

Deaf Studies Through the Eyes of Anthropology

Emily Skanes
emily_skanes@mymail.eku.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <http://encompass.eku.edu/swps>

Recommended Citation

Skanes, Emily, "Deaf Studies Through the Eyes of Anthropology" (2014). *University Presentation Showcase Event*. 10.
<http://encompass.eku.edu/swps/2014/2014/10>

This Poster is brought to you for free and open access by the Scholars Week at Encompass. It has been accepted for inclusion in University Presentation Showcase Event by an authorized administrator of Encompass. For more information, please contact Linda.Sizemore@eku.edu.

Deaf Studies Through the Eyes of Anthropology

By: Emily Skanes
Dr. Wies
Independent Study
Eastern Kentucky University

Abstract

For years, the Deaf community has struggled to achieve their language to be seen as a true language and to have empowerment. Research in anthropology has aided the community in this effort by answering questions like: Is Sign Language a real language, what is deaf culture, and how do deaf view their identity? The concepts discussed include: deaf community, culture, identity, membership, ethnicity, and deafness vs. Deafhood. This Literature analysis will identify the efforts previous studies have done and identify what questions still need to be addressed. This paper suggests that more ethnographic research should be conducted with the deaf culture.

Introduction

“Us verses Them” is the term that defines unity. The Deaf World is a community of people that united against the hearing world. Deaf people were seen as “lesser people” who are not equal to the Other. The difference between hearing and deaf is simply the ability to hear: audiology (Baynton 2010:33). Doctors diagnose people with *deaf or deafness*: a physical impairment, the inability to hear. The diagnosis soon became an identifiable disability which caused the divisiveness of difference to began.

Sign Language provides deaf people with a better way to communicate with one another. The start of the language was in France. Sign Language is a system of communication using visual gesture and signs. *Deaf or Deafhood* is defined as a positive value of identity and is the opposite of *deafness* (Ladd 2003). However, the Oralism Movement began in the 1860s and forced the Deaf people to learn how to read lips and speak. The Deaf people viewed Oralism as a way for hearing people to put the Deaf in a lower status of people. Through all of the struggles the Deaf community has stayed as one voice fighting for their right to speak their language freely. They wanted to be respected as a person and to be treated as one. This period of time strengthened the unity in the Deaf World.

This paper analyzes the Deaf culture and community. Previous scholars have examined anthropological approaches to the Deaf World, historical accounts to the Deaf culture, and Deaf community accounts. The goal of this paper is to determine what further ethnographic research about the Deaf World needs to be examined. To that end, this paper provides a full understanding of the Deaf community. This paper is divided up into four sections to meet its goals. The sections discuss the history of the community, the previous scholars' work, suggestions to further study the community, and conclusions.

History

The Deaf community has shown their independence and presence throughout history. The history of the Deaf and its community is prevalent in all cultures from the beginning of time. The Deaf community has experienced a wave of moments in history where they were appreciated, hated and called dumb, required medical attention, and seen as equal to others. This section will discuss how the view of the Deaf has changed through time. Also, it will discuss how the Deaf culture changed from one era to the next.

Beginnings-France

Deaf people were viewed as people without intellect or incapable of completing certain tasks; this view dates back to c. 364 B.C. to Aristotle and Ancient Greeks. The Greeks denied the Deaf education (Edwards 1997). St. Augustine stated that faith comes by hearing and therefore deaf people are incapable of redemption. In the 1500s, the first appearance of a sign language began (Lane 2010). However, the "deaf are dumb" or "deaf and dumb" thought was still prevalent in all societies (Ostrove and Oliva 2010). In 1690, immigrants, who were deaf or carried the gene, came to the United States and started a deaf settlement at Martha's Vineyard (Ladd 2003). The French established the first French

Sign in 1760 and the first free school for the deaf with sign language as communication, which started to change views on deafness (Bauman and Drake 1997; Lane 2010).

Paris was the first city to establish a school to educate deaf people using a language that suited the situation. Other deaf schools were established in different countries, however these were oral-based and the French sought an alternative (Atherton, Russell, and Turner 2001). The French school was established in 1760, at the same time, as the French Sign. The model of this school spread across Europe, which created thirty-three schools within a hundred years. The majority of other sign languages stem from the French.

When we approach deaf cultural studies using an anthropological lens, the idea of a universal sign language is untrue. There are more than fifty native sign languages around the world (Sacks 1990). The French community was the first to see the deaf people as “Deaf and Proud”. This is why all international conferences that occur today are held in Paris, France. Equality for Deaf people in society, however, did not spread as quickly (Ladd 2003).

Oralism Movement

The Oralism Movement was credited to start in Germany with Samuel Heinicke’s concept of a deaf school. He established an oral school for the deaf in 1755. He also promoted Oralism, a method of teaching the deaf to speak using lip-reading (Atherton, Russell, and Turner 2001). The American School for the Deaf opened in 1817 in Hartford, Connecticut. In 1864, the Columbia Institution for the Instruction of the Deaf and Dumb was founded (Patterson 2010:144). Today, this institution is known as Gallaudet University. Alexander Graham Bell is also a person that is credited with Oralism. He promoted deaf education and helped open a school in 1872. The World Congress of the Educators of the Deaf met in Italy in 1880 and passed the Oralism concept to all schools,

which dismissed all deaf teachers and gave jobs to hearing instructors (Lane 2010). In the same year the American National Association for the Deaf was established. The Oralists believed that the deaf could learn to lead a “normal” hearing and speaking life (Baynton 1996). This movement was helped by the invention of the electrical hearing aid in 1892. For years, the American Sign Language was viewed as just a gesture communication and not its own language. People viewed it as English gestures, since there were signs for each concept in English (Kendon 1997; LeMaster and Monaghan 2007). In 1960, William Stokoe wrote the first linguistic book and defended American Sign Language. Previously, Deaf people were discriminated against which made them have low self-esteem: “deaf” identity. However, the empowerment movement changed this identity to “Deaf” identity; the identity that one sees themselves as a proud and strong Deaf person.

Identity Movement (Empowerment)

Deaf empowerment increased after William Stokoe published the first linguistic book in the 1960s. His book titled *Introduction to the Dictionary of American Sign Language* (1976) also helped this movement. Deaf people have fought for their identity since the beginning. However, there was a revelation for Hearing and Deaf in the 1970s with the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 and the Education of All Handicapped Children Act of 1975 (Munoz-Baell and Ruiz 2000). The Rehabilitation Act of 1973 provides services for people with severe disabilities and requires people to treat individuals with disabilities with respect. Education of All Handicapped Children Act of 1975 established the right of children with disabilities to a free public education and provides assistance to the state with the new education requirements. After all the hardships, the Deaf community was finally viewed as individuals and equal to hearing people. The Deaf community fought with

the U.S. government for American Sign Language, ASL, to be seen as a language. The government was not convinced that ASL had the qualifications to be considered as a language.

ASL consists of signs that combines hand gestures, facial expressions, and postures of the body. The Deaf community had to explain that ASL consists of its own pronunciation, word order, and grammar structure. These are the fundamental features of a language (Stokoe 1976; Stewart and Akamatsu 1988; Valli and Lucas 1995; Senghas and Monghan 2002). These articles discuss ASL and some use methods through linguistic anthropology. If ASL was considered a language then the government would have to provide assistance for disabled people in businesses. This struggle compares to other struggles that are developed because of a language barrier. For example, Hispanic women did not get assistance in domestic violence centers because they did not have materials in Spanish. The empowerment movement established ASL as its own language. Finally, in 1990 the Americans with Disabilities Act was passed (Mori 2010). This was another act that provided empowerment for the Deaf community. Identity for Deaf people is one of the most important aspects of their character and culture (Munoz-Baell and Ruiz 2000). This movement made the Hearing community realize that the Deaf community is not so different from them.

Gallaudet University was a powerhouse for this movement. Gallaudet had never had a Deaf president and in 1988, the Deaf President Now campaign started. Students rallied for a new president. They thought there should be one since this was the “Deaf” university. The hearing president was not seen as a full member in the Deaf society. Therefore the policies and decisions that were made, the Deaf people did not agree with. This compares

to the feminist anthropology struggle to have a voice in literature and research that was their own. Also, many Deaf people looked to Gallaudet for leadership in this movement. The Deaf questioned the leadership at Gallaudet, for example, how can Gallaudet lead this Identity Movement with a hearing president that does not understand the oppression? In the end, the president agreed and stepped down from office. This allowed Gallaudet to finally appoint the first Deaf president for a University (Patterson 2010). A Deaf president allowed Gallaudet to regain the public's favor in decisions and policymaking. Gallaudet aided the community in the fight for identity.

Alliance

The Deaf and Hearing communities' team up to support each other to further efforts of equality. The hearing allies of the Deaf community are usually people that grew up with family or friends that were Deaf. Also, allies are people that have been exposed to sign language at some point in their life. This relationship was established to aid the Deaf in their efforts to achieve equality in all situations: such as equal opportunities in employment and education. The aid of the alliance has provided support, comfort, care in every step of the empowerment movement (Ostrove and Oliva 2010, Patterson 2010, O'Toole 2010).

Ostrove and Oliva explain this relationship in their article: *Identifying Allies: Exploring of Deaf-Hearing Relationship* 2010. They define alliance in the aspect of disability and non-disability people. It is a support system. Allies are people who stand up against the disability oppression and a respectful relationship in a diverse work place (Ostrove and Oliva 2010:105-106). These authors wanted to understand the relationship between Deaf, Hard-of-Hearing, and Hearing people through the concepts of social contexts of identity, communication, and mutual respect. To understand this Ostrove and Oliva had to look at

the context of Audism. Audism is the systematic discrimination of individuals based on ability to hear. In other words, hearing people see themselves as superior to the deaf and hard-of-hearing because of the ability to hear (Ostrove and Oliva 2010:106). The authors conducted a study of two groups; one group was made up of Deaf women from Deaf families and the other group made up of deaf women from hearing families. They asked what each had experienced in relationships with hearing people. Ostrove and Oliva found that people wanted a true alliance relationship were both sides knew what each was responsible for in the relationship and that there is respect from both sides. Also, a key importance in a relationship was good communication and understanding (Mori 2010).

Patterson (2010) looked at the unlikelihood of the cross-identity alliance with Deaf and Hearing people. She started the article with the history of Gallaudet University and its alliance movement on campus. Patterson studied Gallaudet at the beginning of its establishment. She agrees with Ostrove and Oliva with the definition of an alliance relationship. Patterson, however, looks at the alliance through the work place. She looked at the history of faculty relationships at Gallaudet. Patterson discusses these relationships that occurred during the feminist movement. Hearing and deaf male individuals were comfortable with each other; however, there was some hostility with women faculty members (Patterson 2010:151). The unlikely alliance that Patterson was studying was of Deaf and Hearing women to achieve higher education and employment equalities. However, once this was achieved the relationship seemed to fade (Patterson 2010:155). Patterson's article focused on an alliance, a type of relationship, but agrees with Ostrove and Oliva.

O'Toole (2012) looked at one relationship between a Deaf man, Dale, and a disabled woman, Judy. It explained how they became allies for the inclusion of deaf people and deaf issues at the first Center of Independent Living in Berkley, California. This article focused on advocacy work that highlights both personal collaboration between deaf and disabled people and impacts on disability advocacy (O'Toole 2010:162). O'Toole agrees with Ostrove and Oliva in their alliance relationship. He takes the model and applies it to one friendship. The alliance aided equality and respect in the community. Both people helped each other in this fight. The center was for disabled people to live, however, they did not have deaf people there. Therefore, Judy and Dale fought for welcoming deaf people into the living community. They argued that Deaf people have rights to live there as well as other disabled people (O'Toole 2010:169). This relationship was a perfect example of Ostrove and Oliva's alliance relationship model and how cross-identity individuals can work together in the same work place as Patterson suggested.

Anthropology works

Previous works in the field of Deaf Studies have recorded many aspects of the community and language. This field of study is a multi-disciplinary one, which includes of Anthropology, Linguistics, History, and Sociology. Previous works have looked at the history of the Deaf, the school settings that deaf people interact with, the language they use, the community they built, and the international community that is found in unity. Each area is defined in its own way provided by several studies. Several works have also looked at a couple of areas within the same study.

History of ASL and Deaf Community

Several previous works have looked at the history of the Deaf community and American Sign Language. These works look at one particular time in the Deaf communities history or the whole span of it. The history of this community dates back to before Christ. This section explains the definition of a sign language. Previous works explore the oppression of Deaf people, the impact that Oralism had on education, and how Empowerment changed the Deaf identity (Stewart and Akamatsu 1988; Atherton, Russell, and Turner 2001). The history of the Deaf is a global, which is discussed in the same articles as well as others.

Stewart and Akamatsu (1988) explore the oppression, perseverance, and liberation of ASL in the education system. This article explains the definition of sign language as a form of communication using hands, fingers, body, and facial expressions to transmit linguistic information (Stewart and Akamatsu 1988:236). Stewart and Akamatsu discuss Oralism and its effects of education (Atherton, Russell, and Turner 2001), and how the Identity Movement was shaped with aid from linguists and social anthropologists (Stokoe 1976; Stewart and Akamatsu 1988; Valli and Lucas 1995; Senghas and Monghan 2002). This promoted ASL and proved that it is a language. People fought for ASL to be once again established in schools. The Total Communication program (Nash 1976), the idea to communicate with deaf children in any means necessary, was established. People communicated by speech, lip-reading, writing, printing, gestures, or signs. Legislation was also being established at this time. It gave an understanding of where ASL came from and where it will go in the future. This article was written in 1988 and since then there have been studies conducted to answer some of the questions this article leaves.

The history of the Deaf is also described in Atherton, Russell, and Turner (2001). They researched the history of the Deaf in Britain's Deaf community. The history of the Deaf for resourcing lacks in primary source materials because their native language is sign language and not spoken and written English. This does not mean that there is no history for the Deaf (Bauman and Drake 1997), it is past down through sign: a form of oral history (Atherton, Russell, and Turner 2001). An example of oral history of the Deaf history is the football game at the University of Central Lancashire's *Deaf United* program. Interviewers recalled the oral stories that they were told about the match (Atherton, Russell, and Turner 2001:39). However, there still are publications of Deaf history by Deaf individuals or allies. This article also discussed the strategies that were developed to overcome the communication barrier between the deaf people and hearing reporters (Bauman and Drake 1997). The article highlights the importance of the Deaf perspective in their history as well as the importance of the Deaf community. Deaf people desire to be treated as human beings with respect, which is the final highlight of this article. Overall, this article gave an insight to the history of the Deaf community in Britain.

School Setting

A popular area of study in Deaf Studies is the school setting. The Deaf community is intermixed with hearing people; however, the Deaf also have schools that are strictly for the Deaf. Previous studies have looked at how Deaf children learn in school (Ramsey and Padden 1998), how the Deaf are taught English (Mayer and Moskos 1998; Silvestre 2009), how Deaf children interact with hearing (Erting 1985; Keating and Mirus 2003), and how policies are placed into schools to accommodate the Deaf (Nash 1976). Learning a new

concept entails frustrations and conflicts between individuals. Education is important part of life for the Deaf as it is for hearing people. Most of these works are focused on one specific aspect of the school setting.

Nash (1976) examines deaf education policy through a sociolinguistic lens. This article looks at how hearing people, whether parents or teachers, approach education of deaf children. Nash suggests formulating policy for the education of deaf children. He looks into the current development in policy and how can this be changed to better the deaf children. The current education policy is special education. This includes state-supported residential schools and special programs in public schools (Nash 1976:350). These programs provided the use of visual systems of communication, like signed English (Stewart and Akamatsu 1988). Research has showed that ASL is in fact a language, however, the application into school use of it has not taken place. This shows the meaning of deafness in policy. The acceptance of sign language means that it is not just gestures, however to withhold from acceptance entails judgment and beliefs that hearing and deaf people have about one another. The Oralist policy was also discussed in this article. Establishing ASL as a language made this policy fall out of effect. Nash wanted to express that policies in education have changed and still need improvement. This article looked at different point of views, however, it came down to respect and no judgment on both sides: deaf and hearing. Deafness is a social phenomenon that people perceive in different ways.

Erting (1985) describes cultural conflict between hearing educators and deaf parents in a school for deaf children. The study looked at interactions between mothers and their preschool-aged deaf children. Parents and teachers are encouraged to use any and every means of communicating to achieve understanding (Erting 1985:228; Nash

1976). The school's policy requires all children to wear some kind of hearing aid. They want to see the children develop auditory and speech skills. The school teaches the children Signed English (Nash 1976), which is an invented language to teach children to learn articles, prefixes and suffixes used in English. Deaf parents view this negatively because there is an existing sign in ASL for the words (Erting 1985:229). The parent program is designed to educate hearing and deaf parents about deafness and provide emotional support. The deafness of a child challenges the hearing parent and their identity. The identity of the parent changes to a parent with a deaf and disabled child. This identity brings frustration to parents because they now have to learn how to teach the child through a different process. Deaf parents expect their child to be deaf, but this does not occur all the time. Deaf parents are challenged when they have a hearing child. The parent program is to help in this challenge and have the participants provide each other with advice. Erting also addresses the hearing educators. The educators view on deafness is hearing-impaired or handicapped. Deaf parents view differently from hearing parents and educators (Patterson 2010; O'Toole 2012). They do not see their deafness as an inability to do something; they see their children as capable of anything. Erting provides the insight on how each person views things differently. Erting focused on one school that provides education for deaf children. Erting's work as provided Anthropology and Deaf Studies insight into education of preschoolers.

There are three articles that discuss the language comprehension of Deaf children in the school systems. These studies explain the process deaf children develop to process learning to spell (Mayer and Mosko 1998), the relationship between drawing and oral

language (Silvestre 2009), and literacy in the classroom (Ramsey and Padden 1998). First, Mayer and Moskos focused on writing language development of deaf and hearing children ages five through nine. They divided the experiment into stages. The first was both hearing and deaf students strung together letters to create text and it served as a label for a picture (Mayer and Moskos 1998:163). In the next stage the students started to see a relationship between their language and print. At the end of grade one, most were in a transition stage. The students began to read and their spelling improved (Mayer and Moskos 1998:164). Second, Silvestre takes a sample of 100 deaf and hearing children ages three to five and tests them with the Goodenough's Human Figure Drawing Test and the WPPSI Scale of Intelligence geometric design. The scores on the human figure were 9.72 average for the hearing group and 8.42 for the deaf group. The scores on the geometric drawing was 9.34 out of a possible 19 for the deaf group with a standard deviation of 3.003, however, there is no significant difference between the deaf and hearing participants. However, the degree of hearing loss is a factor in the complexity of drawing a human figure. The deaf children's oral language level seemed to relate to the drawing (Silvestre 2009:11). Third, Ramsey and Padden compared native and newcomers to sign language in the classroom. They explain that native signers are ones who learn ASL from infancy and that newcomers are those who begin signing later. This article describes a residential classroom for third graders. They look at the literacy of the children and growth in their ability. The authors viewed the complex set of practices on both group and individual level. The native signers performed well in the classroom by participating in discussions and understanding material. The newcomers were slow to participate since they were still learning the language. All articles look at the development language in young children and how they comprehend

information given to them. The authors agree that hearing children learn differently than deaf children. Also, the way children learn to read and write is different from learning to comprehend a language or to spell. Literacy is very important in understand and studying children in the classroom. Each child processes information differently than the next and the schools must develop teaching strategies to accommodate these differences.

Keating and Mirus (2003) examined the interaction of Deaf children and hearing children at school. They express the strategies that the deaf children have developed to communicate to their hearing peers and teachers. There were many challenges that were presented in the classroom. Deaf children are provided interpreting and special tutoring. The isolation that deaf children experience is seen when the children step out of the classroom (Keating and Mirus 2003:116-117). Keating and Mirus focused on two aspects of communicative practices: the organization of participation in a conversation, and the use of symbolic resources in conversation. To communicate the users must produce a message that is understood by the listener to respond feedback. The interactions of deaf and hearing students occur in the lunchroom, however, it results in low frequency conversational interactions (Keating and Mirus 2003:119). The interactions were limited in the complexity of the language used. The most successful types of interactions were the nonlinguistic ones. This study showed that the deaf children used a limited amount of signs and gestures to communicate to their hearing peers although they were learning sign language. Keating and Mirus conclude that if schools think that deaf children are learning through their interactions with hearing peers, the children are not learning to their fullest potential and this idea needs to be revised. The authors provide a great explanation in their observations

on how deaf children understand the material to participate in the classroom. This article provides an understanding of how deaf and hearing students in a mainstream school interact with one another.

Language (ASL)

Language is another aspect of the Deaf community that has witnessed scholarly attention. The language is studied through a linguistic framework. The language of the Deaf community is very interesting. The Deaf people had to fight for the language to be seen as an official language. The accents of the United States are similar to the different signs ASL has in each region of the country. There are several sign languages around the world. Many are native sign languages to that specific country or community. However, the majority of the previous works have looked at ASL. The international languages are looked at within that culture and community, which is discussed in the next section.

Meier (1991) discussed language acquisition by Deaf children. He explains the differences in native and later signers. Meier expresses that the linguistic environment a child grows up in has an impact on the language development. For a spoken language children pass a series of milestones at particular ages (Meier 1991:63). For example, by twelve months, a speaking child is at a one-word stage as well as a signing child. By eighteen to twenty-four months, the signing child enters the two-word stage. Therefore, they began to form simple sentences (Meier 1991:64). Learning a language is hard as one ages, however babies can comprehend and develop language quickly. Meier looks at the Lenneberg hypothesis on late learners. The hypothesis explains that children can gain a native speaker's competence only if they are exposed to the linguistics at a critical period (Meier 1991:65). The best way to learn a language is to immerse oneself in it. If a person is

not speaking a language all the time, it takes longer to develop it. Meier concludes that the Deaf language provides an opportunity to investigate a child's ability to acquire and create language. This article provides an insight to linguistics through the eyes of children. This is an interesting way to understand how people create language and comprehend it. Meier's approach to comparing signed and spoken languages provides a more complete understanding of linguistics.

Kendon (1997) looked at gestures and how they are different across cultures. He first explains that the word *gesture* refers to a movement of the body or of a part that is expressing thought or feeling. An example is the "thumbs up" refers to a good job, approval, or shows understanding. He also explains that sign languages can be seen as gestures to understand and communicate. Gestures and speech are related to each other in communicating a single concept (Kendon 1997:110-111). Kendon also looked at why people use gestures. He found that the gestures were to further express what was being said. For example if someone is giving directions, they might use gesture to provide a more visual concept. Cultural differences can be seen in language differences, culture values and communication ecology, and conventionalization in gestures. Kendon explains that gesture systems are different from sign languages. Gesture systems express an indirect relationship with spoken language (Kendon 1997:122). Kendon provides anthropology with a look at gestures and how languages use these to fully explain the concept. This article also helped explain that sign language should be seen as a true language because it consists of all the characteristics of one. The characteristics of a language are pronunciation, word order, and grammar structure. Kendon and others are reviewed in Senghan and Monaghan (2013).

Senghas and Monaghan (2013) observed the Deaf community and the culture of language. This article reviewed anthropological studies of the Deaf community and suggest theoretical avenues to pursue. The authors explain the linguistics of sign language in great detail. Natural sign languages are complex, grammatical systems with all other aspects for a language. Artificial sign language is created as tools to teach the deaf individuals spoken languages. An example is Signed Exact English (SEE). Fingerspelling is a language system that reflects written alphabets in sign and maybe signed with one or two hands. Gesture is communicative (Kendon 1997) and is seen in Home-sign systems. Home-sign systems are created to communicate from parent to child at the home. These systems are basic and easy to comprehend on either side. Contact signing is the concept that the language varies in geographical area and it depends on if hearing people are present or not (Senghas and Monaghan 2013:74-75). Linguistic communities are a group of people that communicate with each other using language. This is important to note because the Deaf community is one of these linguistic communities that communicate using one language. This article discusses the language ideologies and linguistic ideologies and how these looked at ASL as a language or not. This article ends with explaining what still needs to be done. There have been several ethnographic studies in the United States and Europe; therefore the need is elsewhere. Also, they suggest that there needs to be more team studies conducted.

Community

Community is the last aspect of Deaf Studies. This is one of the most important aspects because it establishes unity among the Deaf. Many Deaf usually do not associate with people outside the community. If they do it is usually only through the work place. The Deaf community is a strong, supportive, and tightknit community. The Deaf rely on one

another heavily. The community holds social gatherings at specific times of the week or month to allow for close friendships build and to establish time for Deaf people to gather without hearing people interfering. However, they do allow hearing people into the community as allies. Most of the allies either have a close friend who is Deaf or have Deaf parents. All these were looked at in previous works as well as in international communities.

Friedner (2010) studied the identity of Deaf women in New Delhi, India. This study looked at transnational identity, which is not only important to Deaf communities but also Deaf culture (Friedner 2010:48). She collected qualitative data of the Deaf women's organization, the nationwide conference (Dehlia Foundation of Deaf Women), and visited Deaf women and their families in New Delhi. Friedner analyzed how the women identified in the public space and domestic space. In the public space, there was an importance on teaching students to become mentors and teachers, however, there was a more important emphasis on rehabilitation function. This function was to promote Deaf awareness and host events to attract more people to the DFDW. These women focused on empowerment that moved identity and pride across India. The domestic space consisted of families, religions, and homes. The women contained several identities: wife, mother, daughter-in-law, sister, and Deaf teacher. The Deaf identity was also highlighted in the domestic space. These women explained that the communities of Deaf women made them become proud of who they are and how they identify themselves whether through family heritage, place of origin, religion, or gender. This study is important to Deaf Studies because it looks at a Deaf community in a specific culture and how they identify themselves in all aspects of life. Friedner explained the importance of empowerment for women gave light to how other

cultures look at Deaf people and community. This article aided the studies in community and empowerment.

Fjord (2010) compared the Danish society and culture with the United States Society. He addressed how the deaf communicate in both and how the technology is different. Fjord conducted two studies, one in Denmark and one in the USA. After anthropological research, Fjord noticed a difference in the societies related to linguistics and technologies that address deafness to disablement (2010:68). Education policies for minority groups were expressed in both nations. The comparative fieldwork analyzed the communities and how the Deaf people in each nation were able to communicate. He found that in Denmark and Norway learning sign language by deaf children and hearing parents is no longer needed with the pediatric cochlear implants. However, in America, the hearing prize the learning of ASL and teach their infants to sign. Hearing parents can communicate with their babies to understand what the child wants. Previously, both societies experienced a frustration with kin that were hearing and not native to sign language. Language and communication is passed down from parents to children. Therefore, if the child cannot speak their parents' language there is a disconnection. Fjord referred to Baynton when he discusses the discrimination of the Deaf as disabled people. Fjord's article gave a good historical background to both nations. He discussed the similarities and differences among the two well. His article aided the Deaf Studies research in several areas: culture, community, linguistics, and history.

Lee (2010) studied the Deaf people in Tanzania. The article first explained that there is an organization in Tanzania called Unity and Development of Deaf of Tanzania. She explained her experience meeting the women for the first time: how they were shocked

that she was conducting a study strictly on Deaf people of Tanzania and not disabled people. This explains a different view that the Tanzania women have. They see that they are equal and united in the fight of oppression. There is no difference in someone who is blind and someone who is deaf. This study was an ethnographic study about community and identity. She expresses that being deaf in Tanzania can mean several things: to be blind, to be generally disabled, to be deaf who speaks, or to be deaf who does not speak (Lee 2010:225). If a person is deaf and cannot speak they are *Bubu* (deaf-mute). This is an offensive term and the deaf Tanzanians argue that they communicate all the time through sign, which is equivalent to speech. She discovered that there are several dialects in Tanzania of the Tanzanian Sign Language and there are home-sign systems. Her goal was to understand and explain their world through an insider's point of view. In the end, she completed her goal. Lee concluded that identity, alliances, and communities were important to the Tanzania culture of the deaf. As a unified people, they could stop the oppression. This article provides good insight into Deaf communities and its unity. Lee's research shows that no matter where one is in the world the community and ideas can still be prevalent and similar as ones own. Lee would agree with Fjord and Friedner when they discuss community and unity. All three articles are good examples of the Deaf community globally.

What has to be done?

The previous works have looked at several areas in Deaf Studies. These areas are detailed above in the history of the Deaf, the school settings, the language, and the community. Each previous work has highlighted specific aspects of Deaf studies to

understand it more fully. However, there still are specific points that need to be addressed. After reviewing all the previous works, I have found three important areas that need further research: study across cultures, international communities and specifically cultures, and the adult education of the Deaf.

First, work needs to be furthered in the area of the cross-cultures. The previous works have looked at how deaf children interact with hearing children in the classroom and diversity in the work place. Also, previous work has looked at some cross-cultures in other countries. However, to understand more about the culture and how people interact with others, there should be more studies. Through these studies, there can be workshops to develop team bonding and respectfulness in the workplace. Children interactions in the classroom are a topic that has been studied. These studies have found that the interactions outside the class occur less or have little communication. Therefore, I suggest further studies in this particular area of how deaf children interact with their counterparts in different situations besides the classroom. This is not the only area that needs to be worked in.

Second, international studies needs further work. The previous work has looked at deaf culture in America, Britain, France, and other parts of the world. These works look at a specific culture and its community. Some studies look at how the culture and the hearing culture of that area interact with each other. However, there is still a need to understand other deaf cultures around the world. Each deaf culture and community has a unique language system that they communicate with. No one sign language is the same. This is a reason why more studies need to be conducted. The international studies were the reason why anthropology started. Anthropologists want to understand how and why people do

what they do and traveling to see other ways of life is how anthropologists achieved this. This desire to understand people is still a desire today as it was in the beginning. Deaf Studies would be furthered through more studies conducted within other cultures.

Finally, through my research I was unable to find many studies addressing adult education of the deaf. Previous studies have looked at policies and interaction in the workplace, but not in colleges or other venues of education. I believe that this is also an important area of study that should be looked into. Gallaudet University and National Technology Institution of the Deaf are the two universities for the Deaf in the United States. There have been studies conducted on these campuses; however, some choose to go to another university. The mainstreaming at a university is the same as mainstreaming in public schools (Erting 1985; Mayer and Moskos 1998; Keating and Mirus 2003). This would show similar interaction with deaf and hearing students in the course as well as the interpreter and instructor. If adult education in Deaf Studies was looked at, it would further the understanding that anthropologists have on the Deaf culture.

Conclusion

Deaf Studies consist of multi-disciplinary research. The research looks at Deaf Studies in all aspects by using the multiple fields of study. The ability to study a subject in multiple venues provides a good overall understanding of it. This also makes Deaf Studies unique by having multiple disciplines research the Deaf culture and community. The different disciplines use their specific study to record all parts of the society. The research is broad but strengthens the recorded information.

Many in multiple disciplines have researched the Deaf culture and community. These studies have researched education, community, international studies, history of the Deaf, and linguistics. The education of the Deaf community was researched by understanding how deaf children learned to spell, how they interacted in the classroom, and policies to mainstream students. Community was researched on how the Deaf view community and in other cultures around the world. Linguistics of the Deaf consist of how the language was formed and what it contains. The previous studies began in the 1920s at the time of the Oralist Movement and the Empowerment Movement. The Deaf culture is still an important culture to observe and record. The Deaf culture has changed through time like other cultures. This makes it important to review previous works and conduct new ones to see what has changed.

After reviewing previous studies conducted on the Deaf culture and community, I found several areas that need further work in. Cross-culture interactions still need to be observed because cultures change which make behaviors of individuals change. International studies need observing because each sign language is unique and the societies are different than ones own. Finally, adult education has only been recorded a few times and education changes with culture. Therefore, it needs to be studied more. To understand the Deaf culture more, I believe that further work in these areas need to be conducted. The Deaf culture, like other cultures, changes with time and so the information recorded about the culture needs to be kept up to date. More studies are always good to understand a society, especially if it is studied by multiple disciplines. Each society is unique and to understand that people are not so different from one another, more studies are needed to compare them. Further work is needed in all subjects.

Reference:

- Atherton, Martin, Dave Russell, and Graham Turner
2001 Looking to the Past: The Role of Oral History Research in Recording the Visual History of Britain's Deaf Community. *Oral History* 29(2):35-47.
- Bagga-Gupta, Sangeeta
2010 Creating and (Re)negotiating Boundaries: Representations as Mediation in Visually Oriented Multilingual Swedish School Settings. *Language, Culture, and Curriculum* 23(3):251-276.
- Bauman, H. Dirksen L. and Jennifer Drake
1997 Silence Is Not Without Voice. *In The Disability Studies Reader*. Lennard J. Davis, ed. Pp. 307-311. London: Routledge.
- Bauman, H. Dirksen L.
1997 Toward a Poetics of Vision, Space, and the Body. *In The Disability Studies Reader*. Lennard J. Davis, ed. Pp. 315-331. London: Routledge.
- Baynton, Douglas
1996 *Forbidden Sign*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- 2010 A Silent Exile on this Earth. *In The Disability Studies Reader*. Lennard J. Davis, ed. Pp. 33-51. London: Routledge.
- Brueggemann, Brenda Jo
2010 The Tango: Or, What Deaf Studies and Disability Studies Do-Do. *In Deaf and Disability Studies: Interdisciplinary Perspectives*. Susan Burch and Alison Kafer, eds. Pp. 245-265. Washington, D.C.: Gallaudet University Press.
- Davis, Lennard J.
1997 Universalizing Marginality. *In The Disability Studies Reader*. Lennard J. Davis, ed. Pp. 110-127. London: Routledge.

- De Clerck Goedele A. M.
2010 Deaf Epistemologies as a Critique and Alternative to the Practice of Science: An Anthropological Perspective. *American Annals of the Deaf* 154(5): 435-446.
- Dennis, Philip A.
2005 Anthropology 1301: Understanding Multicultural America. *College Teaching* 53(2): 65-70.
- Edwards, Margert A.
1997 Deaf and Dumb in Ancient Greece. *In The Disability Studies Reader*. Lennard J. Davis, ed. Pp. 29-51. London: Routledge.
- Edwards, R. A. R.
2010 "Hearing Aids Are Not Deaf": A Historical Perspective on Technology in the Deaf World. *In The Disability Studies Reader*. Lennard J. Davis, ed. Pp. 403-416. London: Routledge.
- Erting, Carol J.
1985 Cultural Conflict in a School for Deaf Children. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly* 16(3):225-243.
- Friedner, Michele
2010 Focus on Which (Deaf) Space? Identity and Belonging among Deaf Women in New Delhi, India. *In Deaf and Disability Studies: Interdisciplinary Perspectives*. Susan Burch and Alison Kafer, eds. Pp. 48-66. Washington, D.C.: Gallaudet University Press.
- Fjord, Lakahmi
2010 Contested Signs: Deaf Children, Indigeneity, and Disablement in Denmark and the United States. *In Deaf and Disability Studies: Interdisciplinary Perspectives*. Susan Burch and Alison Kafer, eds. Pp. 67-100. Washington, D.C.: Gallaudet University Press.
- Johnson, Ginger A., Anne E. Pfister, and Cecilia Vindrola-Padros
2012 Drawings, Photos, and Performances: Using Visual Methods with Children. *Visual Anthropology Review* 28(2): 164-178.
- Keating, Elizabeth and Gene Mirus
2003 Examining Interactions across Language Modalities: Deaf Children and Hearing Peers at School. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly* 34(2):115-135.
- Kendon, Adam
1997 Gesture. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 26:109-128.
- Ladd, Paddy
2003 *Understanding Deaf Culture: In Search of Deafhood*. Clevedon: Cromwell Press
- Lane, Harlan

2010 Construction of Deafness. *In* The Disability Studies Reader. Lennard J. Davis, ed. Pp. 77-93. London: Routledge.

Lee, Jessica

2010 "What Not to Pack": Conducting Research among Deaf People in Tanzania. *In* Deaf and Disability Studies: Interdisciplinary Perspectives. Susan Burch and Alison Kafer, eds. Pp. 222-234. Washington, D.C.: Gallaudet University Press.

LeMaster, Barbara and Leila Monaghan

2007 Variation in Sign Languages. *In* A Cultural Approach Interpersonal Communication: Essential Readings. Leila Monaghan and Jane E. Goodman, eds. Pp. 416-420. Malden: Blackwell Publishing.

Mayer, Connie and Evie Moskos

1998 Deaf Children Learning to Spell. *Research in the Teaching of English* 33(2):158-180.

Mejer, Richard P.

1991 Language Acquisition by Deaf Children. *American Scientist* 79(1):60-70.

Monaghan, Leila

2007 The Founding of Two Deaf Churches: The Interplay of Deaf and Christian Identities. *In* A Cultural Approach Interpersonal Communication: Essential Readings. Leila Monaghan and Jane E. Goodman, eds. Pp. 421-436. Malden: Blackwell Publishing.

Monaghan, Leila

2007 Signing. *In* A Cultural Approach Interpersonal Communication: Essential Readings. Leila Monaghan and Jane E. Goodman, eds. Pp. 413-415. Madlen: Blackwell Publishing.

Mori, Soya

2010 Testing the Social Model of Disability: The United Nations and Language Access for Deaf People. *In* Deaf and Disability Studies: Interdisciplinary Perspectives. Susan Burch and Alison Kafer, eds. Pp. 235-244. Washington, D.C: Gallaudet University Press.

Munoz-Baell Irma M. and M. Teresa Ruiz

2000 Empowering the Deaf. Let the Deaf be Deaf. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health* 54(1): 40-44.

Nash, Jeffrey E.

1976 Some Sociolinguistic Aspects of Deaf Educational Policy. *Sociological Focus* 9(4): 349-360.

Nelson, Jennifer L. and Bradley S. Berens

1997 Spoken Daggers, Deaf Ears, and Silent Mouths. *In The Disability Studies Reader*. Lennard J. Davis, ed. Pp. 52-74. London: Routledge.

Ostrove, Joan and Gina Oliva

2010 Identifying Allies: Explorations of Deaf-Hearing Relationships. *In Deaf and Disability Studies: Interdisciplinary Perspectives*. Susan Burch and Alison Kafer, eds. Pp. 105-119. Washington D.C.: Gallaudet University Press.

O'Toole, Corbett Joan

2010 Dale Dahl and Judy Heumann: Deaf Man, Disabled Woman-Allies in 1970s Berkeley. *In Deaf and Disability Studies: Interdisciplinary Perspectives*. Susan Burch and Alison Kafer, eds. Pp. 162-187. Washington, D.C.: Gallaudet University Press.

Padden, Carol and Tom Humphries

2010 Deaf People: A Different Center. *In The Disability Studies Reader*. Lennard J. Davis, ed. Pp. 393-402. London: Routledge.

Patterson, Lindsey

2010 Unlikely of Alliances: Crossing the Deaf and Hearing Divide. *In Deaf and Disability Studies: Interdisciplinary Perspectives*. Susan Burch and Alison Kafer, eds. Pp. 144-161. Washington, D.C.: Gallaudet University Press.

Ramsey, Claire and Carol Padden

1998 Native and Newcomers: Gaining Access to Literacy in a Classroom for Deaf Children. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly* 29(1): 5-24.

Robinson, Tavian

2010 "We Are of a Different Class": Ableist Rhetoric in Deaf America, 1880-1920. *In Deaf and Disability Studies: Interdisciplinary Perspective*. Susan Burch and Alison Kafer, eds. Pp. 5-21. Washington, D.C.: Gallaudet University Press.

Sacks, Oliver

1990 *Seeing Voices-A Journey into the World of the Deaf*. Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Senghas, Richard J. and Leila Monghan

2002 Signs of Their Times: Deaf Communities and the Culture of Language. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 31:69-97.

Silvestre, Nuria and Cristina Cambra

2009 The Relationship Between Drawing and Oral Language in Deaf Students Aged Three to Five. *Psychology of Education* 25(1):3-15.

Stewart, David A. and Tane C. Akamatsu

1988 The Coming of Age of American Sign Language. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly* 19(3):235-252.

Stokes, William C., Dorothy C. Casterline, and Carl G. Cronenberg
1976 Introduction to the Dictionary of American Sign Language. Rev Ed. Silver Springs:
Linstok Press.

Valli, Clayton and Ceil Lucas
1995 Linguistics of American Sign Language: An Introduction. 2nd ed. Washington:
Gallaudet University Press.