What's the sign for "pint"?

An investigation into the validity of two different models to describe Bristol's current Deaf pub culture.

David O'Brien

MSc in Deaf Studies.

6.10.05

AUTHOR'S DECLARATION.

I declare that the work in this dissertation was carried out in accordance with the Regulations of the University of Bristol. The work is original except where indicated by special reference in the text and no part of the dissertation has been submitted for any other degree.

Any views expressed in the dissertation are those of the author and in no way represent those of the University of Bristol.

The dissertation has not been presented to any other University for examination in either the United Kingdom or overseas.

DEDICATION AND THANKS.

In no particular order –

Paddy for his help and support throughout the year.

Mike for lending me his books and introducing me to the idea of heterotopias.

Noel and Mette for being good mates and teachers!

Naturally, everyone who's been going to the White Hart over the years for giving me something to write about.

Finally, this is dedicated to the original Goldney B1 flat. You messed my life up and I love you for it!

Dai

October 2005.

CONTENTS.

SYNOPSIS.

There has been research concerning the integration or otherwise of Deaf children into mainstream schools, and into the relationships of hearing and Deaf employees in the workplace. However, there has been little or no research into the interactions of Deaf and hearing individuals in social situations.

In Bristol, as in many UK cities, there is a growing "pub scene" in which young Deaf people go to pubs rather than Deaf clubs in order to interact and socialise not only with other young Deaf people but also with hearing people. In this study I examine two possible models for analysing the pub scene and the interactions that occur there. The first model is the theory of heterotopias as described by Foucault in his 1967 lecture "Of Other Spaces". The second model is that of post colonialism, in which the presence of Deaf people in "hearing" pubs is attributed to increased confidence stemming from a post colonial identity in young Deaf people.

Interviews were conducted with both Deaf and hearing regulars from one pub in Bristol frequented by Deaf people. Participant-observation from over a period of five years was also used to build up a picture of the background and history of this social group.

I conclude that both models can be applied to the pub group. However, there remain some difficulties in situating the hearing individuals from the pub group in the post colonial identity constructed for the group.

CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND.

1.1. Rationale for study.

There has been research into the integration of Deaf children in mainstream schools, and into the relationships of hearing and Deaf employees in the workplace. However, there has been little or no research into the social interaction of Deaf and hearing individuals outside such structured interactions as schooling or work.

In Bristol, as in many UK cities, there is a growing "pub scene" in which young Deaf people go to pubs rather than the Deaf club in order to interact and socialise not only with other young Deaf people but also hearing people, both lay and those who have at least rudimentary signing skills. With the declining attendance reported for many Deaf clubs, and also the increasing number of Deaf students who have been mainstreamed for their education, many Deaf young people are becoming excluded from learning about Deaf culture during their childhood. Thus, such pub gatherings may be very important and may play a significant part in the future development of the Deaf community by providing a stepping stone for ex-mainstream pupils to become accustomed to the rules, language and behaviours of the Deaf community.

The pub scene is also an important research area because of the traditional power relationship between Deaf and hearing people. Since Oralism and the era of the missioners, many Deaf people have viewed hearing people who want to be involved in

the Deaf community with suspicion due to the colonial nature of the Deaf community's past. However, in the pub scene under investigation, the White Hart Deaf pub group in Bristol, it would appear that Deaf and hearing people are regarded as equals, and all are accepted, whether hearing or Deaf. The apparent absence of traditional power imbalances in this young and vibrant group of people may illuminate the possible future co-development of the hearing and Deaf communities.

1.2. Theoretical framework.

In this study I shall look at two possible models for describing the White Hart pub scene and the interactions that occur there. The first model is the theory of heterotopias as described by Foucault in his 1967 lecture "Of Other Spaces" (http://foucault.info/documents/heteroTopia/foucault/heteroTopia.en.html). It is postulated that the pub scene could be explained as the construction of a heterotopic community. The second model is that of post colonialism, in which the presence of Deaf people in "hearing" pubs is put down to increased confidence coming from a post colonial identity amongst young, well-educated Deaf people. These theoretical concepts are explained in more depth in sections 2. 2. and 2. 4. By the end of this study I hope to be able to suggest whether either is a useful model in describing what is happening in this pub scene.

1. 3. Literature Review – The Socialising Background.

Due to the scarcity of literature covering d/Deaf and hearing socialising relations, a large part of this literature review is grounded in research which analyses the relationships between hearing and Deaf people during the twentieth century. Basic texts such as Being Deaf (Taylor & Bishop, 1991), The Mask Of Benevolence (Lane, 1992), Really Not Interested In The Deaf? (Alker, 2000) and A Journey into the Deaf World (Lane, Hoffmeister and Bahan, 1996) make no mention of socialising relationships between Deaf and hearing people. The only such text that mentions Deaf and hearing people moving in the same professional sphere is Ladd's (2003, p. 156, 187) mention of Bienvenu and Colonomos' (1989) "third culture" model. This is a description of an "intermediate" discourse that includes subaltern elite Deaf people and self-selected lay hearing people in the same Deafhood discourse. However, despite the best efforts of this researcher, further details of this model could not be located in the time frame of this project.

Two of the most important factors that influenced the attitudes and behaviours of the Deaf community towards hearing people during this period are Oralism and Deaf people's reactions to the presence of missioners to the Deaf, and so this section begins with a brief exploration of the legacy of Oralism.

1.3.1. The legacy of Oralism.

Oralism, the practice of attempting to teach Deaf children to speak and hear through the medium of spoken English, had, since the Milan conference of 1880, become the most prevalent method of educating Deaf children throughout Europe and the USA despite its obvious failure to educate Deaf children. Reports published in the 1970s and 1980s in both Britain and the USA showed that the average orally-educated Deaf school-leaver at the age of 16 had the reading ability of an 8 year old child (Lane, 1992). Lessons under the Oralist agenda were not so much attempts to educate the Deaf children in topics such as maths and science, but rather lessons in speech, trying by sheer repetition to force the ability to talk and recognise speech onto the children. This meant that education in useful subjects was often neglected and the children often fell behind even in what little education they were given due to the fact that all lessons were conducted in speech (Alker, 2000, Mason, 1991). Deaf children from hearing parents were also denied sign language at home by hearing professionals who led their parents to believe that they must, without fail, talk to their children, and avoid sign at all costs.

These oppressive environments in which Deaf children had to grow up nurtured a fear of ridicule and mockery from hearing people, a reluctance to use BSL in public and a general feeling of "fear and submission" (Ladd, 2003, p. 232). The blame for this was laid squarely at the feet of Oralism by many Deaf people, who claimed that Oralism's focus on speech and hearing, something that many Deaf people were unable to do well, and its ignorance of their other skills caused the lack of self confidence amongst the Deaf

community. This lack of self-confidence also manifested itself in a suspicion and

bitterness towards hearing people in later life. Attitudes included the feeling that

> Anything we get, we know hearing will take it away from us again one day.
> (Ladd, 2003, p. 234).

This combination of abuses suffered when young and fear of mockery and ridicule in

later life caused many in the Deaf community to 'close ranks' and exclude hearing people

from their discourses.

1. 3. 2. The establishment of missioners' power in the early 20th century.

In the UK, Deaf clubs are often seen as one of the two pillars of Deaf culture (Ladd,

2003) and the main source of learning about Deaf culture after residential schools.

However, much as the residential schools were mainly under the control of Oralism after

the early part of the 20th century, the Deaf clubs came under the control of the missioners

(Alker, 2000, p. 60).

In the 19th century, there was a great demand for new Deaf schools and Deaf clubs and

funding for these establishments had to be found. However, without government support,

the only way to fund these establishments was to rely on charity - donations from wealthy

individuals or the public, and in the process, seeking the patronage of the nobility. In

order to secure these funds, the helplessness of Deaf people had to be stressed (Ladd,

2003, p.119). In this way, they were opening themselves up to paternalism and colonialism from "benevolent" hearing people (Alker, 2000, p.13).

By the early 20th century, this welfare and charity discourse had largely been taken over by the Anglican Church which had taken control of most of the Deaf clubs and missions in the UK (Ladd, 2003, p.139). By this point, the rise of Oralism had resulted in the academic achievements of Deaf people being sufficiently poor that the paternalistic attitude prevalent at the time seemed justified (Lane, 1993, p. 130) to successive generations of missioners who took over the clubs that already existed and expanded the national network of clubs and missions, setting up their own training programmes to train new missioners. The missioners were mostly hearing, with some deafened or HMFD (Hearing, Mother Father Deaf).

Gaining this hegemony was made possible by the fact that the missioners were amongst the few hearing people who could sign. Deaf people relied on them for interpreting in all kinds of situations including medical, employment, legal and any other situation where literary skills were important (Ladd, 2003, p. 139). The missioners also controlled the Deaf club through their elite subaltern group, a group of "middle class" Deaf people who were more subservient to the missioner in return for positions on the committee.

All these developments led to a 'learned helplessness' in many Deaf people. Because of their poor education and the extensive help provided by the missioners in all parts of their life, they became highly dependent on them (Alker, 2000, p. 40).

1. 3. 3. Deaf lives 1950 – 1970.

Ladd (2003) identified two roots of Deaf culture, the residential schools and the Deaf

clubs, which correspond to childhood and adult life respectively. During this period, just

before mainstreaming was introduced as a national policy for the education of Deaf

children, almost all Deaf children were educated in residential schools, separate from

hearing children of their own age. This meant that the only interaction with hearing

people that many Deaf children had was with hearing parents and families, the medical

profession or teachers – authority figures. This scarcity of contact with hearing people

during childhood, and the mainly negative nature of the contact they did have as outlined

in section 1. 3. 1., affected the attitudes of Deaf people and their relationships with

hearing people, leading to lack of self confidence and their largely submissive

relationship with the missioners in adult life.

However, there were some who rebelled against the missioners' power. These

individuals either challenged the missioners' power in the clubs directly or they left (or

were banned from) the clubs and set up their own social groups in the local pubs, where

they mixed and interacted with hearing people and other Deaf rebels. This Deaf pub

culture spread all over the UK, with specific pubs playing host to Deaf rebels. Indeed,

one informant in Ladd (2003, p. 382) states that there was "always one in every town".

The interactions between the Deaf rebels and the hearing locals in the pubs were wide

ranging. Ladd (2003) has many examples of such "pub rebels" and the interactions that

occurred within the pub. These included asking each other advice on where were good

places to look for jobs, advice on dealing with the council, and also organising sporting

events like a football team. This information flow was by no means one way from the

hearing to the Deaf. The hearing people often asked the Deaf for advice and they helped

hearing people with d/Deaf children place them in Deaf schools (Ladd, 2003, p. 381).

The Deaf rebels were themselves not overtly political. As one informant in Ladd (2003)

stated,

> Most of them would just mouth off and complain, and do nothing. They had
> good ideas, but no confidence or courage to put them into action.
> (Ladd, 2003, p. 391).

However, by the 1970s the National Union of the Deaf developed out of this pub culture

and had both hearing and Deaf members. Indeed many of its publications were aimed at

bringing hearing teachers of the Deaf and parents of Deaf children to appreciate the

deficiencies of the Oralist method of education (Ladd, 1982, Lee, 2004).

1. 3. 4. The Deaf Resurgence from the 1970s onwards.

Ladd (2003) outlines eight stages of the so-called "Deaf Resurgence" when the Deaf

community became more visible and more confident in itself from the 1970s onwards.

These stages played a large part in the development of more positive relationships between hearing and Deaf people, both professional and social.

The Resurgence progressed along many fronts, including the statutory removal of the missioners and their replacement with social workers who expected more independence from Deaf people, the linguistic recognition of sign languages as languages in their own right, and the increased visibility of Deaf people in the media. Society in general became more accepting of both sign languages and the Deaf community, which resulted in a high level of interest in learning to sign, the rediscovery of previously hidden and ignored Deaf histories and eventually culminating in the formation of the discipline of Deaf Studies.

These factors all led to increased interactions between Deaf and hearing professionals in which they accorded each other a more equal status and enabled the Deaf community to gain an increased self confidence and pride in their language and culture. However, Ladd does not explore the social ramifications of this newly developed relationship between Deaf and hearing. In the following sections I shall briefly explore some possible results of that increased confidence from the Resurgence for Deaf young people.

1. 3. 5. The Growth of the Deaf Pub Culture in the 1990s.

Following the removal of the missioners from the Deaf clubs, the development of the NUD with its campaigns for Deaf empowerment and the consequent re-entry of sign

language into Deaf education, Deaf people became more confident and forthright in their participation in mainstream hearing culture in the 1980s and 1990s. This was reflected in the greater visibility of Deaf people on television in such programmes as *See Hear* and the media in general; and in entry to the traditionally 'hearing' fields of work and employment and social spheres. However, at the same time, there was an increase in the mainstreaming of Deaf children for their schooling, to current figures of over 95% (Ladd, 2003, p. 158), which has led to their isolation from the Deaf community, and the loosening of their traditional social ties to the community.

It is believed that the start of the contemporary Deaf pub scene had its roots in London during 1989, when a few Deaf young people met up in The Stag pub in Victoria, every couple of weeks (Dodds, 2000). This grew to regular meetings of over 200 young Deaf people, moving from pub to pub as they were banned from each one in turn. The reasons given by the Deaf people themselves for this banning ranged from violence and aggression on the part of the Deaf clientele (Dodds, 1995), to prejudice and discrimination from the bar staff. It appears the real reasons were probably a mixture of the two (*See Hear*, 11.6.95). The Deaf clubs in London were not happy about this development. Many traditional Deaf club members saw the exodus to hearing pubs as a betrayal of the Deaf community and culture, whereas the young Deaf people felt that they were being pressurised too much to conform to the old, traditional Deaf ways in the Deaf clubs (Woolfe, 1994).

When asked about the popularity of the pub scene in Britain as a whole, it appears that most Deaf young people felt that the Deaf clubs were becoming boring, and the young Deaf wanted and felt they deserved access to exciting places with "pub atmospheres" and "cool environments" (Wheatley, 2001). Some felt that their generation was not catered for in their local Deaf club; instead the focus there was on events for older members or children, not their "in between" generation (Niklaus, 1994). This meant that they felt that they could no longer identify with the older community and culture of the Deaf Clubs (Marvin, 1994).

It is also apparent that young Deaf people felt confident enough as Deaf individuals, albeit in a group, to socialise in mainstream pubs, rather than remain in a "social ghetto" (Wheatley, 2001). Being solely members of a Deaf club closed off from mainstream society was no longer enough for these Deaf people. Because of improved education and employment prospects, they had more money and more confidence in themselves, and felt that they deserved the same entertainment as their hearing contemporaries. As Dodds (1995) put it,

> Today's Deaf youths are looking for a different kind of entertainment. A quiet drink and a game of pool at the Deaf club is not enough for them.
> (Dodds, 1995, p. 16)

The success of the Deaf pub nights had a knock-on effect on some of the traditional Deaf social events, most notably the annual Deaf rally held in Blackpool during September. Traditionally, the BDA North West Area Council (NWAC) booked a hall at the Winter Garden in Blackpool, where the Deaf congregated on the Saturday night to meet and

enjoy themselves. However, in the last few years, seemingly starting in 2001, the Winter

Garden has been almost deserted, with all the young Deaf going to mainstream bars and

nightclubs around Blackpool in order to have a good time in the more trendy atmosphere.

While it seems that one of the deciding factors for many Deaf people staying away from

the Winter Garden was the allegedly poor bar service (BDN October 2001), the fact that

many Deaf people felt confident enough to go to hearing nightclubs and bars, rather than

put up with such service provided by Deaf-organised events, may show a change in the

identity and character of the young Deaf community.

Another perspective on this is that most of today's young Deaf people have been

educated in mainstream schools and so do not have the traditional ties to the Deaf

community that those who grew up in a Deaf family or a Deaf school would have had.

As such, they do not worry about the traditionally collectivist values of the Deaf

community and the fact that they are putting money in hearing pockets, or feeding

"hearing people's mouths" (BDN, 2002) rather than those of the Deaf.

It is important to note that of the people who were involved in the pub scene in London

from its inception, none advocated the closure of Deaf clubs. Instead they wanted a

service that provided them with what they wanted, that is, a good atmosphere, lively

environment and other entertainment rather than a game of pool in the Deaf club. As

Niklaus stated (1994), Deaf clubs must

> …get their act together, keep up with the times and make changes when necessary. If that happens, [Deaf pubs] will then cease to exist. But, until then, [Deaf pubs] will still be here.
> (Niklaus, 1994)

As can be seen by not only the success of the Deaf pub scene in London, but its expansion to many parts of the UK, these changes obviously have not taken place. Whether this has or has not led to a decline in Deaf community togetherness and Deaf culture as feared by some in the older Deaf generation is a consideration that goes beyond the scope of this investigation.

1. 3. 5. A history of the contemporary Bristol pub scene.

Bristol currently has two separate Deaf pub nights. One is a monthly meeting for Deaf people in Bristol and other Deaf people from as far afield as Bath, London and even international visitors. The location has changed periodically as former host pubs have changed owners or interior dècor and therefore have become inappropriate for Deaf people. For example lighting changes have made it too dark to clearly see signing in at least one location. These meetings have proved to be varyingly successful, with numbers rising and falling over the years, between 10 or 15 up to 50 or 60 on the really successful nights, but recently have settled to a fairly regular level of around 30 to 40 people. These nights are currently being held in Bar Med.

However, the meetings I am researching in this project are held in the White Hart pub and are different in that they embrace signing hearing people in a way that the Deaf

nights in Bar Med do not. The people who attend Deaf nights in Bar Med are usually

regulars from the Deaf club. I have in the past observed several Deaf people complain

about hearing people attending, claiming that the Deaf nights are for Deaf people only,

despite the fact that the hearing people concerned could sign. However, the White Hart

group welcomes all hearing and d/Deaf people, so long as they have at least a basic

knowledge of British Sign Language (BSL) and a willingness to communicate. This

appears to stem from its development from the Centre of Deaf Studies (CDS) in the

University of Bristol, which teaches BSL, Deaf culture, Deaf history and other courses

related to Deafhood. The White Hart pub group also welcomes young Deaf and hearing

people from all over Bristol, as well as Deaf and hearing students from other courses in

the University of Bristol and the University of the West of England (UWE).

Although there may well have been a pub scene in Bristol before the advent of the White

Hart social nights, none of my mostly young, informants could shed light on it. What

follows is a description of the pub scene that existed in the 1990s, reconstructed from

both information gleaned from informants, and my own participant observations, and

how it became the White Hart pub scene which I examine in this study.

The origins of the Deaf pub scene in Bristol lie in the early 1990s when the Centre for

Deaf Studies was located in Berkley Square, Bristol. The Deaf pub group met in pubs

near the premises of the CDS. In the period of 1995 to 1997 there were often 40 to 50

people in attendance, including Deaf and hearing students from the CDS and other

departments and UWE, local interpreters and staff from the CDS. Everyone mixed well and attendance was seen as important for all, regardless of signing ability.

Of the hearing people who attended, many also attended the Deaf club in Bristol on Wednesday nights, which were perceived to be 'open nights'. However, around 1998, the Deaf club passed a resolution effectively barring hearing people from the club. After this, very few hearing people attended the club, even when the events were designated as 'open' events. On the other hand, Deaf people from the pub group seemed to be active members of the Deaf club.

During the years 1997 to 1998 the social activities of the night and the venue slowly changed, with people meeting early to eat in the Berkley then going on to the White Hart for the rest of the night.

However, in 1999, when I began attending the social nights, the venue changed again to the Richmond Springs pub in Clifton. The reason for this change in venue was the Sign Society. This is a University society founded by CDS students, which teaches BSL to other students from the University of Bristol. During the academic year 1999 to 2000, the society met on a Thursday, the same night as the White Hart pub gathering. This became a problem because most of the major figures of the pub group were involved in the Society in one way or another. The Richmond Springs was closer to the Students Union, where the Sign Society classes were held, than the White Hart, so it was agreed to change the venue.

By this time the number of attendees at the pub group had dropped to between 10 and 15 regulars with occasional appearances from staff from the CDS. The number of hearing people compared to Deaf had risen, but the regulars were split quite evenly between Deaf and hearing. Almost all of the attendees during the period 1999 to 2002 were from the CDS. The reason for this drop in numbers was attributed to the fact that the Deaf Studies course at the CDS had changed from a diploma course to a BSc course. This meant that entry requirements for the course were higher and so fewer Deaf people were able to access the course.

While this explains the reduction in numbers of Deaf people, the exact cause for the reduction in hearing numbers is unknown. It was suggested by an informant that the way the course was set up also created more division between the year groups, meaning that the cohesiveness of the group was lost and some people broke away to socialise elsewhere.

By 2002, due to the unpopularity of the Richmond Springs, the venue had changed to the Rat and Parrot pub on Whiteladies Road to try and attract more people. When this failed to boost the numbers after a few weeks, the venue reverted to the White Hart. Since then the more central location of the pub has slowly attracted more attendance from both Deaf and hearing people from inside and outside the Universities. The level of popularity now, in the academic year 2005-2006, is such that the group continues to meet during

University vacations, with students travelling back to Bristol to meet up with regulars who are Bristol residents.

While the meetings in the White Hart are different from normal Deaf pub nights, they are not completely unique. Similar nights exist in other University towns such as Preston and Wolverhampton (Dodds 2005, Sutherland 2005) where there is a sizable Deaf presence in the student body. Both Preston and Wolverhampton have a similar make up of attendees as Bristol, that is Deaf and hearing students and staff and other local hearing people, and local Deaf people.

CHAPTER 2. TWO MODELS FOR EXAMINING THE PUB CULTURE.

2. 1. Introduction.

In this section I examine two models that could be used to analyse the pub culture that

exists within the group that meets in the White Hart in Bristol. The first model is that of

heterotopias, which was outlined by Foucault in his 1967 lecture "Of Other Spaces"[1].

The second model I shall examine is that of post colonialism and how a post colonial

identity can be constructed for Deaf people and how this identity may have affected the

relations and interactions of Deaf and hearing people in the White Hart pub group.

A third possibility is the theory of Thirdspace as described by Soja (1996). This theory is

primarily concerned with the presentation of an "other" option, rather than relying on

closed "either/or" descriptions of the world. In the case of this study, the "other" option

could be considered to be the White Hart pub group, which, as is argued later, belongs

neither to the Deaf or hearing community, but is a combination of both. However, the

"trialectics"[2] of Thirdspace is an extremely wide ranging subject and the remit of this

dissertation is not sufficiently wide to adequately examine the implications or

possibilities of using this model. Heterotopias do play some small part in the theory of

---

[1] "Of Other Spaces" was published as "Des Espaces Autreś" in the French journal
Architecture/Movement/Continuité in October 1984, and was the basis of a lecture given by Foucault in
1976. It was not reviewed for publication by the author and so is not part of the official corpus of his work.
It was however released into the public domain before his death and is available on the internet.
[2] "Trialectics" – a term used by Soja (1996) to illustrate the nature of Thirdspace in its provision of a third
option beyond the traditional "either/or" nature of social research. It is a play on the word dialectics, using
the prefix *tri-* in the place of *di-* to illustrate the third, or "other", option.

Thirdspace, and so my examination of this model could be used as a starting point for understanding the possible applications of the Thirdspace model to the Deaf pub culture

2. 2. Heterotopias – A brief description.

The concept of heterotopias was first postulated by Michel Foucault in a lecture entitled "Of Other Spaces" written in 1967. It describes the difference between utopias and heterotopias and the six principles that define heterotopias.

Utopias are sites of no real space. They have some kind of relationship to 'real' society but are not actually real. By definition, they present societies in an idealised form, and often mirror or mimic aspects of real life, in order to draw parallels and contrasts with the society from which they originate. Such a concept has been explored in numerous works of literature which hypothesise about such idealised societies, such as Huxley's 'Island' and Plato's 'Republic'. However, in every society there are what Foucault terms "counter sites". These are examples of an "effectively enacted utopia" within real society. They reflect, contest and invert real sites, and although they can be physically pinpointed, they exist outside all places. These are heterotopias.

2. 3. The six principles that describe and define heterotopias.

2. 3. 1. Separation from mainstream society.

The first principle is that of separation from mainstream society. There are two main categories of heterotopia within this principle.

The first category is present in what Foucault terms 'primitive societies' and is called "crisis heterotopias". These are places reserved for people who are in a state of crisis in relation to the rest of society. These crises are things that society cannot, or will not, cope with and so the individuals concerned are temporarily removed from society. Examples used by Foucault to illustrate this category include pregnant women who are going through the crisis of childbirth, something that male-dominated society may not want to confront; the elderly being removed to hospitals to prepare for death; and the socially taboo development of the sexuality of young men during military service or in boarding schools within their barracks and dormitories. These individuals are placed outside normal society until the crisis can pass.

Foucault writes that these crisis heterotopias are being replaced by heterotopias of deviation. This appears to involve more permanent removal from society than the crisis heterotopias. These heterotopias of deviation are where people who deviate from the norm required by society are placed. Examples of these heterotopias include psychiatric hospitals, prisons, and retirement homes. A retirement home could be seen as both a

crisis heterotopia and a heterotopia of deviation, because although old age can be viewed as a crisis, the idleness of retirement could also be seen as a deviation from the norm of working society.

2. 3. 2. Different patterns in time.

The second principle is that existing heterotopias can function in different patterns as time goes on. The example used by Foucault is graveyards. Before the 18th century, the graveyard of a town was near the church, in the centre of the settlement. In this period, it was only the select few that had their own tombs. Most of the bodies ended up in the charnel house, where the last traces of individuality were lost. In those days there was a strong belief in resurrection of the soul and so the bodies of the deceased weren't considered to be very important. However, Foucault argues that after this people became less sure of their faith in God and the afterlife and so the physical remains of the bodies became much more important as they were the only remains of one's life. They were therefore treated with much more respect, with "his or her own little box for his or her own little personal decay". So the focus shifted. Cemeteries became "the other city", that of the dead; death and decay became synonymous with disease and because of this threat of disease, the location of the cemeteries was physically changed to outside the towns.

2. 3. 3. Several real spaces in a single space.

The third principle is that heterotopias can juxtapose several real spaces in a single space. Good examples of this are theatre stages and cinema screens. Both of these have physical locations, but can show limitless varieties of other real spaces. Another example Foucault uses is gardens, because in gardens plants and features from all over the world can be assembled at a single location.

2. 3. 4. Linked to slices of time.

The fourth principle is that heterotopias are linked to slices of time. There are two extremes of time difference that Foucault describes. The first is indefinitely accumulating time, such as that of museums and libraries. They show the tastes and fashions, ideas and beliefs of society changing over time. This means that, in effect, they are accumulating time constantly. The other extreme is the transitory, precarious aspect of time, for example, a fairground that is there for one week of a year, then it disappears and returns one year later, seemingly always the same, never changing from one year to the next.

2. 3. 5. Systems of opening and closing.

The fifth principle of heterotopias is that there is a system of opening and closing that makes them both isolated and at the same time, penetrable. Heterotopias are not freely

accessible. Either the individual is forced to enter the heterotopia (for example, prisons, psychiatric hospitals and the like), or they have to submit to rites, rituals and rules in order to gain access (such as recruitment for the army, paying for access to cinemas and gardens, and so on). There are some heterotopias where there is apparent entry that actually hides exclusion. Foucault uses an example of guest rooms in the farmhouses of South America in which the guest can freely access their room but is cut off from the family's own quarters. While the guest was welcome to stay in the farmhouse, they were excluded from the family itself.

2. 3. 6. Relationship with all other spaces.

The sixth and final principle is that heterotopias have a relationship with all other spaces. As Foucault himself put it,

> …their role is to create a space that is other, another real space, as perfect,
> as meticulous, as well arranged as ours is messy, ill constructed and
> jumbled.

This quote describes what Foucault labelled a heterotopia of compensation.

The pub gatherings in the White Hart will be examined using these six principles as a guideline to see whether or not the theory of heterotopias can be applied to them.

2. 4. Post colonial theory.

The term post colonialism describes the power of colonialist discourse to shape and form opinion in its colonies (Ashcroft, Griffiths & Tiffin, 1998). It also refers to the resistance of colonial subjects to this colonialist power and the differing responses of these subjects in both pre- and post-independence communities.

While this theory is usually applied to communities and cultures that have been physically colonised by European powers, such as Algeria, India and similar countries, it has been argued by Ladd (2003) (following Lane, 1993 and Wrigley, 1996) that in the case of the Deaf community in Britain, there has been linguistic and cultural colonialism.

All post colonial societies have their own internal agendas that interact with and modify the response to colonial interference, so it is vitally important that each application of post colonial theory is grounded firmly in the culture and values of the community under investigation (Young, 2003). To this end, this theory outlined in this section is much more specifically oriented towards Deaf people than the previous section, which outlined the theory of heterotopias.

2. 4. 1. Colonialism and Deaf communities.

The theory of colonialism as applied to the Deaf community in Britain has its roots in the development of Oralism and the take over of the Deaf clubs by the missioners in the early

20th century. Ladd (2003) defines colonialism following Merry (1991) as an unequal

power relationship between two groups where

> One not only controls and rules the other, but also endeavours to impose its
> cultural order on the subordinate group.
> (Ladd, 2003, p.79)

There existed a similar system of control to that in Imperial India where Indians were

used to control their own society in ways that benefited the British colonists (Loomba,

1998). This form of control existed as a "petit bourgeoisie" group of Deaf people under

the missioners who were used to carry out their plans and maintain control of the clubs

and of the BDA.

Another colonial parallel is Loomba's (1998) summary of characteristics given to

colonised peoples by the European colonisers with the characteristics given to the Deaf

by professionals involved in medical discourses (Lane, 1993, p. 36).

However, in the 1970s, along with the pub rebels' rejection of missioner controlled clubs,

the missioners were eventually removed from positions of power within the Deaf clubs.

Thus the door was opened for the development of a post colonial Deaf identity as there

was more freedom for Deaf people to run their own affairs with less direct influence from

designated hearing 'colonialists' from the majority society.

2. 4. 2. Colonialism and identity.

One of the most useful aspects of post colonial theory as applied to Deaf communities can be seen in the search for a post colonial identity in the Caribbean. As Hall (2001) puts it,

> …if the search for identity always involves a search for origins, it is impossible to locate in the Caribbean an origin for its peoples.
> (Hall, 2001, p. 282)

In much the same way, it is impossible to find an origin for Deaf identities. There is retention of old customs, old stories and the desire to retain the traditions of the Deaf clubs. Yet at the same time, these traditions have never been pure and untouched by the influence of the wider hearing culture prevalent in British society. Even in Deaf schools, the stories and adventures of Deaf children were influenced by the films and television shows of the wider hearing community (Ladd, 2003, p. 307-308). Even with no access to subtitles or interpreted performances, they still made a mark on the imaginations of the young story-tellers. However, despite this, they still "retained something of the connection" (Hall, 2001) to their tradition, their Deaf culture.

This makes it difficult for us to say what exactly 'pure' Deaf culture is. In fact, it begs the question whether there is a 'pure' Deaf culture. Instead it suggests that it is a hybrid culture of sorts, a mixture of Deaf culture and the culture of the wider hearing community in which Deaf people are brought up. However we approach this problem, it is accepted that there is such a thing as Deaf communities and Deaf identities, but the question remains: how are these identities constructed?

2. 4. 3. Characteristics of post colonial identities.

One of the biggest challenges with trying to construct a post-colonial identity in a community is that it will often immediately take on a purely oppositional identity. From being under siege for so long from a larger, stronger culture, the leaders of the minority culture may turn to simply opposing the coloniser rather than trying to form a healthy self identity for the community. An example of this danger can be found in the writing of Kiberd (2001). He explores the attempts of the leaders of the Gaelic League in Ireland in the late 1800s to build a positive Irish identity, as opposed to one based on "reactive patriotism" which constructed an Irish identity which saw "Ireland as not-England". The parallel between the latter and Deaf identity is made clear in the following quote taken from Ladd (2003),

> …very few of the Deaf informants were comfortable with the idea that they might, in any way, have what they saw as a 'Hearing' identity.
> (Ladd, 2003, p. 419)

By rejecting the possibility of having a 'Hearing' identity in this way, the Deaf community runs the risk of creating an unhealthy self-identity which is defined predominantly by its opposition to hearing culture rather than a strong self identity in and of itself that embraces all aspects of social influence on the Deaf community, whether those influences are hearing or Deaf. The insistence on the authenticity, or purity, of a Deaf identity could also be to the detriment of the Deaf community as a whole. As Fee

(1995) writes, this demand for authenticity can deny minority groups a "living, changing culture".

However, care must be taken not to move too far in the opposite direction and become too liberal in accepting any of those who feel themselves to be part of the minority group but who do not have any actual connections to the minority group. These issues of the degree of acceptance or insistence on authenticity within the community must be carefully considered when constructing a post colonial Deaf identity, especially when taking into account the fact that the majority of d/Deaf children are now in mainstream education and "are unaware of the Deaf history, tradition and culture" (Ladd, 2003, p. 446).

This rejection of both the insistence on authenticity and oppositional identities leads to the possibility of creating an identity which incorporates both hearing influences, that is, influences from the colonising culture, and influences from the Deaf community and culture. In the past there have been concerns about this kind of mixed identity, with beliefs that it will lead to a conflict within the individual between his 'native' or traditional identity and the adopted identity of the colonial power. Fanon (1961) is particularly critical of this possibility and his ideas about the creation of a post colonial identity are discussed below. The most recent conception of this throry is that of 'hybridity' (Bhabha, 1994), in which the different aspects of the character of both the native culture and the colonial culture move towards a more harmonious resolution. Hybridity is discussed later in this section.

Fanon in 'The Wretched of the Earth' (1961) describes how the merging of colonial identity and native identity in what he calls native intellectuals can lead to conflict within the individual. In this case the native intellectuals he is describing are those who have been educated in the colonial methods, language and schools. It is my contention that this is an appropriate comparison for the modern Deaf community in the UK because so many young Deaf people are now educated in small groups in mainstream education rather than traditional Deaf schools and are exposed to a much stronger hearing influence in their education, without the support of large groups of their Deaf peers, than in times past. While it is incorrect to label all young Deaf people intellectuals, the comparison of the educational methods, that is, colonial methods, languages and schools, stands.

When discussing native intellectuals, Fanon claims that at first during colonialism they will "try to make European culture their own" (1961, p. 176) in an attempt to prove that they can succeed and perform on a level equal to that of the colonisers. However, they then run the risk of losing touch with their roots in the native community. At the point of rebellion, when the shackles of colonialism are being cast off, Fanon believed the native intellectual must

> …lose himself at whatever cost in his own barbarous people. Because he feels he is becoming estranged, that is to say because he feels that he is the living haunt of contradictions which run the risk of becoming insurmountable…
> (Fanon, 1961, p. 175)

In this quote, Fanon is stating that he believes a harmonious identity containing both the colonist culture and the native culture is impossible. If the native intellectual is to find peace, he must utterly reject the colonists' influence on him.

However, this rejection leads the native intellectual to try and find his identity in the past, in the customs and traditions of his people. This in turn leads the intellectual to become a stereotype of his own culture, to

> …go native as much as you can… to cut off those wings that before you had
> allowed yourself to grow.
> (Fanon, 1961, p. 178)

Fanon goes on to describe his belief that only by submerging themselves in their native culture does the native intellectual develop the identity Fanon feels necessary to contribute to their culture.

However, this view of rejection of one culture in order to develop a 'pure' native culture has since fallen from favour. The accepted theory now is that of hybridity (Bhabha, 1994). In this case, it is accepted that there is a degree of cross over between the two cultures involved in the colonial relationship. As described by Loomba (1998), this arises because "not everything that takes place in the crossover zones can be monitored and controlled" (p.173). An example of this might be the interactions between the Deaf pub rebels and their contact with hearing working-class men in the pubs in the 1970s. Not only did the Deaf people gain from this relationship with help with their English skills and advice on where to look for jobs and so on, but the hearing people benefited as

well, by learning basic BSL, fingerspelling and advice on how to raise their own Deaf children.

Hybridity itself arises due to the fact that one of the

> …striking contradictions about colonialism is that it both needs to 'civilise'
> its 'others', and to fix them into perpetual 'otherness'.
> (Loomba, 1998, p.173)

This can be seen in the fact that despite all efforts of the Oralists to "normalise" Deaf children through oral education, they still insisted on the difference between Deaf and hearing people, leading to an "ambivalent" identity (Ashcroft, Griffiths & Tiffin, 1998, p.13).

Ladd himself suggests that hybridity may not be an accurate reading of the conflict present within Deaf people between their Deaf selves and the identity forced upon them by Oralist colonialists. The quote on page 28, in which Ladd claims that the majority of his Deaf informants rejected the suggestion that they may have a 'Hearing' identity, illustrates this point.

However, all the informants in Ladd's study attended Deaf schools in their youth and were victims of strict Oralist practice. Currently, 95.7% of Deaf children are mainstreamed (Ladd, 2003, p. 158) in local schools. So they are not only surrounded by hearing people every day of their school lives, that is the teachers and other pupils, but also at home, by their parents and siblings. With the improvement in technology that

gives d/Deaf people and d/Deaf children a better chance of communicating orally and the relaxation of the wider public's attitudes to BSL, there is a greater chance that these children can form strong bonds with their family at least. This did not happen with residential boarding schools for the Deaf, in which most pupils only saw their families during the holidays, with a few travelling home at weekends to visit. Bearing this in mind, it is far more likely that Deaf children today will pick up hearing culture during their formative years to a far greater extent and under far more liberal conditions than Deaf children in times past.

It must also be remembered that within each post colonial community, there are several internal agendas and forces that interact in different ways with the colonialist power. So while a hybrid identity may have been an inaccurate model to use for Ladd's informants, the hybrid model may well be a useful model to be used to analyse the developments in Deaf youth culture in the 21st century.

2. 4. 4. Incorporating hearing people into a post colonial Deaf identity.

However, one of the major problems with this theory is how to construct some kind of model to explain how hearing people might have a post colonial identity when it comes to Deaf people. Almost all post colonial literature focuses purely on the formerly colonised people, sparing very little thought for the former colonisers and how the two groups might have a constructive, harmonious lifestyle together once the post colonial period has begun. What little research there is tends to look more at conflict between the

two societies, such as in Ferguson (2001) in which the life of Antoinette, a character in 'Wide Sargasso Sea' is described as "white but not English or European, West Indian but not black."

A description of this kind could well apply to hearing children of Deaf parents, hearing people with a large stake in the Deaf community, or even d/Deaf people who went through mainstream education. Other research tends to focus on settler communities, such as white Australians who dispossessed the Aborigines of their land and suppressed their culture, yet were themselves the subjects of British colonial rule, and missed their "home" in Britain (Curthoys, 2003). A theory linked to this settler identity is that of "race traitors", people who reject their "whiteness", or in this case, "hearingness" completely and try and submerge themselves in the culture of the oppressed group (Haggis, 2004). Again, as we shall see, these kind of models do not seem to reflect what is happening in the White Hart between hearing and Deaf people, but it is hoped that the interviews and observations conducted during this study will clarify some of these issues.

CHAPTER 3. METHODOLOGY.

3.1. The ethnographic approach.

For this research project I will use qualitative rather than quantitative research methodology. While quantitative methods enable researchers to look at a larger sample using, for example, questionnaires and surveys (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2000), I feel that for this area, where there is very little research, qualitative research methods would give the richest information. It is also the case that there are simply not enough informants in the pub group to get a meaningful response to quantitative research methods.

In order to study the pub scene in the White Hart and get the best quality information, it was decided to use an ethnographic approach. Ethnography involves understanding a culture and a way of life from the point of view of its inhabitants (Punch, 1998, p. 157), in that it is a practice that places the researcher "in the midst of whatever it is they study" (Berg, 2004, p. 148). This is a standpoint perfectly suited to this project due to the researcher's extensive experience in the White Hart pub scene over 5 years. Another reason for using this method is that, since the findings of this research could not be predicted due to the dearth of previous literature, the flexible nature of ethnographic research is a definite advantage (Cohen et al 2000, p.137).

As stated by Punch (1998 p. 156), the ethnographer's task is to understand the meaning behind the culture in the group under investigation. In order to do this, the researcher used his position as a Deaf ex-mainstream pupil with contacts in both the Deaf and hearing communities to examine the meanings behind the behaviour of members of each of the communities when the two cultures meet in the White Hart. Issues concerning the ethics and other problems concerned with performing insider research are covered in section 3. 5. In order to be transparent about issues with may have influenced my choice of research topic (Berg, 2004, p. 157), and any potential sources of bias that my upbringing and lifestyle may have created, I have included a section below in which I situate myself within the study.

3. 2. Situating myself within this study.

I was born hearing in a hearing middle class family in Dublin, in the Republic of Ireland. My early childhood was spent in London and Leeds, and at age 5, while living in Leeds, I caught pneumococcal meningitis for the second time and became profoundly deaf. From this point in the mid-1980s onwards, I was in mainstream oral education. Initially I was educated for two years in a mainstream primary school in Leeds with a peripatetic teacher of the Deaf visiting once a week. When my family moved to Swansea in South Wales, I was moved first to a primary school with a PHU and then a comprehensive school with a PHU and classroom support for some subjects. At no point during my school career was I encouraged to use BSL to communicate. While this consistently oral approach to my education did lead to social exclusion, it was an academically successful period of my

life. In my home life, my family and I attended BSL classes several times, with my parents passing their stage one exams when I was 7 years of age. However, aside from a few 'home signs' and the occasional use of finger-spelling, sign was not used, or needed, in the home. The whole family was aware of See Hear, and we did watch it when we were able to, but being an active family we were often out at weekends and so we usually missed it.

I did eventually learn to sign and completed my level one CACDP certificate exam when I was 19, just after completing my A-levels. During this period I also spent one year training with and playing for the Welsh Deaf rugby team, but did not really become involved in the Deaf community beyond this. I then attended the University of Bristol to study for a BSc degree in Biological Sciences. Once at University I fell in with a group of young Deaf BSL users and made my first real ventures into the Deaf community. However, despite this I was still largely isolated from contact with Deaf people due to the fact I was the only Deaf person in the Biological Sciences department. The pub group, as it was then, was one of my first experiences of socialising with Deaf people and remains a regular feature of my social life to this day. However, I very rarely attend Bristol Deaf Club, finding it difficult to fit in with the people who make up the regulars there. At least part of this is due to my oral upbringing and my lack of confidence in pure BSL, but also that my interests, which include Welsh rugby, indie-rock music and literature, are not well represented amongst the conversations in Bristol Deaf club.

My contact with people with a strong Deaf identity increased when I finished my Biology degree and began this MSc course in Deaf Studies in the Centre for Deaf Studies, also in the University of Bristol. While this has taught me a lot about Deaf culture, Deaf issues and politics and BSL, I still feel that I have a mixed Deaf and hearing identity, due to my closeness with my family when growing up, the fact that I still retain a number of close hearing friends and that I still count English as my preferred method of self expression. This mixed identity has no doubt played an important part in my selection of this topic for my research, as has my long time attendance at the White Hart pub. Having seen the comings and goings amongst the pub group over the years and the relationships that have been built up there between Deaf and hearing people, I have become very interested in this rather unique situation where Deaf and hearing people meet as equals with a form of communication that is accessible to all.

3. 3. Reliability, validity, generalizability and planning.

In order to address the three factors of reliability, validity and generalizability of the data found during the project, I decided to not only rely on observations and informal chat in the pub, but also to interview selected informants in order to obtain more in-depth views and opinions. In this way I could identify any areas where answers given in the pub with people watching might reflect the social mores or conventions of what the informant perceived to be appropriate for the Deaf community rather than their personal feelings (Davies, 1999). By video recording the interviews, and thus retaining a hard copy of what was said for future analysis rather than relying on hastily scribbled notes, I further

ensured the reliability of the data (Peräkylä, 1997). Since the pub group is so heterogeneous in both its Deaf and hearing attendees in terms of their experience with the Deaf community, it must be recognised that complete reliability is very difficult to achieve. This problem is compounded by the fact that there is no previous research in this area, so there is no way to compare my findings with previous results. This heterogeneity of the group is why I chose to interview a wide range of people with differing experiences, to try to represent the range of opinions that are present in the group.

Generalizability on the other hand is much more difficult to address. As has been explained previously, the White Hart pub scene is very different from other Deaf pub scenes in that they accept hearing people much more readily than the monthly Deaf pub scene. In order to address this concern, it may be better to treat the White Hart as a unique situation where any conclusions cannot be generalized to cover other Deaf pub gatherings, until further research into other parallel situations is conducted. It must also be stressed that it should not be attempted to generalize these conclusions to wider interaction between hearing and Deaf people outside this unique situation.

Once the site and aim of the project had been established, the 11 stages of planning naturalistic research as outlined by Bogden and Biklen (1992) (in Cohen et al, 2000, p. 140) could be attempted. Stages 1: locating a field of study, 2: addressing ethical issues, 3: deciding on the sampling, 4: finding a role and managing entry into the context, 5: finding informants and 6: developing and maintaining relationships in the field, had

already been established or were quickly achieved due to my familiarity with the individuals within the group and my position as long time member of the social group. Thus issues of trust, access to the field of study and identifying informants were not problematic.

Stage 7, data collection in-situ, was not difficult. Having attended the pub gatherings for five years I was well attuned to the themes and trends that occurred within the group. This meant that observations were easily made and relevant themes for further investigation were readily spotted. Interviews were quickly arranged and carried out in a relaxed informal environment.

Stage 8, data collection outside the field, involved knowing something of my informants' backgrounds. Again, due to my good relationships with my informants, this was easily achieved.

Stage 9 and 11, data collection and writing reports, were undertaken while still attending the pub nights. This gave me the flexibility to incorporate any issues that arose during the course of preparing the report that might not have otherwise been covered (in this case, stage 10, preparation for leaving the field, was not applicable as the pub group is still the cornerstone of the researcher's social life!).

3. 4. Informants and interviews.

The informants were chosen based on several factors. In order to represent the diversity within the groups, three Deaf informants with varying degrees of involvement in the Deaf community were chosen, and three hearing informants with a similar diversity of experience and involvement with Deaf people were selected. The unifying factors between all individuals interviewed was their involvement in the pub scene and their skill in BSL. Initial enquiries and years of observation placed ability in BSL as the number one prerequisite to take part in the social activities surrounding the pub group.

Due to this prerequisite and the researcher's own communication preference for BSL or SSE (Sign Supported English) over spoken English alone, wherever possible, interviews were conducted in BSL and video-taped. Unfortunately, two of the informants were unavailable for face to face interviews during the time frame of the project. Luckily, both informants were hearing with good levels of self-expression in written English, and readily agreed to provide answers to questions posed via email. All informants were open to the prospect of follow-up questions as the project progressed, thus keeping it an "unfolding and evolving sort of study" (Punch, 1998, p161).

One of the major advantages of the interview method over more quantitative methods is that it is extremely adaptable (Bell, 1999). Researchers are free to follow up any interesting points that might arise out of the interview in a way that is impossible with more structured quantitative methods. For this research project, due to the lack of

background literature available, the aim was to use a relatively unstructured interview technique to draw out as much information as possible, because as stated by Cohen, Manion & Morrison (2000) –

> … the unstructured interview is useful when the researcher is not aware of what she does not know, and therefore, relies on the respondent to tell her!
> (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2000, p. 270)

The interviews themselves were conducted in a relaxed atmosphere at my home in Bristol. All of the informants I interviewed had been there before and so were familiar with the surroundings. The option of conducting the interview elsewhere at a location of the informant's own choice was given, but turned down each time. This was taken to mean that the informants were comfortable with the location. While I had prepared a list of general questions to ask all informants which were kept constant throughout the process (see Appendix 1 and 2 for examples of the questions used), any interesting points brought up by the informants were followed up during the interview, so at times it was more like an informal conversation rather than an interview. All interviews were recorded on video camera with both the informant and the researcher in the field of view so that accurate transcripts could be made. On a number of occasions, follow up questions were emailed to the informants with the invitation of further discussion of points brought up in other interviews. The two informants unavailable for face to face interviews were both sent personalised email copies of the questions modified to include points brought up in previous interviews. Again, they were encouraged to add any other information they felt important, either in reply to that email or in consequent emails.

5 other informants, 3 Deaf and 2 hearing, while not interview subjects, provided a lot of important background information, particularly about the history of the White Hart pub group. These informants usually passed on their information either in informal conversations or in emails. They were also given anonymity.

3. 5. Confidentiality and ethical considerations.

It was made clear amongst the pub group when this research was first considered that the focus of the project would be on the people and their interactions and events occurring within the group. Adequate time and opportunity were provided for any protests or concerns to be aired about the project. In fact, there were none, and such feedback as was received was positive. Thus, goodwill and co-operation, as stressed by Cohen et al (2000 p. 54) were achieved. This openness and honesty about my aims and the purposes of my research also minimised the chances of my being accused of using "sneaky strategies" (de Laine, 2000, p. 68) or of breaking confidences that might lead to an "ethical hangover" (de Laine, 2000, p. 70) after the project was finished. This openness and honesty about my aims also prevented me from becoming an "invisible" insider-researcher, and thus avoided any of the dangers connected with such invisibility (Berg, 2004, p.163), such as learning more than I wanted or needed to know about aspects of the research that might prove sensitive. However, my status as a long time member of the pub group protected me from any exclusion within the group during the course of the project.

Once informants had been identified and had provided their written consent, all informants were given the option of confidentiality. By changing the names of the informants and avoiding as much as possible any level of descriptive detail about their background, the possibility of attributing any particular quotes to any one informant was minimised. It was made clear to all informants that total anonymity could not be expected due to the close-knit nature of the group. They all accepted this risk. However, I also made it clear to the informants that if they did not want to respond to a question, they should feel free not to do so. A potential problem with this part of the study was that many of the informants were my friends. This could potentially have caused conflict between myself and the informants if I had used information gleaned from what they took to be intimate conversations between friends (de Laine, 2000, p. 68). To avoid this as far as possible, I resolved not to report any conversations outside the interview situation in any detail, although it was unavoidable that some observations must be used to provide support for the observations made during the interview (Miller & Glassner, 1997). It was also made clear that information given in the interview situation was to be used and quoted, possibly at length, in the report. Even within the interview situation, I exercised some caution with which quotes to use and which were too personal or intimate to report without betraying confidence. As de Laine (2000) writes, "no fieldworker ever has a license to tell all" (p. 76). On a similar note, whenever other individuals were named in the interview situation, their names were changed to protect their identities.

3. 6. Sources of bias.

The pub group under investigation in this study represents a meeting place of several different discourses. For example, the Deaf discourse of those who attended Deaf schools and are culturally Deaf; the deafness discourses that might be present in deaf ex-mainstream pupils who have only recently been exposed to Deaf culture, and various hearing discourses. It is important that each of these discourses is adequately explored and explained for each interviewee in order that a representative social reality is built up (Miller 1997). Sources of bias that may be important for this project would include the tendency for the interviewer to see the subject in his or her own image, and imposing his or her own preconceptions and prejudices on the subject. Lack of self-knowledge on the part of the interviewer can prevent mutual disclosure and understanding between interviewer and informant due to defence mechanisms on the part of the interviewer (Holstein & Gubrium, 1997). In order to try and avoid this arising, section 3. 2., in which I situate myself in the study, attempts to make transparent my own background and potential sources of bias. This should also reveal some of my motives for choosing this topic for study, which again, should reveal any potential sources of bias and show why I chose to investigate some aspects of this pub group and not others (Berg, 2004, p. 157).

It is also important that the interviewees are interviewed in their preferred language, so that they can express themselves clearly and freely. For this to be the case, with a Deaf interviewer, all potential subjects were chosen on their skill at expressing themselves in BSL or SSE, as well as their ability to express their knowledge about the pub group.

However, this in itself could be a source of bias. By choosing informants in this way and thus excluding those with weaker ability in BSL, I am excluding those who are on the periphery of the group. These people could well prove to be a potentially valuable source of information. However, when bearing in mind that there is only a single researcher in this project, this potential bias does not seem to be avoidable. As Bell (1999) writes, it is important to bear in mind that if a set of interviews is conducted by a single researcher, it is possible that there could be a consistent bias in all the interviews, which would be unnoticeable without rigorous analysis of the data. However, this is again addressed by the fact that the researcher has situated himself within his own study in section 3. 2. to expose any potential for bias.

CHAPTER 4. DATA CHAPTER

In this chapter I present my findings from the research. Due to the limitations of the

word count, I have combined these directly into the discussion of the two models under

consideration. Since this approach may be felt to limit the amount of interview data

presented, the transcripts of two interviews I conducted are presented in Appendices 3

and 4 to give the reader a better impression of the data I have collected.

When writing about the mixed Deaf/hearing group in this section, it shall be referred to as

the "Deaf group" to follow the example of the informants interviewed, despite the fact

that it is made up of almost equal number of Deaf and hearing people. This apparent

contradiction can be illustrated by the fact that Jess, one of the Deaf informants from the

CDS, refers to her hearing friends who sign as Deaf people in her interviews. When

asked for clarification about this, she said

> …I see them as part of the Deaf world as they all sign, are Deaf aware and
> so on. I see them as Deaf.

It appears that using the term "Deaf" for the White Hart pub group may show some

blurring of the boundaries between hearing and Deaf, because both hearing and Deaf

informants referred to the group as the "Deaf group" rather than the "signing group" or

any other term. It may, on the other hand, show that they identify the pub group as a

definite "Deaf space", rather than a mixed group as such.

Conclusions will be drawn in chapter 5.

4. 1. An outline of the background of each informant.

In this section I shall give a brief summary of each informants' background to illustrate any particular biases that may be present in each of their interview data. Relevant information will include the length and extent of their involvement in the Deaf community, preferred mode of communication, and where relevant, their educational background. It must be borne in mind that in order to preserve the anonymity of the informants, some of these details are left deliberately vague.

Herman. Herman is a Deaf man with a strong, well developed awareness of his own Deaf identity and has been involved in the Deaf community for many years. He is the only Deaf person in his family and was educated orally in a mainstream school, but now considers BSL to be his first language. He has been involved in the White Hart pub group for 2 years.

Jess. Jess is a young Deaf woman whose immediate family are all hearing. She has become involved in the Deaf community relatively recently, and started attending the White Hart pub nights just over 1 year ago. She studies at the CDS in the University of Bristol, and was again educated in a mainstream school.

Pauline. Pauline is a hearing student at the CDS and has been involved in the

Deaf community through University, employment and voluntary posts for over 6 years.

She socialises with both Deaf and hearing people, and has been attending the White Hart

pub group for 3 years.

Persephone. Persephone is a hearing interpreting student in the CDS who has a

member of her immediate family who is Deaf. She has been using sign, both as SSE

(Sign Supported English) and BSL for her whole life. Although she feels it is only

recently that she has become truly fluent, she considers herself to be more comfortable

expressing herself in BSL rather than English. She has been attending the White Hart

pub nights for over 1 year.

Serena. Serena is an interpreting student in the CDS who started studying BSL at

13, although she has only been a regular user for the last 3 years. She has been involved

in many Deaf events in Bristol and her home town and considers herself to be equally

comfortable in both BSL and English. She has been attending the White Hart pub nights

for 3 years.

Stavros. Stavros is a young deaf man who is learning BSL and considers himself

to be in the process of becoming "big D" Deaf. He was educated in an oral mainstream

school and only became involved in the Deaf community to a limited degree 3 years ago.

He had been attending the White Hart pub nights on an irregular basis for 2 years, until

this year when he started taking BSL lessons and becoming more involved in the Deaf community.

4. 2. The present day Bristol pub scene at the White Hart.

Currently, in 2005, the pub group is very successful, although not quite on the same level as in the mid 1990s. The average attendance is 20 to 30 people, with slightly more Deaf than hearing.

Most of the hearing people attending the pub are either students from the CDS or friends of established group members. On the other hand, very few of the Deaf people are from the University, but what few there are, hail from both the CDS and other courses in the University of Bristol, and also from UWE.

The Deaf people from the Universities are almost all from mainstream schools, with one or two from Mary Hare Grammar School. The remaining Deaf people are locals or from Weston Super Mare or Gloucester and most are either employed or in college, although attendance by Deaf people from outside the University group is a fairly recent occurrence.

Interestingly, there is also a gender imbalance within the group. Most of the Deaf people who attend regularly are men. On the other hand, most of the hearing regulars are women, the majority of whom are involved with the CDS. More research would be

required to tease out the reasons for this, although one suggestion is put forward in chapter 4. 4. 1.

During the pub nights in the White Hart themselves, the structure of the night remains fairly constant from week to week. The early arrivals usually secure a table in the same spot every week and people arrive from around eight o'clock onwards.

Topics of conversation vary widely and include politics (Deaf and national), music, religion, sport and everything in between. Discussions of Deaf politics are by no means restricted to Deaf people, with everyone, hearing or Deaf, welcome to participate.

Within the group, everyone, hearing and Deaf, signs to each other, and usually spoken English alone is usually only used when interpreting BSL conversations for non-signers. When two people use English only to communicate, it is usually with people who cannot sign, or if the conversation is taking place outside the main group. Interaction with bar staff is usually either by spoken English or gesture, although some staff have learned some basic BSL.

The relationships within the groups are by no means restricted to once weekly meetings on Thursdays. Many of the people who attend the pub also socialise on other occasions, meeting up with particular friends from the pub during the week, and other events are often arranged for the weekends. Indeed, there are a number of romantic relationships

(mostly mixed in that one party is Deaf and the other hearing) that have developed from the pub group which obviously continue after each weekly meeting has finished.

4. 3. The White Hart – a heterotopia?

In this section I shall go through the six criteria Foucault used to define heterotopias and use information gleaned from the interviews and from observations to argue whether or not each point supports using the idea of the White Hart pub scene being a heterotopic site.

4. 3. 1. Separation from mainstream society.

The first point, of "crisis" heterotopias or "heterotopias of deviation" which are separate from mainstream society, is a difficult point at which to start. Foucault defines the crisis heterotopias as being reserved for people who are in a state of crisis in relation to the rest of society and so act as a place to which people can be temporarily removed for the duration of the crisis. Heterotopias of deviation on the other hand are more permanent. Foucault uses prisons, psychiatric hospitals and retirement homes as examples of this type of heterotopia.

The difficulty lies in determining which of these two heterotopias best describe what occurs in the White Hart. While the meetings are only once a week and last for approximately 4 hours, thus filling the "temporary" requirement for crisis heterotopias,

they are a more or less permanent fixture throughout the year, with fairly regular

attendees, which suggests more of a heterotopia of deviation. Furthermore, because

everyone who attends the pub is either Deaf or a BSL user, it could be argued that they

are "deviants"[3] from the norm of hearing, speaking society. Indeed, it was a common

theme among all the informants that the weekly pub meetings and the fact that they can

all communicate freely through BSL had become an important part of their life. This is

illustrated by Persephone, a hearing woman with a Deaf member of her immediate

family,

> I don't see the pub as being different from my 'normal life'… it feels the
> same, only it's better, full of young people. I love it! And feel comfortable
> there!

This illustrates the position of the people who attend the pub group as "deviants" from

hearing, speaking society, "deviants" who see their d/Deaf, signing group as their normal,

day to day life. If the informants had said that the pub group was completely separate

from their 'normal' lives, then this would suggest that the pub group is a crisis

heterotopia, a temporary refuge from the outside world.

It was also felt that the group was very isolated from the wider hearing groups in the pub.

As one informant, Jess, who is herself Deaf, said

> There's some feeling of a bubble around us, we never take notice of what
> other people are doing, whereas people on the outside look in and watch.

---

[3] The term "deviant" is retained, in inverted commas, to describe the inhabitants of heterotopias of
deviation. I have chosen to retain this term despite its negative and judgemental connotations because it is
the term that Foucault himself uses to describe the inhabitants of these heterotopias.

Another Deaf informant, Stavros, compared the Deaf pub group to an island to which non-signing hearing people occasionally paid a visit. One of the hearing informants, Pauline, said when asked whether she was able to switch from her everyday life, in which she has limited contact with Deaf people, to the full signing environment in the pub,

> It's not a problem shifting because I don't feel I have to, because I'm just being myself. Part of me now is that I sign as well.

This feeling of the Deaf pub group and the behaviours expressed as being part of everyday life rather than a one-off every week was one which ran through all of the interviews conducted. Even Stavros, the Deaf informant with the least developed Deaf identity, said that in his social life the Deaf pub group was linked to everything he did. This attitude was also expressed by the hearing informants, which may not be surprising as they were all connected to the CDS.

Thus, it appears that the idea of the pub group being a heterotopia of deviation is more appropriate than a crisis heterotopia.

4. 3. 2. Different patterns in time.

The second point, of heterotopias functioning in different patterns as time goes on, is very appropriate for this topic. Not only has the Deaf pub scene in general gone from being a place for rebels and outsiders from the Deaf clubs to being a popular scene with young

Deaf people, but the White Hart group itself has gone through many changes since its inception, as described in chapter1. 3. 5., above. It has gone from a place with large numbers of Deaf people, where status as staff members or students in the University was relatively unimportant, to a place where it was predominantly students from the CDS in attendance with no staff and with much fewer Deaf people, to the present situation, where the emphasis on the University is very much reduced, with more and more Deaf people from outside the University attending.

4. 3. 3. Several real spaces in a single space.

The third point, that heterotopias juxtapose several real spaces in a single space, is also a valid criterion to apply here. All of the informants mentioned the fact that there is a mixture of both Deaf and hearing cultures in the group, and some also went so far as to contrast the different sub-groups within the main Deaf and hearing groups, such as those involved with the University, people with a political bent, and those involved with the Bristol Deaf youth. Herman, brought this up unprompted when talking about whether it was easy for new people to fit into the group.

> The students are all in the same course and class, there's the Bristol Deaf
> youth group, you have the Welsh group, the Deaf DST (Deaf Studies Trust),
> all mixed up.

Pauline illustrated these sub-groups by saying that as a student herself, she could relate more easily to the students in the pub group than others because

> …we're all in the same boat; we have the same worries, no money, have to
> do our own laundry and so on.

This emphasises that there are many different groups present in the pub group, not only hearing and Deaf, but divisions on a much smaller scale such as religious beliefs, political beliefs, different backgrounds and so on and these in themselves can attract different people. There is very much a feeling that there are several real spaces juxtaposed within the pub, not only the simple hearing and Deaf divide.

4. 3. 4. Linked to slices of time.

The fourth point, that heterotopias are limited to slices of time, is also easily applied to the White Hart pub scene. The meetings occur once a week and last for only a few hours at a time. In this way it is easy to draw comparison with the example Foucault used, the fairground (albeit on a much shorter, weekly timetable), with its annual here one day, gone the next cycle. However, this could also be the case when looking at an individual's attendance over the years. Most of the students only attend the White Hart pub gatherings while they are in university in Bristol. Once they have finished their course, they tend to stop going to the pub, even if they do remain in Bristol after their studies. Although there are some who continue attending, they are very much in the minority. So while the pub group is limited to slices of time in that it occurs every week, it may also be limited to slices of time in that many people only attend while they are in University. This may well have changed with the rise in numbers of professional Deaf people attending, but this is something that needs more research in the future.

4. 3. 5. Systems of opening and closing.

The fifth point, that heterotopias have a system of opening and closing that makes them both isolated and penetrable, is possibly one of the most interesting of the six and is ripe for further research. The fact that, as mentioned earlier, the Deaf group is within a "bubble" and so isolated from the rest of the pub points towards this being true. This isolation could be either enforced, as with the communication problems faced by Deaf people, or voluntary on the part of the hearing people. This isolation is due to the systems of closing the heterotopia referred to in the title of this section.

 A recurrent theme in a lot of the interviews is a feeling that one has to "prove oneself" in order to be accepted, and a large factor in this proof was ability in BSL. This reflects Foucault's assertion that one must pass some kind of rite or ritual before being allowed into the heterotopia. This is the system of opening, or the process by which the heterotopia becomes penetrable.

This not only applied to the hearing people who attended (as may have been expected) but also to the Deaf people themselves. Indeed, Herman brought this up with respect to Stavros, who despite only recently learning BSL and trying to become involved in the Deaf community has become a regular member of the pub group.

> Like Stavros, it's hard for him to fit in. He's needed a lot of patience to come every week. People have come to respect him and accept him.

Persephone also mentioned this need to prove oneself.

> If you attend regularly and show commitment people will be more accepting
> of them and that applies to both Deaf and hearing!

Stavros himself was well aware of the need for dedication and hard work to become accepted by the Deaf group. He expressed the belief that commitment to the group was needed in order to become accepted. Some of the informants believed that becoming involved in the Deaf pub group was much easier than becoming involved with the traditional Deaf people based in the Deaf club. However, this is best explored in the next section, which will look at the use of post colonialism as a model to describe the Deaf pub group.

The other point that Foucault raises in his description of this fifth criterion is that some heterotopias have "apparent entry". I believe that this could work on several levels in this pub group. There are many different groups present in the Deaf group, not just the Deaf and hearing. While some of the informants felt that hearing people could never be fully part of the Deaf group, there was also an implication that Deaf people could never really be fully part of the hearing group, that those who were not students could never really be part of the University group, that people who were not from Bristol could never be part of the Bristol Deaf community and so on for all the other subdivisions present within the main group.

Again, Herman and Pauline's descriptions of the different groups present in the pub and the levels of acceptance shown by each towards different newcomers are important here. This can be illustrated by observations made over the years. Groups such as young Deaf people from Mary Hare and ex-mainstream pupils tend to mix better with other Mary Hare pupils, other ex-mainstreamers and hearing people. The same goes for individuals from other groups; they were all accepted more readily by those with similar backgrounds to themselves. Herman made another comment that illustrates this point very well, when talking about whether he could relate well with all people in the Deaf pub group, hearing or Deaf. While he at first stated that he would talk to Deaf people more than hearing people because he felt he knew the Deaf people better than hearing people, upon further questioning he clarified this by adding that

> But the Deaf from Bristol, I don't know them well. I treat them the same as hearing people. So I'll meet with my close friends first and chat.

This illustrates that just being Deaf does not necessarily give you automatic entry into all of the Deaf sub-groups. In this case, it could be argued that the Bristol Deaf group have only apparent entry into the group that Herman belongs to, and that he himself has only apparent entry into the Bristol Deaf group.

This seems to illustrate that the different groups present within the larger pub group are not only split by the hearing/Deaf divide, and in a lot of cases, the question of Deaf or hearing does not arise. Serena said, when asked if she could relate to everyone who attended the pub,

Probably not everyone, but if I can't it's not because they are Hearing [sic] or Deaf.

Indeed, being accepted by one part of the group does not guarantee that you will be accepted by other groups, or that you will have anything more than the "apparent entry" as described by Foucault.

4. 3. 6. Relationship with all other spaces.

The final criterion that Foucault defines is that heterotopias create a space which is perfect and well arranged. While it is not being argued that the pub group is a model of perfection in itself, looking at the communication problems and lack of access to information that most Deaf people meet in everyday life, the fact that BSL is used between all individuals in the pub group eases many of these problems.

4. 4. The White Hart – an example of post colonial identities amongst Deaf and hearing?

In this section I shall look at how the theory of post colonialism can be applied to the White Hart pub group. I shall attempt to apply the theory outlined in section 2. 4. to both Deaf and hearing people.

4. 4. 1. Oppositional identities or not?

It is clear from the observations made, and the very fact that hearing people are present and welcomed into the pub group, that the culture and identity of the Deaf people in the group is not merely an oppositional one. They are not attempting to create an identity for themselves as simply "not-hearing". Indeed, all the Deaf informants claimed to have a hearing facet to their identity. Although Herman rejected this in his interview, saying instead that he had a "strong Deaf identity", he has claimed several times outside the interview situation that he has both hearing and Deaf aspects to his identity due to his relationship with his family and the fact that he has a number of close hearing friends. The apparent contradiction here could be explained by the fact that an interview, no matter how informally set up, is still a formal recording of one's thoughts and feelings. This could have put pressure on Herman, with his long-term involvement in the Deaf community, to reflect the social mores and conventions of the Deaf community in his interview to protect his standing in the community (Davies, 1999). As might have been expected, Stavros had the strongest feeling of a 'hearing identity' due to his more recent entry into the Deaf community, but Jess also agreed that her hearing family background had a large part to play in her acceptance of having a mixed identity. However, it must again be stressed that there were only three informants interviewed, so there is a risk of over-generalising the responses given.

Interestingly, the hearing people in the group did not show oppositional identities either.

From observation, many hearing people, when attempting to join groups of Deaf people

will defer to them on any point of culture, taking the approach that the Deaf person is

always right. This could in some ways be seen as the hearing person becoming

oppositional to their own hearing culture. The other oppositional approach that is

sometimes seen in hearing people is the patronising, paternal approach as exemplified by

the missioners. In this case, the hearing person is taking a stance oppositional to Deaf

culture and identity, the traditional colonial attitude, as it were. However, from my

observations, neither of these attitudes seem to arise within the group. Of course,

awareness of Deaf politics and life experiences has made them realise that, as Pauline

stated

> ...I can't match up on the decision to be "d" or "D" or to wear a hearing aid
> or not, or use BSL or be oral... I can talk about Deaf politics, but my beliefs
> aren't worth as much as a Deaf person's in those areas.

By this it was meant that simply because of her differing experiences through life,

Pauline felt that she could never really understand or feel as strongly as Deaf people do

about Deaf issues and politics. Still, she felt perfectly able to discuss such issues within

the group.

It was agreed by all informants that the group contained elements of both Deaf and

hearing culture, that it was extremely mixed. Many of them pointed out that the whole

point of the pub group was to use BSL and so the fundamental, underlying culture was

Deaf, but all agreed that hearing culture was represented as well. Herman put it like this

Both (cultures) are there for sharing. We share experiences, share cultures, languages. We learn from their culture and they learn from ours, so it's an exchange.

The lack of an oppositional culture was also shown in the fact that there are actually a number of romantic relationships that have formed in the pub between hearing and Deaf people. Stavros and Pauline were particularly observant about this. The fact that these relationships occur and happen very much on an equal footing between the two people involved suggests that neither the Deaf nor hearing people are constructing oppositional identities for themselves, or willing to, as Fanon (1961, p. 175) put it, "lose himself at whatever cost in his own barbarous people". This could also be used to reject the idea of the hearing people taking on settler identities in that by being open to relationships with Deaf individuals, they are not showing the usual traits of oppression (Curthoys, 2003). Pauline, Persephone and Stavros seemed to think that the gender imbalance came, to an extent, from the presence of the largely female CDS student body. This idea is commonly held within the group to be due to the perception of Deaf Studies and interpreting as "caring" subjects. This, as both Pauline and Stavros pointed out, led to high numbers of women who can sign, which is seen as a very attractive prospect for Deaf men. As illustrated by Pauline,

I think it's because people say, "Woah! There's loads of girls in the pub and they can all sign!"

Part of the attraction is almost certainly that in a relationship between a Deaf man and hearing woman, as Stavros said,

> The relationships would be more successful and longer lasting from meeting up in the pub rather than birds pulled [sic] elsewhere.

This attitude stemmed from the fact that hearing people who attend the pub group generally have at least a basic understanding of BSL and other Deaf issues, so this should, in theory, lead to greater rapport between hearing and Deaf people.

4. 4. 2. Hybridity and authenticity.

The data covered in the preceding section seems to suggest that rather than developing a strictly oppositional post colonial identity, the culture of the group is very much mixed, with acceptance from both Deaf and hearing of each other's basic cultures, creating a hybrid group.

Acceptance into the group does not rely on a person being 'authentically' Deaf. Indeed, Persephone said in her interview that

> …anyone is welcome and accepted regardless of their skills (in BSL).

As has been previously pointed out, all of the Deaf informants felt that they had a mixed Deaf/hearing identity, and the fact that hearing people are present in the group shows that 'authenticity' does not play a large part in acceptance. However, despite Persephone's statement, the group is not overly liberal about who it accepts. As pointed out in chapter

4. 3. 5., dedication and patience are essential if one wants to be accepted. Skill in BSL was repeatedly claimed to be essential for acceptance into the group as well. Indeed, both Persephone and Serena, very popular hearing figures within the group, both claimed to be at least equally comfortable in both English and BSL when expressing themselves or receiving information. It is this proficiency in BSL, among other things, that has made them central figures in the group. So while having an 'authentic' Deaf identity is not necessary to joining the group, the group itself is not too liberal about who is accepted either.

This can be contrasted with Herman's account of trying to fit in at the Bristol Deaf club, in which he said that he had to work hard to try and prove he could follow their rules and fit in with the strong Deaf personalities there (bearing in mind that Herman has the strongest Deaf identity of all the informants interviewed). This has very important implications for the idea of oppositional identities. From personal experience and observation I have found that many ex-mainstream pupils without well developed Deaf identities can have a very difficult time fitting into and being accepted into Deaf clubs. By not worrying about 'authentic' Deaf identities, the pub group seems to have proved itself very popular with those who may not have a sufficiently strong Deaf identity to fit into the Deaf clubs.

4. 4. 3. Power issues in the "crossover zone".

When considering post colonial identities for this group, hybridity appears to be the right model to use because what happens in the pub is out of control of both the hearing community and the Deaf community. In other words, it is very much happening in the "crossover zones" mentioned by Loomba (1998). This is illustrated by the facts that the group is separate from the other hearing groups in the pub, and so from the hearing community; and Herman's story about not being accepted in the Bristol Deaf club, and so is separate from the Deaf community as well. An example of this lack of control in the crossover zones is that the hearing members of the group readily interpret for the Deaf members. This is shown to be out of the control of the hearing community with the structures, rules and guidelines laid down by hearing-led interpreting agencies, because, as Serena, an interpreting student in the CDS, said

> …my interpreting lecturers have said we shouldn't be doing this as we are not skilled enough and it will get us into bad habits. Despite this … I would never refuse to do it.

Indeed, the kind of 'interpreting' that they are called on to do is often very much removed from the traditional view of interpreters simply transmitting information. Most 'interpreting' that takes place is between hearing non-signers and Deaf people, and is usually discussions about Deaf culture and BSL, although it occasionally includes other more general topics such as sport and film. As Pauline put it, because the conversations in the pub are more informal and relaxed, then the 'interpreter' often wants to be "involved in the conversation as well", something that could never happen in the more

formal, controlled world of professional interpreting. This often leads to three way conversations, where the 'interpreter' is not only relaying information between the Deaf person and the non-signing hearing lay person, but also contributing to the conversation on their own behalf.

However, despite this informality there is still a strong awareness of the risks associated with the power an interpreter can have over the Deaf person. Perhaps not surprisingly the Deaf informants were most aware of this, with Stavros being able to give an example of poor practice making him feel powerless in a pub situation. In this case it was when a female member of the pub group was acting as an interpreter for him, but was telling the hearing person information about him "without confirming with me what she said to that person", and therefore acting more, as Stavros put it, as a "spokesperson, not an interpreter". However, Serena was also aware of this power imbalance

> I do find it strange the way it changes the balance somehow, from when I have been signing with someone to then interpret for them, like it sort of gives me more power and I don't like that it separates me in some way.

So while she is aware of the power imbalance, she does not enjoy it. Stavros pointed out that there are some hearing people in the pub group who are more likely than others to be asked to interpret due to their more "chilled out attitude", meaning that these hearing people are unlikely to exploit such power imbalances. He felt that some Deaf people were more confident in asking him or other Deaf people with good oral skills to interpret, rather than hearing people because they felt they could trust Deaf people more and didn't have to worry so much about the power imbalance.

Herman was asked why he thought hearing people become interpreters to clarify the Deaf attitude towards interpreters. He said

> Money. Some are in it for money. Some really want to learn BSL. Some, very few, interpreters are in it to support the Deaf community. Not in a patronising way. Some are good signers, but then they get paid and go home. They're professional. But then the Deaf feel they're being used for money. So it's a can't win situation for the Deaf.

By this it appears that Herman wants both a personal, social relationship with the interpreters and yet at the same time expects them to act as model professionals. However, if the interpreter acts as a professional and does not get involved in a personal way with their client base, he seems to feel that they are not giving enough back into the Deaf community. It could be said that if this attitude is prevalent throughout the Deaf community, then it is a no-win situation for the interpreters as well.

While most of the informants gave similar accounts claiming that the kind of interpreting that the hearing people did in the pub was more in the role of a *communicator* than official interpretation, these attitudes and preoccupations with power imbalances do show an undercurrent of what could be seen as an oppositional identity at play. This is visible in the attitudes of suspicion that some Deaf people have towards the interpreters, and the paternal attitude seen in some interpreters themselves, as illustrated by Stavros' example of bad practice (p. 59-60). So while the character of the group as a whole is not oppositional, there are visible examples of individuals with oppositional facets to their characters. This is perfectly understandable, as each post colonial community has many

different agendas interacting and competing with one another. However, these attitudes

of suspicion and paternalism could be seen as relics of the attitudes present in the Deaf

community before independence from the missioners and the Deaf resurgence. It must be

considered whether the community as a whole might be better off without these negative

attitudes, especially in situations such as the White Hart pub group where there is

potential for a hybrid identity to develop.

This confusion of issues surrounding interpreting and the concerns about power

imbalance illustrates the type of problem that occurs when trying to construct a hybrid

identity for the White Hart Deaf pub group. While none of the people in the Deaf pub

group want the power imbalances to arise, it is obvious that the imbalance does arise.

Interpreters, whether in formal or informal situations, control the information flow

between two parties and so wield power over both. This could be seen as an example of

the "double bind" hypothesis postulated by Ladd (2003, p. 252, 420). While they are

trying to give their Deaf friends better access to the events in the pub, the hearing people

acting as interpreters are sometimes met with suspicion, which could well lead to an

"unfortunate self-censorship" (Ladd, 2003, p. 252) on their part in the future. However,

on a brighter note, this appears to be something that all the hearing people in the pub

group are aware of, not just the interpreting students. Awareness of the problem could be

the first step on the path to solving it.

4. 4. 4. Hearing identities.

Having addressed the characteristics identified in chapter 2. 4., there is still a conceptual problem as to how hearing pub group members can be situated in the post colonial theory for the pub. As mentioned previously, there is quite simply a dearth of research into how the former colonial and colonised peoples can have a healthy relationship together in the post-independence period.

The discussion of 'Wide Sargasso Sea' in Ferguson (2001) and the conflict between the two parts of Antoinette's character in the novel may well apply for Deaf children of hearing parents or HMFD, where there is a conflict between the culture one was brought up in and the culture in which one is expected to live in later life. However, this doesn't seem to ring true for the hearing members of the group. While the pub group is a major part of their social lives, they do not live in the Deaf community and have not been rejected from the hearing community.

The fact that hearing members of the pub group have not been rejected by the hearing community could be used to reject the idea of them being some kind of "race traitors" (Haggis, 2004). They have not abandoned their own culture to submerge themselves in the Deaf community. Instead, the group remains very much an "island", as Stavros labelled it, in between the hearing and Deaf mainlands. This lack of theory to cover the hearing members of the pub group remains one of the major problems with trying to apply the theory of post colonialism to the Deaf pub group in the White Hart.

5. CONCLUSIONS AND EVALUATION.

In this chapter I review the two concepts posited. As stressed repeatedly throughout the study, I will confine myself to the question of Deaf-hearing socialising, as the wider implications for Deaf-hearing relationships are beyond the scope of this study. However, where appropriate, suggestions and pointers for further research have been offered.

5. 1. Relevance of the heterotopic concept.

As has been seen in chapter 4., both of the models considered can be applied to the pub group in the White Hart, but with differing levels of fit.

As regards heterotopias, all six of their defining principles can be met by the pub group. From the information gleaned in this study, there is no evidence to suggest that the theory of heterotopias is not a valid model to use to describe the pub group. Since this theory is focussed on the space that is created within the pub by the interactions between the people involved, a single theory can be used to describe what is going on, rather than needing one theory for the Deaf and another for the hearing. This means that there is the added advantage of simplicity when using this theory. Having a single theory also stresses the unity of the group. Having multiple theories to explain the Deaf behaviour and the hearing behaviour would suggest divisions within the group that don't seem to be present.

The heterotopic model could be applied to other areas of the field of Deaf studies where there is potential to investigate a Deaf space or Deaf friendly space. Such areas might be in the creation or study of bilingual working environments where Deaf and hearing employees can be equally valued (see for example, Young, Ackerman & Kyle, 1998).

5. 2. Relevance of the post colonial concept.

The post colonial theory on the other hand is much more problematic. While it is obviously easy to construct post colonial identities for Deaf people (see Ladd, 2003, for more in-depth examination of this theory), it is much more difficult to do this for hearing people. As mentioned earlier, there are theories that cover former colonists, such as settler identities, race traitors and the brief analysis of Wide Sargasso Sea by Ferguson (2001), but they are by no means comprehensive. So while this theory could well explain why Deaf people may be more prepared to socialise with hearing people now than in the past, it is not useful for explaining why the hearing people are more likely to socialise on equal terms with Deaf people.

So in conclusion, weighing up the ease of use of each model and the extent to which it covers all members of the pub group, the more appropriate of the two models discussed in this project has to be that of heterotopia.

5. 3. Evaluation of methodology.

As far as my research methods are concerned, I believe my methodology to be sound. The biggest constraint on this study was time. If more time had been available I would have been able to expand the study somewhat, with a much more extensive literature review incorporating more difficult to find references and a more detailed grounding in theory. However, with the constraints that were present, I feel I was relatively successful in achieving the aims of my project. This was also my first research project in the field of social sciences and the first time I have had to arrange and conduct interviews. For much of this project I found it difficult to construct an effective strategy and timetable and this resulted in trying to solve problems as I encountered them, as I simply didn't have the experience or expertise to anticipate difficulties before they arose.

If more time had been available, all informants would have been interviewed face to face, rather than via email. I would also have liked to arrange several rounds of interviews to cover issues that came up in interviewing other informants. If this had been possible, I could have started with a standard general interview for all informants in the first round of interviews, then added more specific or in depth questions in subsequent rounds of interviews to cover points that arose during the process. Another possibility would be to have group interviews in which all the informants, Deaf and hearing, could meet and discuss the issues arising from the research, thus being made aware of the others' attitudes and feelings. This may have uncovered otherwise untouched data, including

areas where there were differences of opinion or downright conflict between the Deaf and hearing informants.

Another option would be to initiate such discussion in the pub itself thus involving the whole group, not just the informants. However, this would probably have required more than just one researcher in order to record all the exchanges and to keep such a conversation flowing with prompts and questions. Another possibility would be to expand my circle of informants to include those who do not attend the pub group. This might have given me a clearer picture of how the group relates to the wider Deaf and hearing communities. While this was something I considered during the planning phase of the project, I had to abandon this idea due to possible communication difficulties and the time constraints.

It may also have been to my advantage to give more emphasis to the fact that the interviews were intended as conversations rather than structured interviews. Although this did come about at some points in some interviews, at other times the interviews were very much question and response affairs. It may have also been better if I had arranged the interviews to be held in pubs themselves rather than at my home. By conducting the interviews in my house, it may well be argued that I had set myself up in a position of power, which is why the "conversational" style of interviewing never really happened. The extra informality and familiarity of the surroundings in a pub may have equalised that power imbalance and thus allowed the informant to be more relaxed and forthcoming in the interviews.

5. 4. Further research options.

This project has opened up many areas that would benefit from further research, not only from the perspective of this project itself, but also in respect of the development of a wider view of the field of Deaf Studies in general.

5. 4. 1. Thirdspace.

As mentioned in chapter 2, Soja's (1996) theory of Thirdspace could offer a third possible model that could be used to analyse the White Hart pub scene. However, space and time limitations in this project would not allow me to investigate this possibility. The fields of Geography and other social sciences are ripe for exploration from the perspective of Deaf Studies, and use of the tools of these disciplines could provide vast contributions to the field.

5. 4. 2. The fourth heterotopic principle – slices of time.

The second option, which is an extension of this project, would be to further explore the fourth principle of heterotopias, which is that they exist in slices of time, with regards to the lifetimes of the attendees. As mentioned in chapter 4, many people seem to stop attending the pub when they graduate from University. However, given the increased numbers of professional Deaf people attending, it would be valuable to explore whether

they are likely to carry on attending or if they stop once the students they are friends with leave Bristol. It would also suggest whether or not the attitudes and social relations formed in the pub are more permanent. If this is indeed the case, it would point towards the possibility of using post colonial theory as well as heterotopias to explain what is happening in the group – the development of long term attitude changes towards greater equality in relationships, in effect, the development of a permanent post colonial identity.

5. 4. 3. Constructing a hearing post colonial identity.

Another important direction for future research is to further investigate the place of hearing people in the construction of a post colonial identity for the Deaf community. This is a topic touched upon in this study, but to suggest solutions to this problem is beyond its scope. There are a number of social scenes like the White Hart around the UK, and with the increase in mainstreaming as the educational method of choice, there are likely to be more. Not only will this increase in social interaction probably increase the hybridity of the Deaf identity in the future, but will hopefully also increase the number of hearing people with positive attitudes towards the Deaf community with a desire to be involved as interpreters, or to allow parents of Deaf children to play a role in the Deaf community, to give but two examples. Other similar areas would be the role played by many hearing people in the FDP BSL awareness marches in the early 2000s, and the continuing valuable contributions of other hearing allies to the Deaf community. Rather than having a simple theoretical view of hearing people as oppressive colonisers and Deaf people as the oppressed minority, finding some theoretical framework for these

"positive hearing people" (Dodds, 1998) to somehow fit into the post colonial Deaf community will become an increasingly important concern.

5. 4. 4. Historical perspectives.

Finally, the further development of the historical themes mentioned in the literature review would be a very valuable contribution to the field of Deaf history. The development of radical political groups out of the politics of the Deaf pub rebels in the 1970s and the development of the current pub scene, both stemming from dissatisfaction in the Deaf community, deserve a much more in depth analysis than I can give them here. The development of such social events as the Deaf Rave, which is based on a hearing concept, but given a Deaf flavour by Sign singing and rapping and emphasis on other visual acts rather than the music, is also a valuable area for further research.

While the theory of heterotopia seems to be the most appropriate to describe the White Hart pub group itself, there is vast potential for a fully developed theory of post colonial identities to be applied to the wider Deaf community and its interactions with the hearing community. It is my view that this will be a vital area of future research in the field of Deaf Studies.

REFERENCES.

Alker, D (2000) Really Not Interested in the Deaf? This is the story of Deaf people.

  Darwen Press.

Anon (2002) It got worse this year. *British Deaf News* 33, 10: 16-17.

Anon (2001) Another side of the story. *British Deaf News* 32, 10: 15-16

Ashcroft, B, Griffiths, G & Tiffin, H (1998) Post-colonial studies: the key concepts.

  Routledge, London & New York.

Berg, BL (2004) Qualitative research methods for the social sciences (5th edition).

  Pearson, Boston.

Bhabha, HK (1994) The location of culture. Routledge, London & New York.

Cohen, L, Manion, L & Morrison, K (2000) Research methods in education (5th edition).

  Routledge/Falmer, London.

Curthoys, A (2003) 'We've just started making national histories and you want us to stop

  already?' in Burton, A (Ed) After the imperial turn: thinking with and through the

  nation. Duke University Press.

Davies, CA (1999) Reflexive ethnography: a guide to researching selves and others.

  Routledge, London & New York.

de Laine, M (2000) Fieldwork, participation and practice: ethics and dilemmas in

  qualitative research. SAGE publications, London.

Dodds, J (2005) Personal communication.

Dodds, J (2000) Cheers!... How the Deaf pub set up was born. *British Deaf News* 31, 12:

  23-34.

Dodds, J (1998) Yes, but I'm hearing. *The Voice* 2, 1: 7.

Dodds, J (1995) Young Faces. *British Deaf News* 26, 11: 16.

Fanon, F (1961) The wretched of the Earth. Penguin Books ltd Group, London.

Fee, M (1995) 'Who can write as other?' in Ashcroft, B, Griffiths, G & Tiffin, H (Eds)

    The post-colonial studies reader. Routledge, London & New York.

Ferguson, M (2001) 'Sending the younger son across the Wide Sargasso Sea: the new

    colonizer arrives' in Castle, G (Ed) Post colonial discourses: an anthology.

    Blackwell Publishers Ltd, Oxford.

Foucault, M (1967) Of other spaces.

    http://foucault.info/documents/heteroTopia/foucault/heteroTopia.en.html

Haggis, J (2004) Beyond race and whiteness? Reflections on the new abolitionists and an

    Australian critical whiteness studies. *Borderlands e-jounal* 3, 2.

    http://borderlandsejournal.adelaide.edu.au/vol3no2_2004/haggis_beyond.htm

Hall, S (2001) 'Negotiating Caribbean identities' in Castle, G (Ed) Post colonial

    discourses: an anthology. Blackwell Publishers Ltd, Oxford.

Holstein, JA & Gubrium, JF (1997) 'Active interviewing' in Silverman, D (Ed)

    Qualitative research: theory, method and practice. SAGE Publications Ltd,

    London.

Huxley, A (1962) Island. Vintage, London.

Huxley, A (1932) Brave New World. Flamingo, London.

Kiberd, D (2001) 'Inventing Ireland' in Castle, G (Ed) Post colonial discourses: an

    anthology. Blackwell Publishers Ltd, Oxford.

Ladd, P (2003) Understanding Deaf culture: in search of Deafhood. Multilingual Matters

Ltd, Clevedon.

Ladd, P (1982) 'National Union of the Deaf' in Lee, R (Ed) Writings from Deaf

liberation: a selection of NUD papers, 1976-1986. National Union of the Deaf.

Lane, H (1993) The mask of benevolence: disabling the Deaf community. Vintage

Books, New York.

Lane, H, Hoffmeister, R & Bahan, B (1996) A journey into the Deaf world. Dawn Sign

Press, San Diego.

Lee, R (2004) A beginner's introduction to Deaf history. British Deaf History Society

Publications.

Loomba, A (1998) Colonialism/post colonialism. Routledge, St Ives.

Marvin, H (1994) Is one big London club the answer? *British Deaf News* 25, 8: 9

Miller, J & Glassner, B (1997) 'The "inside" and "outside": finding realities in

interviews' in Silverman, D (Ed) Qualitative research: theory, method and practice.

SAGE Publications Ltd, London.

Niklaus, C (1994) Meeting social needs without responsibility. *British Deaf News* 25, 8:

9.

Orwell, G (1949) Nineteen Eighty-Four. Penguin Books, London.

Peräkylä, A (1997) 'Reliability and validity in research based on transcripts' in

Silverman, D (Ed) Qualitative research: theory, method and practice. SAGE

Publications Ltd, London.

Punch, KF (1998) Introduction to social research: quantitative and qualitative approaches.

SAGE Publications Ltd, London.

See Hear, episode first broadcast 11.6.1995 (tape number 248 in University of Bristol Social Sciences Deaf Studies library).

Soja, EW (1996) Thirdspace: journeys to Los Angeles and other real-and-imagined-spaces. Blackwell Publishers Ltd, Oxford.

Sutherland, I (2005) Personal communication.

Taylor, G & Bishop, J (1991) Being Deaf: the experience of Deafness. Printer Publications, London.

Wheatley, M (2001) Breaking away: Blackpool rally, Winter Garden and the whole lot. *British Deaf News* 32, 10: 14-15.

Woolfe, R (1994) Deaf people should have choice. *British Deaf News* 25, 8: 8.

Wrigley, O (1996) The politics of Deafness. Gallaudet University Press.

Young, A, Ackerman, J & Kyle, J (1998) Looking on: Deaf people and the organisation of services. The Policy Press, Bristol.

Young, RJC (2003) Postcolonialism – a very short introduction. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

APPENDIX 1. Example of the interview outline used for hearing informants.

1. How long have you been going to the pub?

2. How long have you been using BSL? Would you describe yourself as fluent?

3. Have you been involved in the Deaf community before?

4. Are you aware of the politics of the Deaf community?

5. Can you cope well in the hearing world and the Deaf world? Do you feel able to switch back and forth?

6. In day to day life, which language (BSL or English) are you most comfortable with, and which do you actually use the most?

7. Do you see the pub culture as separate from your "normal" life, i.e. dipping into a different culture for a time, whether it's hearing or Deaf culture? Do you feel comfortable there?

8. Do you feel that our group in the pub is part of the wider hearing pub group? That is, is there a degree of interaction or do you feel it is separate?

9. Do you feel the culture within the pub group is predominantly Deaf or hearing? Or is it a mixture of the two?

10. Do you feel that the Deaf people bring Deaf culture to the pub in that they are making it more visible and maybe more accepted? Is this important to you?

11. Who appear to be the "leaders" in the group? Deaf, hearing or a mixture?

12. When you are there, do you actually draw a distinction between Deaf and hearing? Do you prefer to mix with one group over the other?

13. Did you find it easy to fit into the group when you first joined? Why?

14. Is the group open and accessible? For both hearing and Deaf or more so for one than the other?

15. What about ability in BSL, is that important?

16. Can you relate to everyone there, hearing and Deaf?

17. Do you feel that the pub group gives people a door into the Deaf community?

18. Do you think the pub group has a good mixture of Deaf and hearing identities? Are they both represented? Is communication easy?

19. How do you feel about being asked to interpret for Deaf people in the pub? Does it seem fair?

20. Why do you go to the pub?

21. How did you find out where and when to go?

APPENDIX 2. Example of the interview outline used for Deaf informants.

1. How long have you been going to the pub?

2. How would you describe yourself (e.g. deaf, Deaf, deafened, other)?

3. What was your educational background (e.g. mainstream, Deaf school, PHU, other)?

4. Do you feel you have a strong Deaf identity or mixed hearing/Deaf identity?

5. Can you cope well in the hearing world and the Deaf world? Do you feel able to switch back and forth?

6. In day to day life, which language (BSL or English) are you most comfortable with, and which do you actually use the most?

7. Do you see the pub culture as separate from your "normal" life, i.e. dipping into a different culture for a time, whether it's hearing or Deaf culture? Do you feel comfortable there?

8. Do you feel that our group in the pub is part of the wider hearing pub group? That is, is there a degree of interaction or do you feel it is separate?

9. Do you feel the culture within the pub group is predominantly Deaf or hearing? Or is it a mixture of the two?

10. Do you feel that the Deaf people bring Deaf culture to the pub in that they are making it more visible and maybe more accepted? Is this important to you?

11. Who appear to be the "leaders" in the group? Deaf, hearing or a mixture?

12. When you are there, do you actually draw a distinction between Deaf and hearing? Do you prefer to mix with one group over the other?

13. Did you find it easy to fit into the group when you first joined? Why?

14. Is the group open and accessible? For both hearing and Deaf or more so for one than the other?

15. What about ability in BSL, is that important?

16. Can you relate to everyone there, hearing and Deaf?

17. Do you feel that the pub group gives people a door into the Deaf community?

18. Do you think the pub group has a good mixture of Deaf and hearing identities? Are they both represented? Is communication easy?

19. Why do you go?

20. How did you find out where and when to go?

APPENDIX 3. Example transcript of an interview with a hearing informant (Pauline).

How long have you been going to the pub?

Since I arrived in Bristol really.

How long have you been using BSL?

From 1999 to now, about six years.

Would you say you're fluent?

No. I'm a part time user!

Have you been involved in the Deaf community?

I've only properly been involved since I came to Bristol.

How are you involved? Work, voluntary work?

In the University and meeting people outside University. Before, it felt like there was no Deaf community there (in Pauline's previous University), it was really different, the group was isolated. Whereas here there's a huge group, there's more Deaf people than I've ever seen in my life there, so it's easy to join in and become part of the community, kind of.

Are you aware of the politics of the Deaf community? The "big D, little d" thing, Deaf culture, Deaf rights and so on?

Yes.

Do you feel part of the Deaf community?

With some people, yes. With others I still have to prove myself. I have to say where I'm from, who I know, where I learned BSL, blah blah blah. But most of the time, yes because people who know me and I know them as well. Yeah, most of the time, yeah.

Do you go to the Deaf club?

No, I've never been ever.

Do you cope well in the Deaf community with the people from the pub?

It's OK now. I still make mistakes, silly mistakes, but most of the time, yes. I get on alright. I'm still learning stuff, it's an ongoing process of improving your knowledge.

When you go the the pub or other Deaf things so you find it easy to switch from hearing to Deaf?

Well, I feel different because people who know what I do and my work know that, like, this is me and I'm kind of a part of the Deaf community in Bristol, or the University Deaf community in Bristol. It's not a problem shifting because I don't feel I have to, because I'm just being myself. Part of me now is that I sign as well, it's another skill, like speaking French, but you don't have to travel!

Obviously you use English more than BSL in everyday life.

Yeah.

Which do you feel more comfortable with?

Now, I'm really nervous when I meet a new person if they're full BSL. It's difficult and a bit scary because when they know I'm hearing I expect them to treat me differently, or I expect myself to perform better. But in the pub it's easy because some of the people there don't sign at all, so you can do "half and half". I prefer that to full BSL because it doesn't test my skills. I think I'm a bit rusty at full BSL.

When you go to the pub, do you feel it's different from your normal life? Like a taster of a different culture?

Only in terms of what people talk about. It's difficult to describe because… (pause)… When you go to the pub there's not much difference between Deaf and hearing people because everyone drinks and chats and talks about football or TV rah rah rah. But there's different ways of doing it between signing and speaking. It's slower with signing, not as noisy! But there are differences, cultural differences, like if you talk about what happened at work today – Deaf people would talk more about obstacles, a hearing person wouldn't have as many to overcome as perhaps a Deaf person might have.

There's not a huge difference. Everyone's chatting and drinking, it's just Deaf people's ways are different. It's easy to earwig on other people's conversations too!

So you feel it's normal life?

Yes.

Do you feel we're part of the wider pub group? Are there interactions between us and the other groups in the pub?

When you're standing there and people are trying to get through, yes! But I think everyone knows there's a Deaf group there, sometimes someone will come up and say, "Oh, you're signing, I think it's great!" But generally they'll know we're there but leave us alone. It's not a bad thing though, they're not ignoring us, it's all happy and friendly, like in the pub, that Scouse man – he knows you're all Deaf and he knows he can't communicate with you but he's happy enough to know you're there.

Do you feel we're part of the pub's culture?

Yeah, but so's everyone in the pub.

I think we've covered this, but in the group, do you think the culture is hearing, Deaf or mixed?

Really Deaf! Because the group is about a way of communication, it's based on sign language, so you have to say it's Deaf.

Do hearing people bring their culture as well?

Probably, yes, because they'll say things like, "It's loud in here," and want to leave, things like that that Deaf people wouldn't say. Like the TV will be on and the music will be playing and I might ask "What's that," if I can't remember the song. It's difficult to concentrate on signing when you can hear talking all the time!

Do you think there's a mixture then, even if it's more Deaf?

More deaf. Because if you're there, the reason you came is to sign, or you're Deaf aware. It really is a Deaf person's group but with some hearing people.

Do you think it's important to show Deaf culture, language, to educate people?

Well, I don't mind. It's the only pub I know apart from Bar Med where you get a big group of Deaf people who go to the pub, I've never been to groups like that before. I think it raises awareness just by being there. People can watch, they won't understand, but because you're there, people can say, "Oh, I went to the pub and there was a group of Deaf people there, it was so cool, they were all signing!" It's a way of broadening people's minds about what is normal.

Is it important to you personally to raise awareness like that?

For me, the importance is possibly less because it's not my own way of life. I was brought up with speech. But yes, it's important, it's a good thing.

In the group, who are the leaders, the strong characters? Are they Deaf or hearing or mixed?

People with strong BSL skills, possibly the "D" thing as well. There are hearing people who have "D" but are hearing themselves, and they are leaders. They come in and everyone's like "Oh!" Very easy to understand. But really there's a mixture. But you never really notice if people are Deaf or hearing.

Do you tell the difference between Deaf or hearing? Do you treat them the same, are you treated the same by them?

I try to treat them the same. But if you're having a conversation with someone and they ask "Are you Deaf or hearing?" and I say "Hearing", their signs will change. But if I was Deaf it would be easier to match their experience, what they've been through, but because I'm hearing I can't do that, or feel the same emotional connection to sign language as the Deaf community. But you get to a point where you should be accepted, regardless of whether you're Deaf or hearing. It's difficult to accept. But if it happens I'll just carry on.

It happens less now. You have to become a familiar face. If people know who you are it's easier. You can say you've proved yourself and people will accept you.

It doesn't really matter if you're Deaf or hearing, because if you're there, you can sign. If they're hearing you can be naughty and cheat and speak to them if they are new, so you can learn who they are and so on, then you can pass that information on to others easier.

When you first arrived, did you find it easy to fit in?

Yeah. I just told them I was in University doing Deaf Studies. That's what you do when you move to a new area.

Is the group open and accessible for both Deaf and hearing?

Yes but if you are hearing you have to be prepared to prove yourself, because the group doesn't belong to us, it's theirs. I have to prove myself because it's like a club, like a members only club, only I'm not a member, I'm a guest.

Skill in BSL is important?

Yes.

Can you relate to everyone there, hearing and Deaf?

Mostly hearing people, yeah. We're all in the same boat, most of us are students, we have the same worries, no money, have to do our own laundry and so on. So on that level, yes. But I can't match up on the decision to be "d" or "D" or to wear a hearing aid or not, or use BSL or be Oral. I can't understand that.

Do you mean normal everyday stuff you can relate, just less so on the Deaf issues things?

But I can say anything, I can talk about Deaf politics but my beliefs aren't worth as much as a Deaf person's in those areas.

Do you think the pub group is a good door into the Deaf community?

I've brought people who can't sign and don't know anything about the Deaf community and they were a bit frightened. It can be scary. I don't know. Personally, yes. It was good.

In the group, during term time when everyone's there, you can see smaller groups, like people who are learning, the people who want to talk about politics and stuff, yes.

It's a difficult first step into the Deaf community because it's not fully Deaf, there are some hearing people in there as well. But it's not a true representative of the Deaf community. It's still easier to fit in there than in the Deaf club.

Do you think it's a good mixture of hearing and Deaf people and cultures?

Yeah. When international students come it's good, you learn a bit of their culture and sign language as well. Yes, it's integrated. It depends who is there. In University term the students are all there, there are people outside the University too, so there's a range of experiences. Yes.

Communication, is it easy?

Yeah.

When a non-signer comes up to the group and you're asked to interpret, how do you feel about that? Are you comfortable, happy, put up with it or…?

Good question. It depends what that person wants. It's difficult, if for example [R] comes, then I end up interpreting and having my own conversation. If I was just interpreting, transferring information, it'd be fine, but because I want to be involved as well then someone will miss out. If we're having a laugh together then the others will be asking "What's the joke?" and the moment will be gone.

If someone asks me to I will definitely say yes, but when it's informal stuff I want to be involved in the conversation as well!

Does it feel like a job, or something you do for friends?

If we go out and someone comes up and you can't lipread them, then it's something I do naturally. It just happens. It's difficult because people speak so quickly!

But it's not interpreting, not officially. Your mate wants to know what's happening so you tell them! It's what you do.

In the University term, all the hearing who go are mostly girls and the Deaf are mostly blokes. Any idea why?

I think it's a planned thing! All the Deaf studies people are usually women. Always have been. I think it's because people say "Woah! There's loads of girls in the pub and they can all sign!"

Women in general are better communicators than men, so Deaf women probably mix better with hearing people than Deaf men do. And since women are better communicators, you'll get more women involved in Deaf stuff. So if all the Deaf girls are off in the hearing community then the Deaf men see their opportunity, so they come to the pub!

The pub is easy for Deaf men because everyone uses sign language. If they go for a drink with a bloke from work, neither of them can communicate properly anyway, so how can they through BSL and spoken English? Whereas women have more patience!

Is part of it the influence from the University?

Yeah, they go there to practice BSL, grammar, to have a drink and a chat.

How did you find out about the pub group?

Through word of mouth.

Why do you go to the pub?

It started off as a way to get involved with the Deaf community. Then to keep up with friends and to have fun!

APPENDIX 4. Example transcript with a Deaf informant (Herman).

How long have you been going to the pub?

Started in September. About one year ago.

Enjoyed it?

Oh yeah!

How would you describe yourself? "Big D" Deaf, "little d" deaf or?..

I'd say at the moment I'm "big D" Deaf. I grew up Deaf. I was signing up to about six,

then from six to about twenty I became oral. After twenty I came back to signing. I

always knew I wanted to sign, I felt comfortable, so I accept who I am as a Deaf person.

Did you go to mainstream school?

Yes. I went to [G] primary school, stayed there till I was seven, then moved to [N]

primary school, then I became strongly oral. I had no communication support. I had,

[JS], he came in once a month to check my work was OK.

Did you sign growing up with your parents?

My first language was sign.

Your parents sign?

They used Paige Gorman. Only basic signs like DRINK, EAT, simple, basic stuff for

domestic life. Not like BSL like me now, no.

**Do you feel you have a strong Deaf identity or do you feel a mixed Deaf/hearing
identity?**

In the past I was different but now I feel strongly I have a Deaf identity, involved in the

Deaf community. I feel strongly that that is who I am.

What about relationships with hearing family or friends?

I don't really relate well to my parents or my brother. Really through communication problems. Also they don't really know me. They don't understand what I'm going through. They think if I could talk I'd be happy in the future, that's the parent's dream. There's more to it than that.

So strong Deaf identity?

Yes.

Can you cope well in both the Deaf and hearing world, can you switch between the two? Or prefer one over the other?

I can cope well in hearing community but it depends on the situation. If I go to a pub or a café or somewhere where it's really noisy then I will struggle, have to ask "what?", "repeat", so I find it difficult. I say that now, but in the past when I focussed more on sound, lipreading, I could cope better. But now I use BSL I think I've become more lazy. Looking back, I'm not too bothered. I can shift between the two but it depends on the situation.

So do you feel confident with hearing people?

No. Before, I was confident, now less.

Are you confident in the Deaf community?

Now, yes. Because I'm more free to be who I am. I'm happier, I express better. So compared to the hearing community, if I want to say something, it's impossible, it doesn't work.

Obviously you prefer BSL to speech.

Yes.

But which do you use more in everyday life?

When I worked for [C], that was a hearing environment, I spoke more than I signed.
Now I work for a Deaf organisation, I sign more now than before. I'd say now I sign
more, about 70% sign to 30% speech. At home with my family I become the other way
round, 30% sign, 70% speech. It depends on the situation or where I am.

**When you go to the pub, Deaf and hearing mixed with everyone signing, do you feel
that's "normal life" for you, or is it a taste of a different culture in that
environment?**

Yeah, I see what you're trying to say. When I usually go to the pub I feel relieved,
relaxed, can sign, have a beer, chill out. You're free to switch off and chat. That's my
culture, I feel happy. If I'm at work and I can't sign then I'm fed up and down. So
you're relaxed, with friends. It's a different culture between work and family so yes, it's
different.

In the pub, where everyone's signing, is that something you want in the future?

Now yes, because when I moved to Bristol from [W], at first it was new and exciting, but
now I'm used to it. I can see other people all excited, I'm like, "huh, been there, done
that". I feel really connected to the group.

**In the pub with Deaf and hearing, do you feel the hearing people bring their own
culture with them? And Deaf bring their Deaf culture with them?**

For example, two months ago, when there were Deaf and hearing mixed, they each
brought their own cultures and interacted. But last week there were few hearing and it
was just Deaf in a small group, I enjoyed it more. I don't know why but I think it's
because we're all relaxed and signing fluently. Two months ago someone would ask

"what?" and you'd have to go back and repeat yourself and you'd lost focus on the ongoing conversation so… I don't mind hearing people but sometimes it's nice for them to go away, "you have your culture, I have mine, I want to be with Deaf". I can relax more with Deaf, that's it. I don't mean to discriminate, but that's me!

Do you feel our group is part of the wider pub? Do you see any interaction between our group and other groups?

No. We're very closed. We stick together. We don't interact, no.

In the group, is it more Deaf or hearing?

Depends on the people. Kind of half and half. I have both worlds, I can switch, can adjust myself to match. It can be hard work if you stay in one world. It's more fun, have a drink, speak to people, get confused, then go back to the Deaf! It's a laugh!

But usually a mixture?

Yeah. But sometimes just want to chill out and sign.

In the pub, people see a group all signing, is it important for you that a group like that might make people more aware of Deaf issues, culture and BSL?

Yes, it's important that hearing students want to learn sign, they can learn Deaf community, Deaf issues, Deaf language, it means that they'll have a better understanding of how to interpret things from BSL to English. They'll become richer in linguistic skill in the language.

Is it important to you to stand up and say "I'm Deaf, this is my culture!"

Yes. For a long time I didn't know who I am, I was stressed, worried I didn't know. After a long time I realised, that's my identity, I became more relaxed, the stress left me. So yes, it's important I show who I am. Not over the top though!

In the group, who are the leaders, the strong characters? More Deaf or hearing?

Don't know. Some hearing leaders, some Deaf leaders. It depends. If you enjoy it, want to play games… I was one leader recently, then [P] was a leader with drinking games, we take turns. It depends on your skills what leadership you have. If everyone looks up to you they'll follow you. But strong "D" Deaf leaders, no. I don't know. Really I tend to ignore it.

If someone tried to organise something would it matter if they were Deaf or hearing?

[T], he's got good leadership and he's hearing, he signs well. With the girls [L] is a good leader, she brings energy. With the boys we take turns. Every five minutes we switch around!

Do you differentiate between the Deaf and hearing in the pub? Prefer to talk to Deaf over hearing?

Yes. I will talk to the Deaf people first, then when I'm finished I will talk to the hearing people.

Why?

Because I know the Deaf from before. I know them well. Hearing students, I don't know them well. They're learning, I haven't got time to teach them. I want excitement, want to talk to the Deaf.

What about [P]? Met him before?

Yes, six years ago. I've met him, you, [I], [L], met them all. I'll chat to all of them first, catch up with the gossip, then move on and talk to the hearing students. But the Deaf

from Bristol, I don't know them well, I'll treat them the same as hearing people. So I'll meet with my close friends first and chat.

So are you dissing the hearing people or is it just because you don't know them well?

No, they're lovely. I treat hearing and Deaf the same if I don't know them. I'll chat with people I know first, if you haven't got gossip I won't talk to you either! Some hearing, if I'm in a good mood I'll talk to them. But usually a bit extra with the Deaf.

When you arrived in Bristol did you find it easy to fit in?

No, it's really hard to fit into the Deaf community in Bristol, especially the core Deaf community in the Deaf club. All the strong Deaf people, I feel they look down and think I'm cheeky. Two months ago [A] came up and started on me, so I challenged her. So now she accepts me. I feel I have to work and prove I follow their rules to get into their club. Why should I do that? I think it's because the older generation are so different to the younger generation. If I wanted to learn something important from the older group about Deaf community or culture, I'd use them, so I can pass on the information to the youth. It's an important part of my job, I have to be in the middle to pass on the information from older to younger.

Is it easier to fit into the pub group than the Deaf club?

Yes. Much easier. Think it's because the Deaf club has its own boundaries, so they feel secure. They see me as an outsider. [E] group are all outsiders from the Bristol Deaf community. We have some core members, but the Bristol Deaf club has had the same core members for years and it's very difficult to fit in, so the pub group is much more open and accepting. Big attitude difference between young and old generation.

Is it more easy for Deaf people to get in than hearing people?

Been seen a few Deaf arrive, I'm trying to put myself in their situation. Might be more difficult for them because if they'd arrived in October with everyone else then it'd be much easier. But I'd make an effort, I've seen a few new people in the Deaf club and there's no chance of them fitting in. I'd say both, it depends. The students are all in the same course and class, there's the Bristol Deaf youth group, you have the Welsh group, the Deaf DST, all mixed. But if you were alone, like [B], it's hard work for him to fit in. He'd need a lot of patience to come every week. People have come to respect him and accept him. We should be more accepting, but it's hard work, making new friends again. It depends if people have a strong character, if they'll stick with it.

What about [P], he came in at Christmas time, and fit in like that, really easy. But some hearing from Deaf studies, they come for one or two weeks and then disappear and never come again.

You need patience. I think it's the same in hearing clubs. If I go to a rugby club, Deaf or hearing, it's take a long time, maybe two or three months of training with the boys then you'll become part of the group. So I think generally they're all the same.

So if a Deaf person had been through the same experience as you, same education, family, life experience, would it make it easier for you to accept them?

Maybe, but a lot depends on character. [P] is a strong character, went to [X] school so he fits in because he's a party guy. Mainstream maybe harder, [B] for example, he's finding it difficult to fit in. So it depends on their background, yes.

Obviously BSL skills are important, if you can't sign, you can't fit in.

Yes. Have to have BSL skills. Without that, fat chance.

Do you feel the pub group provides a door into the Deaf community for ex-mainstream students?

Yes. That's why I encourage him (B) to go to signing class. Because the Deaf community is now declining we have to go fishing, catch the fish and say "welcome to the Deaf community!" So yes, it's a good door for isolated Deaf people. If you know where to come. That's the biggest problem, isolated Deaf people wouldn't know here to go. So need, for example, the internet (to advertise).

Why is it good? To practice BSL, learn culture things, make contacts?

It's a door for the person themselves to accept their Deafness. They realise they're not the only Deaf person in the world, others have the same problems as them. But again, there are oral deaf groups, so it depends. You need to want to learn BSL. So yes, it's a door to self acceptance.

Is the pub group a good mixture of Deaf and hearing cultures? Are both there?

Yes. Both there for sharing. We share experiences, share culture and languages. We learn from their culture and they learn from ours, so it's an exchange.

You know…. This is a bit off topic, but if you're in the pub and have a communication problem and need an interpreter, are there some people you will ask and some you won't?

Yes. I've been in the pub chatting and a hearing person has come up and I don't understand, I will ask a hearing person to use their interpretation skills. Some are reluctant, others are enthusiastic. Am I wrong to ask?

Some say "Ah, but it's my free time! Oh, OK." Others are more like "Yeah, of course!" How do you feel about that?

I'd prefer enthusiasm because I've given up my free time to teach them. If they can't be bothered then I'll say, "fine, I won't sign to you next time!" So it's like an exchange.

Some people are a bit suspicious of the interpreters because they think maybe they want power, or…

Some, yes, some.

I'm not asking for names or anything.

No, I won't. One or two student interpreters have that. Like for example, I was sitting somewhere, on my break. The interpreter said "OK, you ready? Come on now! Time to go downstairs!" I felt like, "Fuck off! Who do you think you are? You're there for an interpreting job and if I say no, you interpret that and say no, that's it! You're not controlling me, you're only, what the hearing people say you interpret and that's all!" Some interpreters don't understand that. So we have one or two students like that.

Do you think we're teaching them how to behave properly in the pub?

Yes. The students have a better attitude because they're more aware of your culture, they're more aware. That's what I think anyway.

Why do you think they want to be interpreters?

Money. Some are in it for money. Some really want to learn BSL. Some, very few, interpreters are in it to support the Deaf community. Not in a patronising way. Some are good signers, but then they get paid and go home. They're professional. But then the Deaf feel they're being used for money. So it's a can't win situation for the Deaf.

Why do you go to the pub?

To have fun, to sign, meet old friends. It's just a nice atmosphere, I enjoy it.

I found out about the pub from the 18+ group. I took them there to give them more integration into the hearing community, so they'd be more confident. The fact is, the world is hearing, not Deaf community, so we have to be part of the hearing community. Have to put up with it.

APPENDIX 5. Example of consent form signed by all interview informants.