological status of the deaf group, though its
characteristics are described by a number of writers,
and it is generally referred to as the deaf
"community". Nash and Nash (1981:pp:99-100) assert
that in a sociological sense 'the deaf community
is certainly a viable entity, standing as a minority
group among other minority groups'. Higgins
(1980:p:38)suggests that Hillery's definition of
a community as 'people in social inter-action within
a geographical area and having one or more additional
ties' (Hillery:1955:p:111) broadly

characterised deaf communities.

Jones (1982:pp:346-347) thinks that this
definition describes deaf groups in South Humberside;
he suggests, bearing in mind Hillery's (1965:pp:
34) statement that 'sociologists have employed no
less than 16 concepts in formulating 94 different
definitions........that the term as it exists in
the general as well as the technical sense, has too
many meanings to be understood', that in a general
sense the word community might be applied to the
deaf population of South Humberside, in the same
way that it is applied to other groups of people
who have identity of interest, or interests in common,
such as the Jewish community, or the Roman Catholic
community in a Protestant city.

Community, then, is a word which can be
applied to the deaf group in a more general sense.
However, it has implications of exclusiveness which
can mislead those who do not know about deaf people,
and it can lead to the creation of a stereotype of
them (p:42f). It is suggested by the present study
that the phrase "deaf social group" might be a more
appropriate description.

Deaf Social Group

The evidence from the literature and the
testimony of the deaf respondents in this study point
to the fact that those deaf people who come together

for social/recreational activities can be regarded as a social group. Frankenberg (1973:pp:18-19) differentiates between a category and a group, suggesting that a category is a collection of people who share certain characteristics but do not necessarily inter-act socially, whilst the main characteristic of a group is social inter-action between members. He states 'further its members are often seen as having aims in common which impose a group boundary. In other words there are not only members but also individuals who are clearly and definitely not members'.

The deaf group have a strong need to come together, and the use of Sign Language and the choice of "deaf" identity will act as barriers to membership, so that members and non-members can be distinguished. Benderly (1980:p:12) is making this point when she writes that deaf people, unlike other disabled people, form a 'true society', or in the terminology of the present study, a social group.

Culture Too General A Concept To Apply To The Deaf Social Group

A more contentious issue is that of applying the term "culture" to the deaf social group, a practice which has become more common in recent years, particularly as deaf people themselves have sought recognition for Sign Language, and for themselves

as a group.   Indeed, Kyle and Woll (1985:p:23) state categorically 'there is clearly a deaf culture in the U.K.though this is not as visible to hearing people as it is, for example, in the U.S.A.'.

Padden (Baker and Battinson:1980:p:93) defines a culture as 'a set of learned behaviours of a group of people who have their own language, values, rules for behaviour, and traditions' and she suggests that members of the deaf culture behave as deaf people do, use the language of deaf people, and share the beliefs of deaf people towards themselves and other people who are not deaf. Unfortunately, there is little discussion of this subject in relation to the British deaf "community", but Padden's definition might be too general and more fitting for a nation than groups of deaf people who culturally have much in common with the "hearing" people who surround them.

It is argued here that as with community, culture has acquired too general a meaning for it to apply specifically to the deaf group.   It is suggested (Seymour-Smith:1986:p:65) that 'since Tylor's classic definition......the concept of culture had been defined and employed in a great variety of different ways, and there is no overall consensus to its precise meaning'.   Similarly Herskovitz

(1967:p:3) states 'definitions of culture are

numerous. Kroeber and Kluckholn reviewing these

definitions and the concepts of culture associated

with them, list over 160 different formal

delimitations of the term'. Herskovitz goes on to

write that there is general agreement that culture

is learned, allows man to adapt to his natural and

social setting, that it is greatly variable, and

that it is manifested in institutions through patterns

and material objects.

Culture Applies To Whole Societies Or National Groups

In general terms culture can be seen to

apply to whole societies and national groups, as

in the definition by Haviland (1974:pp:8-9); 'when

we speak of culture, we refer to man's learned

behaviour, passed on from generation to generation

by non-hereditary means. Culture is the way of life

of an entire people'. Bullock, Stallybrass and

Strombley (1988:p:195) make a similar definition

of culture as 'the social heritage of a country',

whilst Tumin (1973:p:273) goes into more detail when

describing culture as 'the style of life of a society,

its distinctive way of performing basic institutional

tasks; how goods and services are produced and

distributed, the kind of political organisation that

prevails, themes that are dominant in family life,

and what the children are taught'. More succinctly,

Nobbs, Hine and Flemming (1981:p:51) state 'culture is socially shared and transmitted knowledge of what is, and what ought to be, symbolized in art and artifact'.

It seems that the term culture can be applied more generally; Tumin (1973:p:273) states 'more generally speaking, culture can be considered the life style of any group, society or not. Many groups that collectively comprise our society have distinctive cultures of their own within the general American culture. These are sometimes called "subcultures"'. Maus (1962:p:130) writes 'culture is a heritage passed on from one generation to the next, which is brought up in it. It represents an unmistakable whole which distinguishes one group, tribe, or people from another. It is a historical accumulation'. Harriman (1972:p:92) produces a similar definition when he writes that culture is 'the mores, folkways, institutions, and traditions which distinguish one group, nation, or race from another'.

Deaf Way Of Life And Sub-Cultural Adaptation

If "social group" is to describe the deaf group, it is suggested that "way of life" might best describe what is sometimes call deaf "culture". The idea of sub-culture might be employed to describe why a special way of life is necessary to deaf people.

Except for the 10% of deaf people who are born to one or more deaf parents (Benderly:1980: p:13), deaf people are born into "hearing" society and therefore "hearing" culture. As Benderly (1980: p:13) puts it 'they must learn to be the adults they become from others, in other places, and often without their parents' knowledge or approval'. According to Higgins (1980:p:38) and Nash and Nash (1981:p:100) membership of the deaf community, and therefore deaf culture, is an achieved rather than an ascribed status, and the full meaning of Benderly's statement above is highlighted by this knowledge of achieved membership of the deaf social group. Members of the deaf social group are born into "hearing" society and culture and in order to become fully integrated personalities have to adapt to life without hearing (Jones:1982:pp:304-308). Unfortunately, this process is frequently delayed or hindered by an "oral" education which frowns upon the use of Sign Language.

Sub-cultures, according to Young (1974:p:161) 'emerge from the moral springboard of already existing cultures', and Seymour-Smith (1986:p:271) suggests a sub-culture is a group culture which diverges in part from the dominant culture of the wider society'. She continues 'the term sub-culture is used to refer to minority cultures within a larger dominant culture'. These definitions would seem to apply to the deaf

social group and their particular way of life, which includes Sign Language, exclusive membership, and common experience of life in "hearing" society. It can also be seen that knowledge about living in a "hearing" society would be passed from one generation of members of the deaf social group to the next, in particular Sign language, and, for example, the inadvisability of marrying "hearing" people.

Deaf People Adapt At Different Levels

Clearly, if deaf children are usually born into "hearing" families they have to achieve membership of the deaf social group, and the deaf social group will have grown up out of deaf people's experience of adapting to living without the ability to hear. It can be seen that deaf people adapt at different levels: in situations where they have no choice, as with their parental families and at the work place, they are peripheral members of those groups (p:256f). Because of the limitations of lipreading as a means of receiving spoken communication they adapt by withdrawing to some extent (p:261), or by using special "hearing" people who will give them some idea of what is happening around them, say at family parental events (p:259f). They also use professional Sign Language interpreters or social workers with deaf people to mediate for them with "hearing" people in various communication situations (p310f). All these methods

of adaptation mean that they are accommodating themselves to the limitations of being deaf in "hearing" society.

However, in areas where they have choice Sign Language using deaf people have established the deaf social group, which provides them with a social/recreational life which is able to satisfy their social-psychological needs for individual relationships and group membership. As Jones (1982:p;308) puts it the deaf group is '......a positive adaptation by a group of human beings, who, brought together in infancy, overcame the communication problem, which is the basis of their disability. They accept deafness as part of themselves, and work to find their social and psychological satisfactions within a framework which includes deafness. Thus they gain an equanimity of outlook which might not be expected from people with such a major handicap'.

This adaptation, which is substitution of "deaf" for "hearing", appears to be a normal human response to a particular set of circumstances, and the deaf sub-culture can be seen to have emerged as in Bullock, Stallybrass and Strombley's (1988:p:824) definition: '....a social group with its own sense of identity - ethnic, occupational or otherwise will lead to the development of a sub-culture whose function it is to maintain the security and identity of the

group in question, and to generate a set of meanings
that enable it to tolerate the exigencies of its
situation'. Young (1974:p:161) makes a similar
observation, writing that sub-cultures are '....the
solutions to problems perceived within the framework
of these initial cultures'. He goes on to suggest
a theory of man as 'purposefully striving to achieve
his aspirations, and in this process evolving a series
of solutions or strategies to achieve this end'.

The deaf sub-culture has arisen as an
adaptation to conditions in which deaf people cannot
achieve certain aspirations; originally, they could
not communicate with each other as children, so the
first adaptation was Sign Language. This was followed
by the growth of the deaf social group, because they
aspired to companionship and could not achieve this
with "hearing" people, with whom they had no means
of fluent inter-personal communication. They then
used communication mediators for communication with
"hearing" people in various communication situations.
This ability to communicate fluently also means that
an alternative socialisation process is available
(Jones:1982:p:380) because it is likely, as Lunde
(Stokoe:1978:p:18) suggests, that many of those deaf
from childhood will not pass through the normal
experience of socialisation; and through this
alternative process of socialisation deaf people will

be enabled to experience the deaf sub-cultural acculturation. It must be said here, however, that there is no authoritative work on this subject in the United Kingdom and because of it's importance in the context of Sign Language and knowledge of deafness in general there is a need for research.

Lack Of Communication Limits Deaf People's Access To "Hearing" Acculturation

This adaptation of an alternative process of socialisation through Sign Language has arisen because deaf people cannot absorb the dominant culture, which relies upon fluent inter-personal communication, through speech and hearing, to pass it on. Wilson (1971:p:90), for example, writes that culture is 'socially shared and transmitted'; Nobbs, Hine and Flemming (1981:p:51) write 'the child will learn the culture of his society through the socialisation process - first through family, by learning language'; and Worsley (1980:p:25) states '....culture is only transmissible through coding, classifying and concentrating experience through some kind of language'. Finally, Zeitlin (1973:p:22) states that the elements of culture are 'learned, shared and transmitted'.

The overall impression gained from the literature on culture is that it is necessary to be able to communicate in order to go through the process

of acculturation. Thus deaf people need to make sub-
cultural adaptations in order to achieve the normal
human aspirations of personal contact through inter-
personal communication.

Validity Of Deaf Social Group And Way Of Life

At this point it should be noted that there
is no deaf culture properly defined, but this is not
to deny the validity of the deaf social group, or
its special way of life. Clearly, deaf people form
a group (or, more likely, a number of groups) which
can be identified by certain characteristics (p:335f);
and they have clearly defined sub-cultural adaptations,
which can be described as a distinctive way of life.

From observations made during the course
of this study, some of which are described in appendix
2 (p:645), it appears that some of the activities
which take place in deaf clubs and other places, in
which deaf people take part, cannot be defined as
"deaf" culture in the true sense. The deaf clubs them-
selves, in some cases with licensed bars, seem to be no
more than ordinary social clubs, except that the means
of communication is Sign Language. There is nothing
peculiarly "deaf" about bingo, for example, except
that in the deaf club the caller uses Sign Language.

The same could be said of some of the more
"cultural" activities; the deaf church, for example,
has deaf choirs which sign hymns and anthems. The

writer of this study attended a festival of deaf choirs at Coventry Cathedral in October 1987. There were approximately 30 choirs from all over England, and as far away as Scotland and Northern Ireland.

All the choirs were accompanied by organ music and in most cases there was at least one "hearing" person, usually the conductor, who could give the rhythm. In all cases except one it was observed that they used the English form of words on the lips, and supported this with signs (Sign Supported English).

During the day at Coventry Cathedral the writer met a group of Sign Language students from the Communication Centre at the Royal School for the Deaf, Derby. There were also a number of deaf people there who were Sign Language teachers. They were scornful of the fact that Sign Supported English was used, and the general feeling was that this was 'not real deaf culture'. However, there were something like 30 choirs, some with as many as 20 members, and there were about 3 to 400 in the audience. Nearly everyone was deaf and they were all using Sign Language. It was not "deaf" culture, it was "hearing" culture adapted so that deaf people could enjoy it. It was deaf people taking part in their special way of life. Translation into British Sign Language would have been difficult and would have made it difficult

to use music. As it was, the participants were able to enjoy signing to the rhythm of the music, in unison.

The same could be said of other activities which have been called deaf "culture", such as sign-song, a recent phenomenon in which a deaf person accompanies a "pop" song with signs, which has become popular with young deaf people. In this, Sign Language is used, but it is an adaptation of "hearing" culture, and is now part of the peculiar way of life of deaf people; but it is not distinctively "deaf" culture. Deaf theatre comes into the same category, with deaf people acting and using Sign Language instead of speech, but the idea of theatre itself is "hearing" culture.

Deaf Social Group Not Homogeneous: A Variety Of Sub-Groups

Those who were scornful that British Sign Language was not used at Coventry should have been aware that these were deaf people taking part, who were defining how they wanted to behave. This was their deaf way of life, illustrating a point that has not been particularly noticed in the literature, which is that there is likely to be a variety of sub-groups within the overall deaf social group (p: 361). The British deaf social group has an exclusive membership in that all are deaf; but it is not a homogeneous group. The individuals differ greatly,

as the present writer observed during the course of
the present study. It is likely that there is a great
variety of ability, in communicating with "hearing"
people, knowledge of English, ability to speak, general
education, personal interests and inclination.

There is also likely to be a variety of
sub-groups within the deaf sub-culture; the deaf
children of deaf parents, for example, probably have
the purest British Sign Language, having been brought
up with it as their first language in the family.
A deaf person (Layne:1982:p:190), writing of the
Rochester (U.S.A.) deaf community, states '....hearing
people tend to view this community as one homogeneous
group of deaf people. Based on the insider's
perspective presented here, it appears that the
Rochester deaf community is in reality a collection
of smaller communities'.

Although there is no written evidence, it
is clear from the present writer's observations that
some deaf people meet in places other than the
traditional deaf clubs, and that these deaf clubs
do not necessarily meet the social needs of all deaf
people. Further research is needed to establish the
extent of the British deaf social group, and the
relation between the group and the deaf way of life.
Brien (1981:p:2) writes 'though deaf community and
deaf culture are inseparable parts of the same entity,

not every deaf person is culturally deaf'. It is
likely that the British deaf social group has grown
in recent years to include other groups of deaf people
who might not even have admitted to being deaf in
the past.

Ex-pupils of Mary Hare Grammar School (for
the deaf) are another example. Ladd (Miles:1988:p:28)
states that ex-pupils of this school do not attend
deaf clubs in Scotland; however, this does not mean
that they do not meet each other. Although nothing
else is known of the Scottish ex-Mary Hare pupils,
the present writer knows of another group from this
school who regularly meet together, though they live
in different parts of the country; they do not
generally attend deaf clubs. When two of their year
married, 24 out of the 26 in that year came to the
wedding; when one of the year died recently the young
person's father is known to have been deeply impressed
by how many deaf school-friends attended the funeral.
One of this group said 'it's an unwritten law, you
always turn up to 18th and 21st birthday parties'.
With school reunions and other more informal
gatherings, the members of this school year go to
considerable lengths to meet. At one 21st birthday
party the five guests travelled to the east coast
from Glasgow, Birmingham, Chester, London, and
Bournemouth.

These young people appear to accept their deafness; one remarked to another 'you seem to be proud of being deaf' and received the answer, 'I am, aren't you, or are you still trying to be like the "hearing"?

It would be wrong to describe a group like this as "culturally" deaf. They are well educated (some at universities and polytechnics), well read, widely travelled (one recently returned from Australia with "Operation Raleigh") young people. They attend "hearing" discotheques, cinemas, and social activities with their "hearing" fellow students, but they give the impression of having come to terms with the limitations imposed by their deafness. They welcome such innovations as Sign Language interpreters in "hearing" theatre (British Deaf News:1988:p:6) because this widens their access to "hearing" culture. They have made the adaptation of Sign Language, but to them, apart from helping them to communicate with each other, it is a means of access to "hearing" culture, rather than the larger deaf social group - though some of them are into this as well. These deaf people have made sub-cultural adaptations to make life bearable for themselves in "hearing" society, every bit as much as those who use British Sign Language.

It might be reasonable to suggest that there

is no one deaf social group, but a number of groups, containing deaf people who adapt to some extent, on a continuum between spending most of their leisure time with deaf people, through moving between deaf and "hearing" worlds, to having little to do with the deaf social group.

The Deaf Clubs As Meeting Places For General Activities

It has been suggested in the paragraph above that the deaf social group is not homogeneous, that the abilities and inclinations of individual deaf people vary greatly, and that there are likely to be numerous sub-groups. This might be said of "hearing" society; however, deaf people usually have only one formal meeting place in a particular geographical area, the deaf club, though it is likely that informal groups of deaf people meet regularly in cafes, public houses and their homes. In Spalding, for example, one respondent reported meeting other deaf people in a cafe each week. This, perhaps, is why it is sometimes mistakenly believed that the deaf club is the local deaf "community". In fact it is where the local deaf people meet formally, that is all. Jones (1982:p:223) quotes Abrahams as saying that she could not find like-minded deaf people in the run of the mill deaf club. She went to Mary Hare Grammar School, so it is for perhaps the same reason the Scottish Mary Hare ex-pupils (p:362) do not attend the deaf

club. Yet as has been noted, some Mary Hare ex-pupils
have the /same need for "deaf" fellowship as other deaf
people. They seek each other out in other ways, but
they are still making sub-cultural adaptations. The
important fact to be noted is not that deaf people
meet in deaf clubs, but that they meet, no matter
where. It is suggested that there is a fruitful area
of research here.

Jones (1982:p:326), describing the deaf
groups in South Humberside, suggests that living there
and being deaf is to be doubly handicapped, because
the opportunity for social activity is limited due
to there being so few deaf people. He writes that
in order to do deaf drama a deaf person living in
Grimsby must travel to Lincoln. This would apply
to most age or interest groups, as well as to sports
teams and such activities as deaf further education
classes.

Thus a deaf person living in the London
area would be more likely to engage in purely "deaf"
activities because of the larger numbers of deaf people
living there. They could, for instance, attend a
variety of classes at the City Literary Institute
(leaflet:undated), which specialises in "deaf" further
education. The deaf person wanting to attend a further
education class in Lincoln would, willy nilly, have
to attend with "hearing" people - providing they could

find an interpreter, then find someone to pay the interpreter's fee.

The point being made here is that the deaf club is not the deaf social group, it is a meeting place for deaf people. To partake in deaf theatre and other peculiarly "deaf" activities many deaf people have to travel, either to other deaf clubs, or places where a particular activity is being arranged, perhaps at a weekend.

The deaf clubs are meeting places, but the deaf social group, in order to function usefully, must be seen as a national, or perhaps regional entity.

Deaf Sub-Culture Dependent Upon The National Culture

An interesting study would be a comparison of deaf social groups in other countries, to establish the extent to which deaf national groups are culturally similar to their national cultures. With regard to the United Kingdom the present study suggests that in the three main elements of culture, namely sociological, ideological, and technological (Kottak:1975:p:19 and Lewis:1969:pp:76-77) deaf people's lives are defined by the dominant national culture.

Sociologically, deaf people are governed by the national political system, they work in the national industrial system, and they generally follow the customs of "hearing" society in as much as they

marry, belong to social clubs, play the national sports and so on.

Ideologically, deaf people appear to conform to the major religions in the United Kingdom, and the Church of England was a major contributor to the development of Missions to deaf people during the 19th century (p:83).

Technologically, deaf people have benefitted from modern electrical devices; personal hearing aids have enabled some partially deaf children to hear almost normally (Conrad:1979:p:2) and sub-titled television, the news and information pages such as Ceefax and Oracle on television, have enabled deaf people, to some extent at least, to keep up with news and information. The Minicom telephone adaptors which print out the message, flashing doorbells, vibrating alarm clocks, and other devices all make life easier for deaf people in a society adapted for those who can hear. However, they are not "deaf" devices, but normal "hearing" technology which has been adapted for use by deaf people.

Summary

The status of the deaf social group has been discussed. It is suggested that both "community" and "culture" are broad concepts which do not clearly define the deaf social group or their distinctive way of life.

Clearly, deaf people have a great need for fellowship
and for a means of communication with which to carry
on this fellowship. Because deaf people inter-act
socially it is suggested that the phrase "social group"
defines their social life without stereotyping them
and is less likely to give the impression that deaf
people are totally excluded from society at large.

Deaf people do not appear to have a separate
culture, but this does not invalidate the importance
to them of their way of life. The deaf social group
has an exclusive membership, but its "culture" or
social behaviour is not original; it is a series
of adaptations which become a way of life and a means
of coping with life in "hearing" society. Therefore
it is suggested that the term "sub-culture" is the
most accurate description. Again, in order to be
more precise, and so as not to give the impression
that deaf people are totally outside "hearing"
culture, another phrase, in this case the deaf "way
of life" is used.

It is suggested that the sub-cultural
adaptations to life in "hearing" society that deaf
people are making, correspond closely to the
definition of sub-culture quoted by Thompson
(1982:p:111) : '1.the group identified as sub-culture
shares a distinctive way of life and possesses
knowledge, beliefs, values, codes, tastes and

prejudices of their own 2.these are learned from others in the group who already exhibit these characteristics 3.their way of life has a historical dimension and has somehow become traditional among those who inherit and share the social conditions to which the sub-cultural conditions are a response'.

The fact that deaf children usually have "hearing" parents is thought to be important, because membership of the deaf social group is an achieved status. Not only is it not ascribed, it is frequently discouraged (p:353).

This description allows for the development of a philosophy of deafness in which the deaf child is socialised into deaf sub-culture and "hearing" culture as well. He can be taught to recognise that he is deaf and must adapt, but also that he is part of a wider culture, of work, art, family life and child rearing. The more the deaf person knows of "hearing" culture, the richer will be the deaf sub-culture.

Most of the literature gives the impression of a self-sufficient community with its own culture. This is a false impression, which, it is suggested, further marginalises deaf people. The concept of sub-cultural adaptation because of the inability to hear, and the consequent development of a deaf social group with its own way of life in certain

social-psychological aspects, is a more exact way

of explaining the phenomenon of the deaf social group.

References

Nash, Jeffrey E.   Deafness in Society
&
Nash, Anedith

     Lexington Books, 1981

Higgins, Paul C.   Outsiders in a Hearing World

     Sage, 1980

Jones, K.   The Social Effects of Deafness
                         from Birth or Early Childhood.
                         A Study of the Adult Deaf
                         Population of South Humberside

     Typewritten. M.Phil. Thesis. Unpublished, 1982

Frankenberg, Ronald   Communities in Britain.
                         Social Life in Town and
                         Country

     Penguin Books, 1973

Benderley, B.L.   Dancing Without Music

     Anchor Press/Doubleday, 1980

Kyle, J.G.   Sign Language. The Study
&   of Deaf People and Their
Woll, B.   Language

     Cambridge University Press, 1985

Padden, Carol   Chapter 3 in Baker, Charlotte
                         & Battinson, Robbin (Eds.)
                         'Sign Language and the Deaf
                         Community'
                         The Deaf Community and the
                         Culture of Deaf People

     National Association of the Deaf, 1980, pp89-103

Seymour-Smith,   Macmillan Dictionary of
Charlotte   Anthropology

     Macmillan, 1986

Herkovitz, Melville J.   Cultural Dynamics

     Alfred Knopf, 1967

Zeitlin, Irving M.   Re-Thinking Sociology

     Appleton - Century - Crofts, 1973

Layne, Charles A.   'The Deaf Way: an Ethnography
                           of a Deaf Adult' in Higgins,
                           Paul and Nash, Jeff (Eds.)
                           Social Aspects of Deafness
                           Volume 3

     Conference: Sociology of Deafness, Gallaudet
     College, Washington, 1982, pp:173-192

Brien, David   'Is There a Deaf Culture
                           Available to the Young Deaf
                           Person'

     Proceedings. Study weekend. National Council
     of Social Workers with the Deaf.
     Loughborough, 1981 pp:1-24

Ladd, Paddy   Chapter 2 in Miles, Dorothy
                           British Sign Language. A
                           Beginner's Guide

     BBC Books, 1988, pp:27-43

British Deaf News   'On Tour. Signed Shakespeare'
Report   The British Deaf News
                           March 1988 Vol.19(3) p:6

The City Lit   Information Leaflet
Centre

     The City Lit Centre for Deaf People and Speech
     Therapy, undated

Kottak, Conrad   Cultural Anthropology
Philip

     Random House inc., 1975

Lewis, John   Anthropology Made Simple
B.Sc. Ph.D.

     W.H.Allen, 1969

Conrad, R.   The Deaf School Child

     Harper & Row, 1979

Thompson, Jane L.   Sociology Made Simple

     Heinemann, 1982

Haviland, William A.   Anthropology

   Holt, Rinehart and Winston inc., 1974

Bullock, Alan   The Fontana Dictionary of
Stallybrass, Stephen   Modern Thought
&
Strombley, Stephen (Eds.)

   Fontana Press, 1988

Tumin, Melville M.   Patterns of Society

   Little, Brown and Company, 1973

Nobbs, Jack   Sociology
Hine, Bob
&
Flemming, Margaret

   Macmillan Education, 1981

Maus, Heinz   A Short History of Sociology

   Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1962

Harriman, Philip   Dictionary of Psychology
Lawrence (Ed.)

   Peter Owen, 1972

Young, Jock   'New Directions in Sub-
                        Cultural Theory' in Rex,
                        John (Ed.) Approaches to
                        Sociology

   Routledge, Kegan and Paul, 1974

Lunde, Dr. Anders   Chapter 2 in Stokoe, William
                        C. Sign Language Structure

   Linstock Press inc., 1978, pp:16-24

Wilson, Everett K.   Sociology. Rules, Roles,
                        Relationships

   The Dorsey Press, 1971

Worsley, Peter (Ed.)   Introducing Sociology

   Penguin Books, 1980

The deaf respondents from Lincoln and Spalding appear to have a major handicap in not being able to hear. Lipreading is their only alternative to hearing for the reception of spoken communication, and it is evident from the experiences respondents relate that it is not an efficient method, even when accompanied by gesture. The main findings are briefly summarised before the communication difficulties recounted by the deaf respondents are discussed.

Electronic Aids To Hearing

Electronic hearing aids did not help the majority of respondents to hear speech. Although there are electronic aids to help in everyday life such as flashing doorbells, flashing and vibrating alarm clocks and so on, there is no means yet of turning speech into a visual symbol. According to Martin (1986:p:7) it will be at least ten years before devices to do this will be of practical use to deaf people.

Lack Of Fluent Inter-Personal Communication Imposes Restrictions In Social Situations With "Hearing" People

The lack of fluent inter-personal communication imposed restrictions, and limited opportunity in respondents' social, parental family,

and working lives with "hearing" people. Socially, respondents did not generally belong to "hearing" social/recreational organisations, and the "hearing" social activities they attended were mostly confined to the public house or licensed social club, where intensive inter-personal communication was not necessary (p:236). They did not serve on "hearing" committees (p:234), and had fewer "hearing" than deaf friends (p:245).

In their parental families respondents felt excluded because of their lack of fluent communication (p:258), and their means of finding out what was going on at family events was through a special member of the family who acted as their communication intermediary (p:260). Respondents frequently withdrew from face to face communication at family events (p:260).

At work, some respondents thought they were unlikely to be promoted because of their lack of fluent communication (p:268). At dinner breaks and rest periods they sat with their fellow workers, but could follow little of what was being said around them (p:270). Respondents did not have communication difficulties requiring the intervention of the social worker with deaf people as interpreter at work (p:308), but, as in the family, they usually had a special person who was their communication

intermediary (p:307). It is at work that deaf people's social-communication handicap is most evident, with poor education restricting their entry, and poor communication restricting training and promotion, as well as the range of jobs they are thought capable of doing, leaving them in low socio-economic categories (table:11:p:64).

Because of their lack of fluent inter-personal communication with "hearing" people, respondents appear to be marginal members of society. They are not assimilated into "hearing" social life, their parental families, or at work; they feel excluded from these activities, even when physically present. They are excluded from conversation, from the gathering of information, and from training for work. A particularly telling point in this respect is that deaf people, unlike members of ethnic minorities, do not have the opportunity to learn to converse in the language of the majority culture (p:332f). This constitutes a major social handicap. It is necessary that it is clearly understood that deaf people have a social handicap, and that because of this they are marginal members of "hearing" society.

It is important that the inevitability of impediments to fluent inter-personal communication with "hearing" people is properly understood, because

376

it is from this situation that deaf people's
sub-cultural adaptations originate. Their adaptations
form the cornerstone of any philosoophy of deafness
which accepts that full social assimilation of the
deaf person into "hearing" society is impossible.

Social Intercourse With "Hearing" People On A
Continuum Of Communication Ability

However, it is also necessary to understand
that individual deaf people will assimilate into
"hearing" society to the extent that they are able,
and the adaptations should not be seen as absolute.
Deaf people value the use of speech as a tool for
social intercourse, and they do not shrink from
meeting "hearing" people (p:249). They have "hearing"
friends and exchange home visits with them (p:249).
Deaf people's social behaviour appears to be on a
continuum, between having very little to do with
"hearing" people except for working and living amongst
them, to being actively part of "hearing" society,
though, inevitably, short of total assimilation.
At this point the matter of stereotyping should be
emphasised (p:42f). It is suggested that those who
advocate an exclusive deaf "community" and "culture"
are contributing to the idea of the stereotype deaf
person and that this further marginalises deaf people.

Thus the deaf social group and "hearing"
society are not mutually exclusive - deaf people

can be actively involved in both. It is likely that

eventually deaf people, through the medium of Sign

Language, will be more involved than they are at

present, and already this process can be seen to

have started (p:439f). This point is important

because the controversy created by "oralism" gives

the impression that it is a question of either the

deaf social group, or "hearing" society, whereas

it is possible to achieve a synthesis (Freeman, Carbin

and Boese:1981:p:202). Unfortunately the extreme

"oralists" argue for an exclusive approach which

denies the limitations imposed by deafness. This

view cannot be sustained, as the findings in the

present study make clear, and it is necessary for

this to be accepted before a realistic philosophy

of deafness can be assembled

Adaptations To Life In "Hearing" Society

In spite of this social handicap, deaf

people are able to lead relatively "normal" lives,

in that they have a social life, marry, have

friendships, and work in open employment. In order

to do this they adapt in a number of ways, but

principally by creating a means of fluent

inter-personal communication amongst themselves,

namely Sign Language. They acquire this by mixing

with other deaf children at schools for the deaf.

In this way they become "social" human beings, able

to exchange thoughts and ideas with others like themselves - on this is based the whole concept of the deaf social group, with its own way of life.

It is significant that Sign Language is known only to deaf people and a very few "hearing" people who are involved with the deaf social group. This would include some "hearing" children of deaf parents, who can use Sign Language fluently, and social workers with deaf people, few of whom could claim to be fluent in the way that the former are (p:159f).

The limitations of this are self-evident; deaf people who use Sign Language can only communicate fluently with others who can do so as well. It is necessary that this is understood and accepted. Deaf people need Sign Language, limited as its use might appear to be; they cannot communicate in this way with most of "hearing" society, but it is their only means of fluent communication, and for them to gain the normal social-psychological satisfactions of individual and group relationships they have no alternative. Lipreading, respondents' only method of receiving spoken communication, is not reliable enough to enable them to communicate fluently with "hearing" people in any social situation (p:221f).

Therefore, although Sign Language limits deaf people to communication with other deaf people

(and to "hearing" people who know Sign Language, or through interpreters), it is nonetheless their means of gaining social-psychological freedom, because through it they can have fluent, unfettered inter-personal communication in their social/recreational lives. It is not always recognised that this is probably the most important aspect of deaf people's sub-cultural adaptations.

Sign Language is used in two ways by deaf people. Where they have choice and opportunity they substitute a deaf way of life for a "hearing" one, so creating for themselves an unhandicapped social environment. Out of this adaptation has grown the concept of deaf "community" and "culture".

Where there is no choice deaf people make the best of the situation by accommodating to the "hearing" way of life, using "hearing" people as communication intermediaries. It is suggested that a realistic philosophy of deafness will be framed round these adaptations. Thus it is accepted that total assimilation of the deaf individual is impossible, but by acceptance of his sub-cultural adaptations, and by learning his language, or making interpreters available, "hearing" society can integrate the individual and the group. As suggested later (pp:403 & 405f), it is a matter of accepting difference, rather than ascribing deviance.

At this point it should be noted that deaf people are expected to accommodate to living in society and their difficulties are such that they have to resort to sub-cultural adaptations (p:347f). "Hearing" people do not normally make any accommodation to deafness. Deaf people are expected to lipread, or, at best, to make do with a third party, a communication intermediary (p:302f). It is evident that deaf people have to achieve membership of the deaf "community"; first, because their parents are usually "hearing" people who have aspirations for membership of "hearing" society for their deaf children (p:329); second, because deaf education is mainly "oral" at present, and this method does not recognise that deaf people have to make adaptations in order to live comfortably in "hearing" society (for example, Nolan and Tucker:1988).

The result of this has been that deaf people have become marginalised, their lack of ability to communicate with "hearing" people frustrating their need for fellowship, and forcing them to make sub-cultural adaptations in order to meet their social/recreational needs. That these needs are strong is demonstrated by the well organised deaf "community", and the fact that a complete language, Sign Language, has been created by these people.

The literature attests to the strength and cohesion

of the deaf social group (p:292). In spite of a

hundred years of "oralism", during which Sign Language

has been, at best discouraged, and at worst repressed,

the deaf social group is still in existence, the

living proof that "oralism" has failed to assimilate

deaf people into society.

As Schein and Delk (1974:p:8) state 'because

deaf people constitute a small minority within the

general population, they must accommodate to the

larger group, rather than vice-versa. The extent

of this accommodation is seen in the communication

patterns of deaf people. Most use speech,

expressively, and lipreading, receptively, at least

some of the time in their daily intercourse. But

they also use fingerspelling, signing and writing

in interpersonal contacts, depending on the

circumstances. In short the majority of prevocational

deaf persons are polymodal communicators'. It has

been seen that respondents in the present study use

speech and lipreading for communicating with "hearing"

people (p:234f); however, the failure of this latter

method is evidenced by the existence of Sign Language,

and the deaf social group (p:242). In spite of being

polymodal communicators, the oral mode is evidently

not sufficiently fluent to allow deaf people to gain

their social-psychological satisfactions in "hearing"

society, or even to allow them sufficient one to
one communication to do without Sign Language
interpreters in some situations, or to gather
information, as the survey of referrals shows
(appendix:3:p:673).

It is unfortunately true that most writers
observe this fact, but do no more than regret that
"hearing" people do not ascribe membership of this
"community" to deaf people (p:327f). These writers
are, in fact, marginalising deaf people still further
by this attitude. Whilst it is agreed that the need
for the deaf social group and its way of life is
not in question, it is suggested that "hearing"
society could accommodate in a more positive manner
than by simply providing interpreters (though this
is necessary as well).

Whilst accepting the validity of the deaf
social group, and the need for a deaf way of life,
it is suggested by the present study that the concept
of deaf "community" and "culture" is too narrow,
and actually marginalises deaf people, because it
absolves "hearing" people from the need to accommodate
to deafness, and adds to the stereotype of the deaf
person who does not, and cannot, contribute to
society, when in fact deaf people are living, working
members of society (table:11:p:64).

The impression is also given that deaf

"culture" is somehow different, almost on an ethnic model, when in fact, language apart, deaf "culture" is modelled very much upon "hearing" culture, and has all the characteristics of "hearing" society, sociologically, ideologically, and technologically (p:366f). Deaf people have created a language and a way of life, but in spite of these considerable adaptations, they are still only adaptations. Again, it must be emphasised that to suggest this is not to question the validity or the reality, of these phenomena. It is necessary, however, to point out that the concept of deaf "community" and "culture" can be alienating, and might be one reason why parents of deaf children grasp at the "oral" theory.

An alternative is to suggest that "hearing" society should ascribe "deafness" to deaf people. This would need to be done in the spirit of a philosophy of deafness which accepted the inevitability of impediments to inter-personal communication between deaf and "hearing" people using speech and lipreading as their means of communication, and in which "hearing" people accepted responsibility for communication with deaf people. It would incorporate deaf people's need to make sub-cultural adaptations, because it is unreasonable to expect all "hearing" people to be fluent in Sign Language, and fluency of inter-personal communication is the

essence of the deaf social group, and its reason
for being.

Thus the validity and integrity of the
deaf social group, and the deaf way of life would
be maintained, but they would be accepted as part
of society, and deaf individuals would be catered
for as a matter of course in everyday life, through
direct Sign Language by "hearing" individuals, or
through interpreters.

"Hearing" Society's Obligation To Use Sign Language

The communication situation involving deaf
and "hearing" people has been considered from the
deaf person's point of view; the methodology did
not allow for examination of how "hearing" people
saw the matter. Although some "hearing" people
had made an effort to communicate with individual
respondents, this was generally confined to particular
situations in which deaf and "hearing" were thrown
together, such as at work (p:307f). "Hearing" people
generally did not use Sign Language, and the onus
was on the deaf person to lipread or follow the
gestures made to him (p:220). Therefore it is
suggested that research into communication between
deaf and "hearing" people from the point of view
of the "hearing" participant would be valuable.

In this connection it must be borne in
mind that, until recently at least, deaf people have

been educated under the "oralist" regime, where the
onus is on them to learn to communicate in the way
that "hearing" people do. This has a twofold effect;
first, deaf people grow up having to try to
understand, through lipreading, what "hearing" people
say to them, and the deaf social group has grown
up out of this lack of fluent inter-personal
communication; second, "hearing" people have not
accepted the alternative, Sign Language, and have
seen the fault for poor communication as lying with
the deaf person. Thus deaf people have been
stigmatised as being poor communicators, and as
"failures" because they have not achieved the standard
of "oral" communication set for them by "hearing"
society, and they have been excluded from the
community at large.

The changes now taking place reverse this
situation. The suggestion that Sign Language should
have some place in deaf education (p:454f) puts the
onus for communication upon the "hearing" person,
in this case parents and teachers, to learn to
communicate in a way that the deaf person can
understand. This leads to the deaf person having
expectations of "hearing" society; either "hearing"
people being able to use his means of communication,
or having Sign Language interpreters available -
thus the responsibility for communication falls to

"hearing" society.

An anecdote related by a deaf woman serves
to illustrate this. She and her husband went into
a MacDonalds for lunch, signing to each other as
they entered. As they went to order, the young person
behind the counter asked in Sign Language 'what do
you want?' It turned out that the counter assistant
had her stage I communication certificate. She had
enough vocabulary to exchange names and to explain
she had signed to the deaf couple because she saw
them signing to each other. Whilst it is accepted
that this young person might not meet enough deaf
people to become fluent, she personifies a "hearing"
society in which deaf people are accepted as "deaf"
and as part of that society. Had the counter
assistant not been able to do some Sign Language,
the deaf couple might have looked hesitant and
socially inept. As it was, the young person
apologised for her inadequate communication. This,
it is suggested, is acceptance in its fullest sense,
with "hearing" society accommodating to deafness,
and realising its own, rather than deaf people's,
communication inadequacy.

This new situation indicates a change in
attitude on the part of "hearing" society, in that
there is acceptance of the fact that deaf people
cannot be assimilated through hearing and lipreading;

therefore recognition must be given to deaf people's
chosen form of communication, which must now be
accepted as different rather than deviant. This
is a reflection of changes in "hearing" society's
attitudes to disabled people in general (and of
disabled people's attitudes to themselves). Shearer
(1981:p:10) writes 'in the past, it is they (disabled
people) who have carried the responsibility for
fitting into "normal" social patterns. There has
been little thought that these patterns should adapt
to encompass them'.

Clearly, there are implications for the
deaf social group, still very much cut off from the
mainstream community. Greater access through Sign
Language, to services and information, including
theatre, television, further and higher education,
and perhaps eventually to English language, is already
having an effect. The deaf social group is seen
to be developing ways of "marrying" "deaf" and
"hearing" cultures. The deaf sign-song movement,
and signing choirs are two such developments which
incorporate features from both cultures and are
adapted, through Sign Language, for deaf people's
participation (p:358f). The fact that Sign Language
interpreters are available occasionally at theatrical
performances (p:443) is a way of deaf people having
access to "hearing" culture, even though it is at

second hand. In this way deaf theatre is able to benefit from deaf people's experience of "hearing" theatre.

This matter is discussed more fully later (p:439f) because there are considerable changes taking place. Simpson (1989:p:8) demonstrates that "hearing" people are now making efforts to communicate with deaf people. Unfortunately that situation is somewhat haphazard at present, and a philosopy of deafness which accepts deaf people's need for access to "hearing" society will have to address the problem of training "hearing" people in Sign Language at different levels, and for varying situations. It is not realistic, for example, to expect that everyone should be able to communicate fluently with deaf people, but is is possible to envisage a time when anyone who might have some contact with deaf people can communicate at say level I of the Council for the Advancement of Communication with Deaf People's Sign Language communication certificate. At the other end of the scale, those who have professional Sign Language responsibilities will have a high level of skill and the ability to operate bi-lingually (Kyle:1989:p:4).

Recapitulation

It will be helpful at this point to recapitulate what this study has established. In

the first place, services are seen to grow up around
deaf people's need to socialise, their need for work,
their need to communicate with "hearing" society,
and their need to have an advocate, in particular
for employment (p:80f). At the same time it is seen
that some "hearing" people perceived deaf people's
needs differently from deaf people, and suggested
policies which deaf people were not willing to accept,
in the fields of education and social welfare
(pp:88f). Nonetheless, these policies were forced
upon them. Integration by assimilation became the
aspiration of "hearing" people, for deaf people,
and Sign Language and the deaf way of life came to
be looked upon as "deviant". Thus deaf people were
forced into the position of having to achieve
membership of the deaf social group, rather than
have membership ascribed to them, because some
"hearing" people did not accept deaf people's
interpretation of their situation.

Deaf people saw the need for substitution
of deaf for "hearing" to allow them the
social-psychological satisfactions of individual
and group relationships; and accommodation to
"hearing" society where they had no choice, (because
"hearing" people refused to accept Sign Language
as "normal" for deaf people, and insisted that they
learn to communicate "orally"), through communication

intermediaries. Their chosen means of communication to achieve both these ends is Sign Language. In effect, deaf people are ascribing "deafness" to themselves by recognising their own communication limitations.

However, the extent of deaf people's social handicap is not defined solely by their inability to understand spoken conversation; the fact that "hearing" people do not use Sign Language to bridge the communication gap is a crucial factor in deaf people's marginal state in society, and society's lack of recognition of deaf people's peculiar needs is responsible for marginalising them.

The findings of this study, and the literature, show that deaf people are unable to communicate fluently with "hearing" people in social/recreational situations, in their parental families, and at work. They come together for social activities, and they use communication intermediaries to help them communicate with "hearing" society. Their referrals to specialist organisations catering for their needs are predominantly of a communication nature, and they look upon these organisations as providing communication services. "Hearing" people's aspirations of total assimilation for these deaf people are therefore seen to be unrealistic.

In addition to the fact that deaf people's

"deafness" was not recognised by "hearing" people,
it can be seen that the paid workers did not
understand deaf adults' need for independence, and
provided services which were based on their own
observation of deaf people's peculiar needs. The
services which arose to meet deaf people's needs
were provided by full time workers, who, although
they understood the need for Sign Language, saw
themselves as "caring" for deaf people. So deaf
people became the objects of a "caring" service,
with no say in the policies governing provision.

The findings and literature suggest that
the cultural adaptations made by deaf people are
appropriate. In order for changes to come about,
however, it is necessary for there to be a change
of attitude towards deafness and deaf people. It
is evident that there is a dichotomy between how
deaf people see their particular needs in relation
to their deafness, and how "hearing" people see them.
Deaf people see their peculiar needs in terms of
communication, and base the resolution of the problems
caused by lack of communication on a social model
of deafness. Deaf education and the parents of deaf
children aspire to total assimilation of the deaf
person into "hearing" society through "oral" training.
In addition, workers with deaf adults see them as
needing "care" through "services", services which

deaf people do not necessarily subscribe to, because
they have no say in them.

Clearly there is no unifying philosophy
of deafness, based upon the peculiar needs of deaf
people as they perceive them, which can be applied
to policies which will recognise the deaf person's
role of independent citizen rather than client.
There are, however, signs that changes in attitude
on the part of "hearing" people are leading to changes
in policy. How these changes are coming about, what
deaf people's needs are, and how they may be
incorporated into a philosophy of deafness, are
discussed in the following chapters.

References

Martin, M.C.   Communication Aids for the
                            Hearing Impaired

   Typewritten. Lecture given to the 1st South
   East Asian Conference on Audiology, Hong Kong,
   1986

Freeman, Roger D.   Can't Your Child Hear?
Carbin, Clifton F.
&
Boese, Robert J.

   Croom Helm Ltd, 1981

Nolan, Michael   The Hearing Impaired Child
&   and the Family
Tucker, Ivan G.

   Souvenir Press (E & A) Ltd., 1988

Schein, Jerome D.   The Deaf Population of the
&   United States
Delk, Marcus T. Jnr.

   National Association of the Deaf, 1974

Shearer, Ann   Disability: Whose Handicap?

   Basil Blackwell, 1981

Simpson, Stewart   'The Continuing Development
                            in Communication Skills'
                            Deafness. The Journal of
                            the Sociology of Deafness
                            Spring 1989 Vol.5(1) p:8

Kyle, Jim G.   'Some Aspects of British
                            Sign Language - English
                            Interpreting'
                            Deafness. The Journal of
                            The Sociology of Deafness
                            Spring 1989 Vol.5(1) pp:4-7