Lexical variation and change in British Sign Language

Adam Schembri

Rose Stamp, Jordan Fenlon, Ramas Rentelis, Kearsy Cormier, Bronwen Evans & Bencie Woll







Overview of presentation

- Background to British Sign Language Corpus Project
- Study 1: Lexical variation and change in BSL
- Study 2: Accommodation and dialect contact
- Implications
- Conclusion

Corpus linguistics

- A corpus is a representative sample of a community's language that is transcribed and coded and available to be shared among different users and that can be searched using a computer
- Corpus projects for sign languages are new, and an area in which Australian research is leading the world
- These will create an 'evidence base' for sign language research that previously did not exist

BANZSL corpus/sociolinguistic variation projects

- Sociolinguistic variation in Auslan project: 2003-2005 (researcher with Trevor Johnston & Della Goswell)
- Auslan Corpus project: 2004-present (researcher with Trevor Johnston)
- Sociolinguistic variation in NZSL project (consultant for David & Rachel McKee)
- BSL Corpus Project (project director, working with Jordan Fenlon, Ramas Rentelis, Rose Stamp, Kearsy Cormier & Bencie Woll)



Background to the projects

- Auslan: 2 projects filmed 255 deaf participants in 5 cities across Australia
- NZSL: 138 deaf participants from 5 cities and towns across New Zealand
- BSL: 249 Deaf participants in 8 cities in the UK
- Projects used elicited narratives, spontaneous narratives, free conversation, interviews, lexical elicitation, responses to video stimuli, barrier games







Why?

- To create digital collections of Auslan, NZSL & BSL data to document the languages of each Deaf community
- To provide an evidence-base for a linguistics of BANZSL varieties, as well as for sign language teaching and interpreter training
- To investigate the factors influencing sociolinguistic variation and change in BANZSL varieties

Studies to date







 \bullet

- Phonological variation and change
 - Location variation in Auslan & NZSL (Schembri et al., 2009)
 - Handshape and orientation variation in BSL (Fenlon et al., 2010)
- Lexical variation and change
 - Number signs in NZSL (McKee et al., 2010)
 - Number, colour and country signs in BSL (Stamp et al., 2010)
 - Fingerspelling in Auslan (Schembri & Johnston, 2007)
 - Grammatical variation and change
 - Directional ('indicating') verbs in Auslan (de Beuzeville et al., 2009) & BSL (Fenlon et al., 2014)
 - Variable subject expression in Auslan & NZSL (McKee et al., in press)



 Lexical variation and change in BSL & Auslan: Number, colour, placename signs & fingerspelling

Regional variation in BSL

e.g. SIX







Manchester



London



Research questions for BSL

- Is there any correlation between the sign variants used and social factors?
- Is there any evidence of dialect leveling taking place in BSL?
 - "…a process whereby differences between regional varieties are reduced, features which make varieties distinctive disappear, and new features emerge and are adopted by speakers over a wide geographical area."
 Williams & Kerswill (1999)

Lexical elicitation task

e.g. Numbers 1-20

e.g. countries (8)



AMERICA

e.g. colours (5) GREEN



Variables under investigation

Number signs 1-20

Signs for countries:



- ♦ BRITAIN
- CHINA
- FRANCE
- GERMANY
- ♦ *INDIA
- IRELAND



Signs for colours:

BROWN
GREEN
GREY
PURPLE
YELLOW

Coding of sign variants

All signs were coded as: Traditional or non-traditional sign variants

Data was coded for the following factors:

- 1. Age (16-39, 40-59, 60+)
- 2. Gender (male vs. female)
- 3. Language background (parents Deaf or hearing)
- 4. School locality (local or non-local school)
- 5. Social class (working or middle)
- 6. Semantic category (number, country or colour)

For number sign data only:

- 1. Ethnicity (White, Asian, Afro-Caribbean, etc.)
- 2. Teacher of BSL



Results

- Results from 7332 examples
- Four significant factors predict the use of non-traditional signs:
 - Age
 - School locality
 - Language background
 - Semantic category of the sign
- Gender & social class were not significant factors in the full analysis
- For number sign data: teaching experience & ethnicity were not significant factors

Age: language change?

Apparent time hypothesis (Bailey, 2002)



UK place names: In-group/outgroup effect e.g. Birmingham

In-group/out-group effect for the following UK place names:

- Belfast
- Glasgow
- Manchester
- Newcastle
- Cardiff
- Bristol
- Birmingham



Bristol



Cardiff



LET vs. Conversational data

- 371 tokens from the conversational data were analysed
- 78 tokens (21%) were not the same sign variant as in the lexical elicitation task
- 61 tokens (of 78) were non-traditional sign variants

e.g. GREEN





Country example 1: AMERICA



Country example 2: INDIA



Number sign SEVENTEEN in Manchester



Traditional







Other

Number sign SEVENTEEN in Birmingham



Research questions

To explore whether dialect contact has influenced lexical change in BSL:

- (1) Is there evidence the signer's accommodate to the dialect of other signers over the course of a single conversational interaction?
- (2) To what extent do signers understand other BSL regional varieties?
- Compare to findings in Woll, 1991
 - Difficulty understanding Northern Irish (44%) & Scottish (12%) signers

Background: BSL dialects & change

- BSL exhibits considerable regional variation
- Variation is mostly at lexical level
- BSL dialects developed differently to spoken language dialects, e.g. schoollects
- Recent studies have shown that there is evidence of dialect levelling in BSL
- So....

For example,





Schembri et al. (2011)

Methodology: Data collection

AIM: To engage two people from **different** regions in spontaneous conversation whilst controlling for the terms they use



- At least 6 participants recruited in each region
- Each paired with the same confederate
- Confederate is a deaf native BSL signer from Bristol
- 25 pairs altogether

DiapixUK task

(Baker & Hazan, 2011; Van Engen et al., 2010)



Dialect contact experiment

- Pre-task eliciting 40 lexical items (including target signs from Diapix task)
- DiapixUK task
 - Beach scene
 - Farm scene
 - Street scene
- Dialect comprehension task
- Post-task interview

Lexical elicitation task

- 40 items
- •12 target concepts (same as Diapix)
- (+ 6 additional concepts for dialect comp)

Colours

BROWN

GREEN

• PURPLE

YELLOW

GREY

- 22 distracters
- Target signs:

<u>Numbers</u>

- FOUR
- NINE
- SIX
- TEN
- TWELVE
- SEVENTEEN
- EIGHTEEN







Dialect contact experiment

- Pre-task eliciting 40 lexical items (including target signs from Diapix task)
- DiapixUK task
 - Beach scene
 - Farm scene
 - Street scene
- Dialect comprehension task
- Post-task interview

Example of the Diapix task





- Brown (beehive)
- Green (shorts)
- Grey (towel)
- Purple (towel)
- Yellow (jumper)

- 4/9 (pears)
- 6 (birds)
- 10 (pins)
- 12 (points)
- 17 (points)

Dialect comprehension task



Accommodation study: Coding

All **regionally-variable** signs were coded with following information:

Dependent Variable:

- Accommodation or not
- 1. Region (BF, GW, MC, NC)
- 2. Age (cont.)
- 3. Gender (male or female)
- 4. Social class (working or middle)
- 5. Language background (parents Deaf or hearing)
- 6. School location (local or non-local school)
- 7. Semantic category (number or colour)
- 8. Mobility (high or low)
- 9. Familiarity rating (0, 1, 2, 3)
- 10. Engagement rating (1-10)



Diapix task: Summary

- No problems with communication
- Instances of misunderstandings resolved by mouthing & other communication strategies

Participants

- 0.049 (119 tokens), 5% convergent
- 10% divergent
- Range 0-18%

Age & accommodation proportion



Possible interpretations

- Sign language perception & production systems not linked in the same way as spoken languages
- Identity-marker:
 - Dialects viewed as 'school-lects'
 - Lack of hierarchical community
 - No prestige across regions
- Communicational efficiency not an issue
- Methodological issue?

Dialect comprehension: Coding

48 trials x 3 blocks = accuracy score <u>Dependent Variable:</u>

- Accurate or not
- 1. Region (BF, GW, MC, NC)
- 2. Age (cont.)
- 3. Gender (male or female)
- 4. Social class (working or middle)
- 5. Language background (parents Deaf or hearing)
- 6. School location (local or non-local school)
- 7. Mobility (high or low)
- 8. Regional origin of sign (BF, BL, BM, CF, GW, L, M, N)
- 9. Block (1, 2, 3)



Dialect comprehension differences

- 21-50% correct, 35% average
- Significant sign region & signer's region interaction

Easily understood sign variants?



Conclusions

- Lexical accommodation is minimal
- Accommodative behaviour is socially conditioned
- Signers from Glasgow and Manchester, younger signers accommodate more
- Comprehension is high within conversation
- Comprehension is low without context or mouthing
- Regional variants appear to be disambiguated with mouthing
- Signers with deaf parents perform more accurately
- Birmingham and London varieties are most easily understood

Future areas of research

- Are BSL regional varieties viewed as dialects or school-lects?
- Do modality differences influence whether accommodation is exhibited in signed languages?
- Do regional varieties in BSL hold any prestige or status?

Contacts & websites

- Rose Stamp <u>r.stamp@ucl.ac.uk</u>
- Kearsy Cormier <u>k.cormier@ucl.ac.uk</u>
- Adam Schembri <u>a.schembri@ucl.ac.uk</u>
- Project website

- www.bslcorpusproject.org

Diapix task: 1



- Brown dog
- Green seahorse
- Grey umbrella
- Purple bin
- Yellow car

- 4/9 windows
- 6 flags
- 10 shells
- 12-8pm
- 17 Cafe

Diapix task: 3



- Brown trousers
- Green bike
- Grey Butcher's shop
- Purple car
- Yellow vase



- 4/9 toy shop
- 6 birds
- 10 bookshop
- 12 pies
- 17 miles

Contact

Adam Schembri National Institute for Deaf Studies and Sign Language, La Trobe University, Melbourne, VIC, 3086, Australia a.schembri@latrobe.edu.au