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ABSTRACT

There now exists a body of literature describing the phonology, morphology and syntax of NZSL, but to date there has been no published work on NZSL narrative discourse structure. This study is the first linguistic exploration of New Zealand Sign Language (NZSL) beyond the level of the sentence.

The thesis begins by providing background into the NZSL speech community, and suggests historical and contextual features of the New Zealand Deaf community that influence the structure of the narratives found within it. The thesis reviews and assesses the applicability of research into discourse structures in American Sign Language (ASL) with a view to using this established body of research to guide the development of research strategies for the study of NZSL narratives.

It then investigates the narrative structure of two NZSL narratives. The structural analysis is based on two different methodological approaches. The first approach is Labov’s narrative taxonomy based on oral narratives (Labov & Waletzky, 1967). The second approach amalgamates Gee’s units of narrative production (1986) with Gee’s analysis of narrative story structure and pausing analysis of an ASL narrative (1983). The study will then test the congruence of the two approaches when applied to the same data.

The two narratives highlight the diversity in NZSL narrative production found within the South Island Deaf community. The main finding of this preliminary examination of NZSL narrative structure is that they illustrate basic compliance with the taxonomies proposed by Labov and Gee. Similarity between the narrative
structure and features of ASL stories and an NZSL narrative also emerged. However, the linguistic resources of a visual non-verbal narrative, particularly the aspects of simultaneity and whole body involvement, require a modified approach to explore and subsequently explain NZSL narrative structure and the dynamics of narrative presentation.
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CHAPTER ONE  -  Introduction

1  Introduction

We organise our experiences and our memories mainly in the form of narratives. These may be stories, excuses, myths, reasons for choosing a certain behaviour and avoiding other behaviours (Bruner, 1991). Most often, these experiences are shared, by a teller to an audience, or as Toolan states: “any tale involves a teller, and that therefore narrative study must analyse two basic components, the tale and the teller” (1988, p. 3).

This thesis investigates a language communicated in a visual modality, New Zealand Sign Language (NZSL), by Deaf narrators who are members of the New Zealand Deaf community. This research study sets out to discover the textual parameters that govern the construction of their narratives, as well as exploring some of the background factors, both linguistic and historical, that contribute to the shape and delivery of their narratives.

This chapter introduces the thesis by providing a brief overview of the historical and personal factors that prompted the investigation, the aims and methodological approach to the study, and outlines the organisation of the thesis by a brief description of the chapters that follow.

Section 1.1 will position the study within the current historical and linguistic environment and describes my motivation for undertaking the work.

Section 1.2 will outline the long and short-term aims of the study.
Section 1.3 will describe the methodological approaches to the investigation.

Section 1.4 will describe the organisation of the thesis and summarise the contents of each of the chapters of the thesis.

1.1 The Background to the Study

Tales are told by means of language and the teller chooses the perspective, or viewpoint, from which the tale is told. Slobin (1966) suggests that different languages will offer different perspectives on the world and that the language itself will offer different linguistic devices to express its discrete perspective.

We most often think of language as something tangible, an entity that is spoken or written, but this thesis adopts a slightly different view of language. The definition of language that underpins this thesis is supplied by Margalit Fox, a journalist who has authored a book called *Talking Hands* (2007). Fox was granted exclusive access to a Middle Eastern village whose inhabitants spoke sign language. She was the only non-linguist invited to join a small team who were documenting their sign language. She suggests this definition of language:

> What is language, really? At bottom, it is nothing more than a symbolic code, whose function is to convey meaning. The code is normally realised through speech. That is the default setting for our species: no tribe of hearing people has been found in which a signed language has arisen as the primary means of communication. (Fox, 2007, p. 63)
New Zealand Sign Language (NZSL) has recently been formally recognised as a human language distinct from spoken English signified by the ratification of The New Zealand Sign Language Act 2006. According to the New Zealand National Census of 2006 approximately 24,000 people in New Zealand use NZSL. Of that number, 9,000 New Zealanders identified themselves as culturally Deaf, for whom NZSL is their “default setting”. Now the third official language of New Zealand affords status to the resident Deaf community as a distinct linguistic minority group within New Zealand society.

To begin to understand the language, the people, and how they use their language, we must start from where they are. Their world is visual and its culture, knowledge and traditions are passed down face-to-face, in environments where sign language is regarded as the norm. It stands to reason that a deeper understanding of the linguistic complexities of discourse will be discovered through an analysis of their shared narratives (Eastman, 1980).

One of the central activities in Deaf culture is storytelling. The poster in Figure 1 illustrates the importance and value placed on narrative expertise. Storytelling provides more than a reason for social interaction. Storytelling also provides a platform for the expression and extension of the unique language that unites Deaf community members.

For the past 25 years, I have been intrigued by sign language and the people who acquire it. For the last 18 years, I have been working in New Zealand within the Deaf community. I began in New Zealand as a Service Coordinator of Deaf services in the South Island but found that my interest lay in the more personal face-to-face interaction with Deaf people. Having qualified as a British Sign
Language (BSL) interpreter in England before emigrating, I was able to take up a similar role in New Zealand. Since that time, I have been fortunate enough to have been an interpreter at New Zealand births, deaths and marriages. I have been a Teacher of English to Deaf Adults (TEFL), and have experienced firsthand the complexity of switching modalities while maintaining syntax and sense. I have experienced working as a teacher aide for a profoundly Deaf young student starting her school life in a hearing school, and, at the other end of the educational spectrum, interpreted in mainstream universities for Deaf students on their way to graduating in various disciplines. It was due in large measure to their encouragement and assistance that this project was proposed and completed.
Figure 1: Storyfest Poster

POSTER FOR STORYTELLING COMPETITION

STORYFEST 2008
12 July 2008 / 7:00pm
Auckland Deaf Society, Balmoral
*Door opens at 6:00pm. A friendly reminder: please be seated at 7.00pm no later please.

Free admission for those telling stories!

Sign up to tell a story! Prizes to be won!
Fax: 09 828 3235 Email: info@nzslta.org.nz
Stories can be by individuals or groups
Organised by NZSL Tutors: Auckland Branch (TAB)
1.2 The Aims of the Study

At its most expansive level, the thesis investigates NZSL beyond the level of syntactic and morphological analysis to focus on some of the abundant creative and linguistic complexities that are available in vernacular narratives.

Deaf people produce creative and complex literary forms such as plays and poetry and enjoy complex narrative genres (Bechter, 2004; Lane, Hoffmeister, & Bahan, 1996). For example, *ABC stories* are a unique sign language genre in ASL, in which the handshape for each letter of the alphabet is used in turn to create a coherent story. There are published American Deaf poets such as Lentz (1995) and Clayton Valli (1995). BSL has been well portrayed through the work of Dorothy Miles, a poet and champion of a bilingual approach to deaf education (Miles, 1988). Valli included a videotaped inventory of formal poetic devices for aspiring ASL poets to guide them in creating patterning in their poetry (1995). In New Zealand, the two Deaf Education Centres located in Auckland and Christchurch have extensive collections of videotaped stories recorded by Deaf New Zealanders. These video tapes are used for educational purposes as well as for entertainment and are available to the public and to learners of NZSL. Since 2004, a New Zealand Deaf Short Film Festival is held every two years. This popular event provides a competitive environment where Deaf film makers can exploit and explore the creative properties of NZSL storytelling. This prolific form of sign language discourse, the personal stories of Deaf people, remains the least documented and the least understood part of signed languages.

In the light of the growing interest in NZSL and the growing body of data available in NZSL, this study will begin to explore the structure and some of the internal features of two NZSL personal narratives. The study sets out to achieve
two aims. First, I aim to analyse both the external text structures of two personal narratives produced in the New Zealand Deaf community. Secondly, I endeavour to discover some of the internal linguistic features of NZSL that contribute to the shaping of the personal narratives considered in the data.

In the process of applying spoken language methodology, the structural and textual similarities and differences created by the change of modality will emerge. In a similar vein, within the sub-culture of sign language users, there are linguistic sub-cultures within the signing community; this will emerge more clearly in the data. The influence of linguistic variation on narrative structure will form part of the discussion arising from the data analysis.

The objective was to look beyond linguistic competence and sentential syntax to capture the “folk narratives” (Labov & Waletzky, 1967, p.13) of the Deaf community. Adopting the same philosophical position as Labov, the study aims to uncover the structure of two quite different personal stories created from within the NZSL Deaf community.

1.3 Research Methodology

The data will be approached using both quantitative and qualitative research paradigms. First, by applying two methodologies to two unrehearsed NZSL personal narratives, I will seek to discover the textual construction of the narratives. Secondly, I will explore distinctive sign language constructions that reflect the linguistic parameters within which visual narratives operate.

Gee’s theoretical notion of “Big D and little d” discourses (Gee, 2005) provides a framework within which both qualitative and quantitative research
methodologies can be applied. The notion of “Big D” Discourse offers a framework for viewing the socially constructed notion of a Deaf domain, and “little d” discourse provides a frame of reference to explore the concept of the language in use within the Big D. This two-fold approach allows for the NZSL narrative units to be identified prior to the more detailed analysis of the linguistic devices that are employed.

The quantitative analysis begins with using the narrative classifications as proposed by Labov and Waletzky (1967) and Gee (1986). Having classified the narrative units within the data sample, the research will further quantify two aspects of narrative production as proposed by Gee in his analysis of an ASL narrative (1983). These two further aspects are pausing and prosodic patterning which will be numerically quantified and graphically illustrated. The results of the two NZSL narratives are compared to one another, and as an extension of the inquiry, the two narrative approaches of Labov and Gee are compared across the same data.

Qualitative analysis is reported through the detailed description of the two videoed narratives, describing the narrative features both shared with spoken languages and those that were idiosyncratic to sign language(s). The research also investigates the anomalies and ambiguities of the two NZSL narratives considered here.
1.4 The Organisation of the Thesis

This thesis is organised into five chapters, each dealing with a specific phase of the study.

Chapter Two is the Literature Review, which summarises the two different empirical research streams which have guided this study. The first informs the quantitative analysis and the latter provides a framework for qualitative analysis and discussion of the data.

Labov’s research, taken from oral narratives of personal experience, appears to have much in common with the storytelling tradition of the Deaf community in New Zealand. The resulting Labov taxonomy (Labov & Waletzky, 1967) is summarised in Chapter Two.

Gee’s research is based on data from both spoken and signed narrative. Units of production, based on an oral narrative, are applied to the two NZSL narratives (1986) and his work with the pausal structure in an ASL narrative are also applied to the two NZSL narratives (1983). His methodology is summarised in Chapter Two.

Chapter Two continues by reviewing the relevant empirical data resulting from research into ASL discourse. The published results of ASL research will provide a guide to the investigation of the characteristics that are evident in the construction of NZSL narratives.

Chapter Three describes the methodology. It begins with the rationale for the approach that I have taken to the data, followed by a statement of the four
research questions that I will endeavour to answer. Details of the data corpus are reported, as well as some of the unique issues pertaining to the analysis of linguistic data in a visual modality.

Chapter Four reports the quantitative and qualitative results of the narrative analysis. The findings resulting from the application of Labov and Gee taxonomies are detailed. Quantitative data results based on the replication of Gee’s pausal methodology are illustrated and comparative analyses of stanza length, patterning, and prosody are presented.

Chapter Five details the answers to each of the four questions proposed in Chapter Three. I will then discuss the findings that have come to light through this investigation and place them within the larger context of sign language discourse.

Chapter Six draws some conclusions based on this research project, and outlines some theoretical and practical implications for future NZSL discourse investigation. The chapter acknowledges the limitations of this project, and suggests two potential directions for future research into NZSL discourse.
CHAPTER TWO - Literature Review

2 Introduction

The New Zealand Sign Language Act became law in 2006 and New Zealand Sign Language (NZSL) was declared to be the third official language in New Zealand. The political implications are related to compulsory access in NZSL to government information, widespread educational provision and guaranteed access to qualified Sign Language Interpreters in courts and other legal forums. For the NZSL users and for linguists, the repercussions are much broader.

The seminal work for the global recognition of sign language is attributed to William Stokoe, the “father of linguistics in the field of American Sign Language” (Eastman, 1980, p. 160). The publication of the Dictionary of American Sign Language (Stokoe, Cronenberg, & Casterline, 1965) established ASL as a systematic language that could withstand the linguistic scrutiny applied to spoken languages.

British Sign Language followed suit with the publication of the British Sign Language Dictionary/English in 1992. These events precipitated a major shift in perception about human languages and speech communities. As Bauman says, in the introduction to the book, Open Your Eyes:

Among the seismic shifts in culture brought about in the 1960s was a much quieter but nonetheless profound revolution in our understanding of human language and culture: the validation of the fully linguistic nature of sign languages and the subsequent rewriting of deaf identity from deaf to Deaf, that is, from a pathological state of hearing loss to the cultural identity of a linguistic minority. (Dirksen & Bauman, 2008, p. 1)
The Deaf Studies Research Unit (DSRU) at Victoria University, Wellington, New Zealand, established in 1995, published a *Dictionary of New Zealand Sign Language* in 1997. In July 2011, an online *Dictionary of New Zealand Sign Language* containing more than 5,000 NZSL signs became available. The DSRU continues to be the centre for linguistic and cultural studies in NZSL and of the New Zealand Deaf Community. Their research interests have been primarily in the areas of education, community, linguistic and lexical analysis.

As with American and British counterparts, establishing linguistic autonomy, lexical ordering, and providing an accessible and comprehensive notation system are the obvious precursors to more in-depth NZSL linguistic research. The evolution of NZSL linguistic research parallels that of ASL and BSL. A comprehensive body of linguistic knowledge of NZSL has now been published, paving the way for looking at discourse.

The only published contribution to the field of NZSL Deaf narratives is a book entitled *People of the Eye* (McKee, 2001). As well as introducing the “Deaf World” by way of 16 narratives, McKee orientates the narratives within the particular educational and social conditions of New Zealand. This is the only NZSL book that presents the actual text of Deaf peoples’ personal narratives and allows the linguistic and social conditions that shape them to become transparent. However, there is a small body of published work about ASL and BSL narrative structures authored by both Deaf and hearing researchers.

This chapter will focus on applying Labov’s structural taxonomy to NZSL narratives and compare it to Gee’s sociolinguistic narrative production and pausal analysis. In addition, this chapter will review ASL narrative discourse literature.
2.1 The Structural Narrative Analysis Paradigm

Narratives are stories. Narrative structural analysis seeks to discover the textual units that combine in a particular way to create a narrative. In Schiffrin’s words: “Narratives have a linear structure in which different sections present different kinds of information” (1994, p. 284). Michael Toolan (1988) suggests the narrative analysis offers “ways of looking at narratives that attend systematically to the language of stories . . . that focus on the linguistic form of narratives or their linguistically describable structure” (1988, p. xiii).

One of the most authoritative taxonomies proposed for narrative structural analysis has been formulated by Labov and Waletzky (1967).

2.1.1 Labov’s Perspective

Labov and Waletzky (1967), hereafter referred to as L&W, proposed a classification system to describe the narrative units found in a story. The L&W data corpus consisted of 600 personal stories, elicited by open-ended interview questions. L&W argued that fundamental narrative structure becomes more transparent in simpler narratives, such as oral versions of personal experience. The methodology was intended to mitigate against any anxiety on the part of the storyteller to have to “get it right” for the interviewer, so that they could collect data that was as natural as possible. As L & W stated in their introduction: “By examining the actual narratives of a large number of unsophisticated speakers, it will be possible to relate the formal properties of narrative to their functions” (1967, p. 12).
L&W’s hypothesis was that the vernacular narratives provide greater constructive transparency because natural everyday speech is unrehearsed and not consciously monitored by its speaker. Also, L&W argued that more formal speech styles are learned later in life, usually in adolescence, when the educational system begins to require a more sophisticated register.

L&W’s objective was to analyse simple stories in everyday speech as the first step in the process of devising a broader framework that could include other narrative genres. The same position is assumed with this approach to NZSL narrative analysis. The NZSL narratives in my data sample are unrehearsed and voluntarily performed. The data corpus for this project is drawn from the personal stories of Deaf people.

This following section will review the Labov taxonomic approach, including critical comments by other researchers about his approach to narrative structural analysis.

2.1.2 Labov’s Taxonomy

L&W (1967) describe six narrative sections that constitute a fully formed narrative. These six discrete units are abstract, orientation, complicating action, evaluation, resolution and coda.

2.1.2.1 Abstract

The abstract summarises the narrative. The abstract can be rendered either in a simple clause or two, or in a more elaborate construction. The abstract performs a dual function. It outlines the general proposition that the narrative will address
and it invites the attention of an audience. Toolan (1988) expanded on the engagement function of the abstract. He suggested that the abstract can indicate a switch from a conversation to a monologue, and at the same time, makes sure there is sufficient interest to tell a story (p. 155).

2.1.2.2 **Orientation**

Orientation provides the setting: the time, the place and the actors. The orientation is traditionally articulated near the beginning of the story between the abstract and the complicating action, but this is not always the case. Labov and Waltezky suggested that alternative placement of the orientation can often fulfil an evaluative function (1967, p. 32). This evaluative function of the orientation is in evidence in the analysis of an ASL narrative (Wilson, 1966). The results of the ASL study are reported later in this chapter.

2.1.2.3 **Complicating Action**

The complicating action is the body of the narrative, the recounting of the action or events that the story seeks to tell. In order to continue to engage the audience, there must be both sense and suspense, a logical development of subject matter that continues to be of interest to its audience. The events in the complicating action need to be sequential and interdependent, so the story makes sense and moves forward.

2.1.2.4 **Temporal Juncture**

The individual units of construction, usually narrative clauses, must have a sequential temporal relationship with each other. L&W argued for the notion of temporal juncture: to change the order would be to change the meaning of the

Toolan proposed a different perspective on the notion of temporal juncture:

Perceiving non-random connectedness in a sequence of events is the prerogative of the addressee: it is idle for anyone else (e.g. a teller) to insist that here is a narrative if the addressee just doesn’t see it as one. In this respect at least, the ultimate authority for ratifying a text as a narrative rests not with the teller but with the perceiver/addressee. (1988, p. 8)

Temporal order was explained in a different manner by Todorov (1977). He argued for the concept of transformation rather than temporal juncture as being the crucial link between the action segments of the narrative. He argued for transformative progression in this way:

The simple relation of successive facts does not constitute a narrative: these facts must be organised, which is to say, ultimately they must have elements in common. But if all the elements are in common, there is no longer a narrative, for there is no longer anything to recount. Now, transformation represents precisely a synthesis of differences and resemblance, it links two facts without their being able to be identified. (1977, p. 233)
2.1.2.5  *Resolution*

Having presented the narrative’s activities, L&W’s taxonomy indicates that the complicating action must lead to a resolution, presenting a final outcome of the events detailed in the action. The resolution must leave the audience feeling satisfied that the matters that are presented in the action segments are suitably resolved.

Toolan described narratives as having a trajectory, a route it follows from the creation of a problem to its resolution and conclusion, suggesting that narratives “go somewhere, and are expected to go somewhere, with some sort of development and even a resolution or conclusion provided. We expect them to have beginnings, middles and ends” (1988, p. 4).

2.1.2.6  *Evaluation*

L&W contended that one further element must be present for a narrative to be fully formed. The story must be evaluated, appraised, and positioned in such a way as to create significance, because “without a point it is difficult to distinguish the complicating action from the result” (1967, p. 34), so “most narratives contain an evaluation section which carries out this function” (1967, pp. 34, 35).

Other definitions make the same point. Evaluation is the element that involves “stating or underscoring what is interesting or unusual about the story” (Johnstone, 2005, p. 83). Toolan defined evaluation as any portion of narrative content which “consists of all the means used to establish and sustain the point, the contextual significance and tellability, or reportability, of a story” (1988, p. 156).
L&W further suggested that evaluation exposes the attitude of the narrator, revealing the narrator’s own assessment of the value of the narrative and why it is noteworthy. The narrator wants to be received favourably and is seeking “self-aggrandizement” (1967, p. 34), and evaluative comments are used to accomplish this objective. If there is no personal investment in the narrative, an evaluative segment is less likely to be present.

The most typical location of an evaluation section is between the complicating action and the resolution, but evaluative comments are often found interspersed throughout a narrative.

2.1.2.7 Coda

The final segment, the coda, brings the audience back to the present. Toolan spoke of “the ‘sealing off’ of the narrative” (p. 161). Labov suggested that the coda has the distinction of “bridging the gap between the moment of time at the end of the narrative proper and the present” (1972a, p. 365). L&W’s research suggests the coda is often presented by the introduction of a present verb tense, when the complicating action has been articulated in the past tense. Alternatively, the coda is articulated by a deictic shift through such utterances as “so that’s it; that was that; that’s the end of it; so, there we are” (1967, p. 40). In the last example, the use of the plural pronoun “we” can serve to shift the narrator’s position from being the narrator to being aligned with the audience.

Toolan explained the importance of employing some means of role shifting by suggesting that “the teller seems best advised to signal before the close of his long narrative turn, that he has exited from the marked past narrative to present deictics mode” (Toolan, 1988, p. 162). Toolan is suggesting that the narrator uses
the coda to create a separation between the narrator and the narrative. Deictics such as *this, here* and *now* can function to switch attention from the narrator as actor involved with the story to the narrator as participant in the “real” time situation in which the story has been told. The deictic shift places the narrator in a space distant from the narrative and identifies him as “other than” the narrator.

Labov’s structural view of narratives and Toolan’s (1988) characteristics of narratives show considerable compatibility. Although Toolan takes a different view of temporal juncture and of the role of the audience, there is agreement on the main tenets of narrative construction: narratives relate events that have already been completed, and that narratives exhibit a structural order that shape the final articulation of the story. Another tenet on which they agree is the cognitive pre-construction of events.

Both researchers argue there is a cognitive planning process that precedes the delivery of the narrative. Cognitive pre-construction involves arranging the story “in one’s head” starting at the most memorable or dramatic event and working backwards to organise the less significant but contiguous events. This cognitive preparation is contingent on the point of view that the narrator wishes to assume and convey. Toolan suggests that narratives are “planned, polished and rehearsed by their authors before they are finally presented to their audience” (1988, p. 4).

2.1.3 Using Labov with Signed Narratives

Wilson (1966) investigated the possibility that the Labov taxonomy could appropriately describe the structure of an ASL story. She applied the Labov taxonomy to an ASL narrative called *Tobacco Story* with the following results.
Wilson reported no abstract segment in the ASL story. An orientation appears at the beginning of the narrative. There is a brief introduction to the subject matter of the narrative by checking audience association with one of the characters. The orientation follows by identifying the principal participants and indicating that the classroom is the venue for the ensuing action. Re-orientation occurs when new characters are introduced and the narrator uses the entrance of a new character to introduce the audience to salient physical features in the place and setting of the story that are germane to the action. The physical location of the story (the classroom) does not change but frequent re-orientation within the location is accomplished by manipulating the signing space. Orientation thus becomes a recurring and integral feature of the story. In the strictest sense, the abstract and orientation are not presented as an antecedent to the complicating action.

Furthermore, Wilson made two significant observations about orientation in the analysis of the ASL narrative. First, the notion of temporal juncture is challenged in the orientation. Wilson noted that, contrary to the temporal juncture imperative, the clauses of the orientation section could in fact be reversed without compromising meaning (1966, p. 160). Secondly, Wilson made the following observation. The orientation makes use of extensive non-manual features. This will be discussed further below in section 2.3.

Another structural component, the coda, was investigated in an experiment with ASL narratives, where it was found to be used for the separation function that Toolan (1988) describes. An American research team (Christie, Wilkins, Hicks McDonald, & Neuroth-Gimborne, 1999) investigated the execution of the coda in the personal stories signed by Deaf students. They discovered that the majority of students ended their stories with two signs ME FINISHED. The students were
then asked to write down the same story. One of the Deaf students offered this description of the exercise: “The ending of an English essay [was] as a slow moving away from the topic; a slow motion placing of the paper from a hand-held reading position to a position on the table” (Christie, et al., 1999, p. 174).

The action of concluding the story described by the Deaf student shows a similar purpose to Toolan’s (1988) suggestion that the coda brings a separation between the narrative and the narrator. It appears to be that when a narrator is operating in a visual modality the separation between the two is perceived as a physical movement away from the subject, rather than a spoken deictic utterance such as Toolan describes.

More recently, the results of a study of 12 American Sign Language (ASL) narratives has been completed and published (Mulrooney, 2009). Mulrooney explores the linguistic devices that ASL narrators employ in their personal storytelling. She concludes that signed stories exhibit the same patterning as personal oral narratives. ASL stories show a consistent pattern which includes an introduction, a main events section and a conclusion. Mulrooney’s conclusions add weight to the choice of this researcher to apply the Labov taxonomy to NZSL narratives.

The following section discusses the Labovian paradigm and examines its limitations in the light of more recent research findings.
2.1.4. **A Critical View of Labov’s Methodology**

Thirty years after the original Labov taxonomy was published, Schegloff (2003) revisited L&W’s conclusions. He pointed out that four crucial constituents of story-telling were overlooked in Labov’s original research.

First, he noted that L&W did not consider the interactional aspect of the data collection, apart from acknowledging that the interviewing questions were posed by the listener to a speaker. This in itself, Schegloff commented, is “much like that of an experimental stimulus to occasion the production of the already formed story waiting to be told” (2003, p. 107).

He argued that overlooking the stimulus and response aspect of the interview may obscure the features that would arise in spontaneous story telling.

Secondly, the data for L&W’s research were collected by asking the respondents to reply to specific questions. Schegloff argued that this is tantamount to constructing an artificial environment which will inhibit the spontaneity of the narrative and the creativity of the narrator. Schegloff suggested that this negates a fundamental constituent of storytelling. He claimed that, “Design and constructional features of stories are shaped as well by an orientation to who the recipient(s) is, to how many of them there are, and who they are to one another” (2003, p. 106).

Thirdly, Schegloff argued that quantifiable features of narrative, such as silences, hesitations, “asides” and other non-narrative occurrences are not reported (p. 107). These phenomena form an integral part of interactional data and have a crucial role to play in narrative structural boundaries.
Lastly, Schegloff suggested that by imposing parameters on the creativity of the utterances, the narrator is able to stand “outside” the narrative. In doing so, he may manipulate the structure of his storytelling to suit the objective of the interviewer. Schegloff argued that “the opportunity was missed to re-situate the narrative in social context, to see that the recipient(s) is an irremediable component of a story’s telling” (2003, p. 108).

Schegloff concluded that L&W’s concentration on developing a structural template overrode any consideration of the interactional and environmental influences that may impact the shape of the narrative.

Toolan suggested a different perspective. He argued, “They (i.e. narratives) often do stand alone, not embedded in larger frames, without any accompanying information about the author or the intended audience: they’re just ‘there’ it seems, like a pot someone has made, and you can take them or leave them” (1988, p. 4).

Toolan does not appear to be in agreement with Schegloff about the Labov taxonomy. Nonetheless, the points Schegloff made represent another stream of research on narrative which in this thesis will be called the sociolinguistic paradigm, and which will be discussed in sub-section 2.2.

2.1.5 **Summary**

This section has reviewed Labov’s structural approach to narrative structure. Labov’s taxonomy is being pursued in this thesis for two particular reasons.
First, the Labov model was derived from the analysis of oral narratives. This is key component when considering visual narratives emanating from an oral culture. Secondly, the taxonomy has been applied to a narrative in an ASL narrative (Wilson, 1966). More recently, the textual analysis of a further 12 ASL personal narratives has been published (Mulrooney, 2009). The Labovian taxonomy has not yet been applied to data collected in NZSL.

This section explained Labov’s narrative structural analysis model that was developed from the investigation of oral narratives. Labov has successfully designed a methodology that facilitates narrative text classification based on its internal structures. This section has reviewed the results of Labovian methodology as it has been applied to both spoken narratives and personal narratives delivered in a visual language.

Some of the main literature that both supports and challenges Labov’s narrative methodology and resultant taxonomy has been reviewed in this section. The challenges to the Labovian taxonomy are based on the apparent separation of the narrative data from its social context. However, as will be seen below, Labov did not ignore social context altogether, but included it in his notion of a speech community.

The next section will review some of the literature that will address the narrative in combination with its social context.
2.2 The Sociolinguistic Analysis Paradigm

The sociolinguistic paradigm suggests that narrative discourse needs to be examined within the society in which it arises. In other words, the exploration of situationally determined variables takes precedence over the investigation of formalised textual structure. In the broadest sense, sociolinguistics considers larger societal influences such as power, politics and cultural phenomena. However, in this investigation, the influence of context and the notion of “speech community” will be the two sociolinguistic concepts examined in relation to narratives in NZSL. These two concepts are defined in the following section.

2.2.1 Definitions

2.2.1.1 Context

Context is a key factor in sociolinguistic narrative analysis. In the book *The Sociolinguistics of Sign Languages* (Lucas, 2001) the role of context is defined:

> Context is relevant to the analysis of discourse structure because it is through the use of particular expressions and utterances within specific contexts that people can convey and comprehend what is being communicated. (Metzger & Bahan, 2001, p. 116)

Metzger & Bahan (2001) suggested that context involves three main constituents. First, the physical environment which will have an effect on the style and subject matter of the narration. Secondly, the narrator’s background knowledge about the audience expectations which will influence the organisation of his information. Thirdly, the existing social relationships that are operating in the context which will be a further determinant of the style and construction of the narrative. It is
suggested that text and context interact in ways that have a formative influence on narrative structure.

Johnstone proposed an analytical scaffold that integrates text and context (2005). She suggested that there are six reflexive propositions that describe their interaction. First, she acknowledges a global sociolinguistic paradigm, how global influences shape discourse and how discourse shapes the world. Secondly, language choice shapes discourse, and discourse is shaped by the language we use. Thirdly, discourse is shaped by the people who participate, and as it is communicated, the discourse moulds its participants. She further argued that discourse is cumulative, is shaped by prior discourse, and in turn will shape future possibilities for discourse. The purpose of the discourse will shape how it is created, and in turn will shape a purpose for the audience. And lastly, Johnstone argued that the linguistic medium will affect the discourse, and the discourse will in turn affect the medium in which is it expressed (2005, p. 9).

Of particular interest in this research is the importance of the linguistic medium on narrative construction, and also what the effect both the medium and the message combined have on the construction of the narrative. As Johnstone and others have suggested, the context in which the text arises will influence how the text is shaped, and how it is assimilated. NZSL narratives originate from a distinct group of Deaf individuals who collectively form the Deaf community. Their association is more than a social organisation. It is a speech community.
2.2.1.2  *Speech Community*

A speech community is a group of people who are defined by their use of a common language. In the strictest sense, a sign language community is not a group of speakers, as it does not employ a language that is spoken or audible. However, the NZSL signing community meets the criteria of a speech community as the concept is defined in the literature.

Johnstone defined a speech community as a unique community that is “defined by a language variety” (2005, p. 115). She further commented that even if discourse analysis is focussing primarily on stylistic features, the findings of the analysis will intrinsically produce a social commentary. Text and context will reflexively inform and influence each other.

Hymes (1972) defined a speech community as an entity that can embrace more than one language variety. He defined a speech community as “a community sharing rules for the conduct and interpretation of speech, and rules of the interpretation of at least one linguistic variety” (1972, p. 54).

Trudgill (2003) offered the following definition of a speech community:

A community of speakers who share the same verbal repertoire, and who also share the same norms for linguistic behaviour, including both general norms for language use and more detailed norms for activities such as style shifting. (2003, p. 126)
Labov was also aware of the dynamics of speech communities, and proposed a definition of speech community in these words:

The speech community is not defined by any marked agreement in the use of language elements, so much as by participation in a set of shared norms. These norms may be observed in overt types of evaluative behavior, and by the uniformity of abstract patterns of variation which are invariant in respect to particular levels of usage. (1972b, p. 120)

Labov’s original data sample was selected from a sub-group of a larger monolingual community. His objective was to discover narrative structure by examining vernacular speech, speech characterised by its ordinariness. Labov’s definition and his data corpus are appropriate for investigation of the Deaf speech community. In parallel with Labov’s data which represented narratives presented by a sub-group of a larger linguistic community, the New Zealand Deaf community represents a minority linguistic community. As Johnstone and Hymes have suggested in their individual publications, a speech community will exhibit its own language variety, and at the same time permit and include an eclectic range of lexical knowledge and linguistic competency.

The fact of the Deaf community being a linguistic minority that is in regular contact with a dominant culture and language is the key factor in understanding the language variations found within it. In the larger hearing world, where Deaf people conduct their lives, their communication with hearing people historically alternates between English-based language and a visual and gestural language (McKee, 2001). In a Deaf club, among Deaf people, the influence of the larger
English speaking community is still evident. Within the Deaf speech community, there is a wide range of narrative style and language in use.

In comparative studies conducted in three different American Deaf communities, Lucas et al. argued that the citation form did not appear to impact on the acceptability of the communication. (Lucas, 2001, p. 61). There appears that there is no prescribed linguistic competency that stipulates the norm for acceptable discourse. The NZSL narratives analysed in this paper suggest the narrators possess different competencies in English and NZSL. Both narrators exhibited acceptable narrative ability to tell their stories and to be understood in the context in which they are being delivered.

Gee (2005) approaches discourse analysis from the perspective of the interaction of the context and the text, a paradigm he describes as Big D Discourse, as the domain or context, and little d discourse as the language employed by the speaker/narrator. The next section will review a sociolinguistic narrative methodology based on the research model developed by Gee.

2.2.2 **Sociolinguistic Narrative Methodology**

Gee (1986, 2005, 2007) designed a theoretical framework and a research methodology that permits the analysis of languages in both aural and visual modalities. The overarching theoretical model is represented by a “Big D” and a “little d” nomenclature, embracing both the context and text of discourse. This is explained in sub-section 2.2.2.1.

Gee then proposed and demonstrated a methodology that looks at the production of narrative units and the intrinsic properties of narrative construction in different
modalities. His work on production, prosody and pausal patterning is described in sub-sections 2.2.2.2, 2.2.2.3 and 2.2.2.4. Sub-section 2.2.2.5 will examine the role of discourse marking in narratives.

2.2.2.1 **Big D and little d Discourses**

Gee’s methodological approach to discourse is based on the argument that “language has meaning only in and through social practices” (2005, p. 8). He suggested that two constituents, little d discourse and a Big D Discourse, provide the conceptual framework within which discourse analysis should be conducted. He argued that little d discourse and Big D Discourse concurrently establish meaning and significance for the narrator and the audience as well as shaping and modifying each other.

Big D encapsulates the cultural and interactional aspects of the situation in which the discourse occurs. Big D is the descriptive term Gee employs to describe the behaviours we employ in our interactions with the world. All human beings are members of more than one Discourse. How we speak, what linguistic choices and structures we employ are influenced by the Big D Discourse in which we are communicating. And conversely, once the Discourse has been identified, the little d discourse, the language used in the interaction, will guide understanding of the Discourse in which it is being situated. Little d discourse analysis also provides a vehicle to examine the linguistic features of the language that is employed in discourse.

These definitions provide an interesting analogy to the study of deaf communities, as they, too, use the terminology little d (audiologically deaf) and Big D (culturally Deaf) based on language use and identity: “We use lowercase deaf when referring
to the audiological condition of not hearing, and the uppercase *Deaf* when referring to a particular group of deaf people who share a language . . . and a culture” (Padden & Humphries, 1988, p. 2).

Gee talks about Big D in this way:

> If you put language, action, interaction, values, beliefs, symbols, objects, tools, and places together in such a way that others recognize you as a particular type of who (identity) engaged in a particular type of what (activity), here-and-now, then you have pulled off a Discourse . . . If it is not recognizable, then you’re not ‘in’ the Discourse. (2005)

In summary, Big D encapsulates the shared cultural and interactional aspects of the situation in which the discourse occurs; little d discourse is the language that is employed.

The Big D of NZSL narratives is the Big D Deaf community. The differences between Deaf and hearing domains can be best understood by examining little d discourse, the language that creates the narrative world view. Gee approached little d discourse, language in use, by examining its functions and forms. He suggested that little d discourse functionality can be described in terms of building tasks (2005) and that little d discourse formations can be expressed in terms of units of production (1986).

Language functions to create our world view or the world of the discourse. Gee categorised seven functions of language in discourse. The seven creative processes little d discourse performs are to create significance, to describe activities, to create
identities, to reflect and build relationships, to communicate a moral perspective, to make connections with other discourse and to assign a value status to the language-in-use (2005, pp. 11-19). Language, little d discourse, builds, contributes to and reflects a worldview within a Big D Discourse; Big D Discourse in turn influences alters and transforms the language used within it.

For example, sign language in the Deaf (Big D) community assumes relevancy and stature over spoken English. In the hearing (Big D) community, communication in English is valued by Deaf people for the access it affords them to the larger community. In People of the Eye, McKee’s book of collected narratives from the New Zealand Deaf community, the author suggests that:

> Frustrations expressed in the stories recorded here tend to focus not the deprivation of sound but on problematic interactions with hearing people resulting from differences in language, behaviour and outlook. (McKee, 2001, p. 19)

Little d discourse also presents itself in appropriate formations. Beyond the level of the sentence, at discourse level, Gee suggested textual form can be described in terms of units of production (1986). He suggested that discourse is organised in lines, stanzas and sections of text. The basic structure of a line is an idea unit. The idea unit, first conceptualised by Chafe (1980), is described by Gee as “analogous to the single focus of the eye as it scans a scene through many rapid focuses” (1996). Frequently an idea unit is expressed in speech in the form of a simple clause, but its clausal structure is not the limiting factor. Each idea unit conveys a new piece of information. When idea units are stripped of false starts, pauses and repairs, Gee suggest an “ideal text” emerges from which lines, strophes, stanzas,
and sections can be identified (1986). In narratives, lines are grouped into stanzas, based on their semantic and syntactic compatibility and the flow the narrative. Similarly, stanzas which exhibit the same theme and characters are grouped into sections. The sections combine to form a complete narrative. The units of production are described in more detail in the following section.

2.2.2.2 Gee’s Units of Production

Individual units have one new piece of information towards the end of the unit, signalling a new idea unit is to follow (1986, p. 394). In the process of narration, one unit builds on the last, so each unit contains an old, or given agent, plus new information that progresses the story.

Lines have structural properties. Lines can be identified by their relatively short length, often commencing with “and”. Lines often terminate with a pause, a lengthening of a syllable or other audible phenomenon. Lines also will usually exhibit a semantic and syntactic parallelism with the lines in close proximity. Lines exhibit integrity both in their internal and external structure by internally providing a complete thought and externally providing temporal and semantic juncture with adjacent lines.

Gee also discussed the notion of non-narrative lines. Non-narrative lines can appear as summary lines, or can offer a comment, description or evaluation from a position outside the storyline. They often are not strictly in keeping with the prosody displayed in narrative lines. Gee suggested that non-narrative text lines and stanzas (see below) display different syntactic features and often do not “fit” as neatly within the line and stanza structural template. The non-narrative inclusions are usually prosaic, as they lack the structural parallelism inherent in
prosodic stanzas. These non-narrative segments can be regarded as similar to the evaluative function L&W identified in their structural analysis (1967).

When there is a little hesitation between lines Gee suggested a stanza structure emerges. The stanza is the pivotal structure of the Gee taxonomy of narrative. Stanzas are the primary vehicle to move discourse beyond being a mere syntactic construction. In Gee’s words, “It is with stanzas that discourse takes its most definitive step beyond syntax” (1986, p. 409). Stanzas provide the convergent structure between line and sections of a story, giving shape and character to create the narrative: “These lines sound as if they go together, by tending to be said with the same rate and with little hesitation between the lines” (1986, p. 396).

Stanzas exhibit structure and pattern, often not unlike poetry stanzas, or verse. In Gee’s analysis of the oral language of a young girl from an orally based cultural heritage, he remarked on a pattern of both semantic and prosodic cohesion. Gee described lines as having a parallel structure. By way of example, Gee quoted part of her story (1986, p.397):

```
an’ my mother’s bakin a cake
an’ I went up my grandmother’s house while my mother’s bakin’ a cake
an’ my mother was bakin’ a cheese cake
my grandmother was bakin’ a whipped cream cup cakes
```

Gee identified and quantified prosodic and temporal markers that appear to be naturally occurring in her story. Both the repeated ending of each line in the word “cake” and the lyrical quality of an aabb delivery in speech and subject (lines one and three pertain to “mother” and lines two and four to “grandmother”) display a natural rhythm as they carry the story forward. The apparent natural emergence
of prosodic composition in oral narratives will be discussed in more detail in the next section.

The largest unit of production in Gee’s schemata is the section. Sections display consistent themes or locations, thus providing a means of accommodating transition within the narrative. Sections are the equivalent of episodes or complicating action segments (L & W, 1967). Sections do not permit changes of time, place or characters, and each section tends to exhibit an internal parallelism in both meaning and prosody. They frequently start with hesitations or a false start and often end with a summary of the preceding action.

2.2.2.3 Prosody in Narratives

Minami and McCabe (1991) applied Gee’s unit analysis model to oral Japanese children’s stories. Their findings revealed discernible and succinct stanzas, of three lines in length and rendered in groups of three. Their investigation further noted the regularity of syllable patterning and regular prosody throughout the oral presentation.

Minami and McCabe’s research also argued that Japanese narrative discourse adhered to a Labovian pattern of orientation, complicating action and an outcome, each segment usually articulated in a single line. This is a significant finding because the same two narrative approaches have been applied to the same narratives in a similar fashion undertaken here with a visual language.

Hymes (1981) found that the heuristic of stanza and verse fitted the oral production of North American Indians (1981). North American Indian narratives are unwritten and have been overlooked by researchers for that reason. He argued
that narratives originating in an oral culture are often only examined in translation and not in their original form (1981). Hymes suggested that the “verbal art” (1981, p. 5) recreated in oral narratives is too often subjected to a syntactic structure that does not reflect its poetic and historical value.

Ong (1982) pointed out that prosodic structures and temporal markers are hallmarks of oral language. Because there is no written code, words have no independent existence. Ong proposed that because in oral culture “there are occurrences, events” (1982, p. 31), oral language therefore must perform the function of generating knowledge and history. This creates the need for a good memory as there is no written record to which reference can be made. Ong suggested that “mnemonic needs determine even syntax” (1982, p. 34). He suggested that this explains the patterning, prosody and temporal marking that are characteristics of oral language.

2.2.2.4 Pausal Patterning in Narratives

Another form of patterning, or narrative structuring, was also investigated by Gee. Working with a story narrated in ASL, Gee and Kegl (1983) found that the pauses, the short time lapses in the narrative, were significant and informative, and performed an integral function in narrative structure. By analysing the story’s formation based on the pausal structure, they discovered that pauses marked the shift from one functional division to another within the narrative. Furthermore, Gee argued that the pause structure of a narrative mirrors overall story structure. He demonstrated this by the construction of a hierarchical pause tree that can represent the narrative structure of the text (1983). The application of Gee’s template to the NZSL narratives in this study and can be found in Chapter Four, Figures 5 and 7.
A pausal analysis was undertaken by Wilson with the ASL narrative, the *Tobacco Story* (1966), that was discussed above with reference to Labov, but with a different result than that of Gee and Kegl (1966). Her investigation concluded that pauses, as Gee defined them, appear to be significant only at the beginning, middle and end of the narrative. Wilson concluded that other lengthy pauses in the story did not appear to be indicative of narrative divisions (1966, p. 167). Instead a distinctive ASL feature appeared to be associated with the pauses.

Wilson found that the pauses were frequently used to indicate either the beginning of a reference shift (Bahan & Supalla, 1995) or to mark constructed dialogue (Metzger, 1995) rather than to indicate a narrative boundary. In one instance, pauses occurred at the end of every line, in the middle of an episode, and thus were clearly not marking narrative segmentation (Wilson, 1966, p. 167).

2.2.2.5 Discourse marking in Narratives

As Gee extended his narrative investigations into other languages he made this comment, “English is particularly impoverished in discourse particles and other formal discourse markers and some other languages are rich in them” (1986, p. 392).

Shiffrin (1994) argued that discourse markers are multi-functional, rather than syntactic or structural. Her premise is that the primary function of discourse markers is to join sequences and provide coherence within the narrative. Two of the most common in English are “and” and “and then”.

Metzger (2001) reported an equivalent sequential and cohesive function being carried out by a single sign/word in an ASL narrative. In a narrative about the
Oklahoma city bombing, she reported the use of the ASL sign FINE to separate events and to connect the sequence of events (2001, p. 132).

Schiffrin and Metzger share the view that language is behaviour based. Schiffrin argued that all utterances are products of behaviour (Schiffrin, 1994) and Metzger and Bahan stated that “language is the behaviour through which people communicate” (Metzger & Bahan, 2001, p. 115). This coincides with the dynamics of speech communities: behavioural norms influence lexical and productive features in narrative production.

Deaf sign language users universally, including NZSL users, are a linguistic minority, required to understand and perform their everyday tasks in interaction with non-Deaf people in a spoken and aural language that they may not be able to fully reproduce. The dominance of the spoken language community that surrounds them is unavoidable for most Deaf people. Within Deaf Discourses, there will be interference and influence from the dominant language that surrounds them. Personal signed narratives often focus on aspects of the interplay of Deaf and Hearing Discourse. There are many published accounts of the linguistic confusion encountered by Deaf children in hearing schools (McKee, 2001; Taylor & Bishop, 1991) and by Deaf adults in a variety of settings (Padden & Humphries 2005; 1998). There is also a considerable catalogue of videotaped discourse recorded by New Zealand Deaf people detailing personal experiences when communicating outside Deaf Discourse. This substantial library of visual accounts is referred to in Chapter One.
2.2.3 **Summary**

This section has focussed primarily on the theoretical framework and the tools of inquiry proposed by Gee. The Big D Discourse and little d discourse theoretical model has provided the framework in which the literature review in this section has been situated.

Big D Discourse provides a comprehensive framework within which sociolinguistic aspects of narrative production have been situated. The Big D/little d discourse model moves narrative analysis beyond syntactical linguistic investigation and allows for consideration of other factors, which Gee subsequently investigated, such as prosody, pausing and semantic parallelism to become transparent (1986, p. 408).

2.3 **Other Research on ASL Discourse**

Besides studies into signed narratives that have followed Labov and Gee, there have also been other studies that have focused on other aspects of signed language discourse, including narratives. Since these studies may be relevant to the narratives considered in this research study they will be briefly summarized here.

2.3.1 **Early Research**

One of the earliest empirical studies into sign language discourse investigated the conversational contract in ASL (Wilbur & Petitto, 1983). Although not strictly exploring narrative discourse, Wilbur & Petitto’s quantitative analysis of interactive communication noted that the terminators in conversations employed both oral and visual constituents. This might be equated to the coda found in
personal narratives, since both forms serve the same function. Wilbur and Pettito reported that termination in signed conversation was signalled by the dropping of the hands in 77% of the sample (1983, p. 235). This will be discussed in later chapters.

Prinz and Prinz (1985) also studied the development of conversational conventions in profoundly deaf children who were being educated in a residential school for the deaf. Their investigation concluded that 82% of the children aged 9–11 were demonstrating the same degree of communicative competency that the adult deaf signers exhibited in Wilbur and Pettito’s study (1985, p. 16).

2.3.2 More Recent Research

In the previous sections on Labov and Gee, Wilson’s analysis of Tobacco Story has been discussed. Besides looking at it from the perspectives of Labov and Gee, Wilson (1966) also considered the unique resources that a signed language brings to narrative. One of her main observations, for example, is that orientation in the story was indicated by the absence of non-manual features, such as facial expressions, pantomimic delivery or deliberate gesture. However, the other segments of the narrative, the complicating action and evaluation, employed the “full range” (1966, p. 160) of ASL linguistic resources, but the orientation lacked aspectual inflection or characterisation.

Wilson’s observation supports Schiffrin’s argument that different kinds of information are articulated by choosing different linguistic components (1994, p. 284). In the ASL story, the orientation was conveyed without aspectual inflection or characterisation, yet the complicating action and resolution resonated with them. The employment of facial expression, pantomime, role play and constructed
dialogue are prominent features of both the complicating action and the narrative’s resolution (Metzger, 1995; Tannen, 1989).

Winston (1991) extended the construction paradigm further. She suggested that constructed dialogue and constructed action can be used in parallel formation with each other in ASL. Constructed action, often referred to as role play, can be assumed and played out by the narrator while simultaneously transmitting information or actions emanating from the character role he has assumed. Winston (1991) termed the dynamic interaction of the two strategies as action performative. By exploiting the simultaneity afforded in signed narrative, action performatives effectively engage the audience with both the action and the actor directly and instantaneously. The use of action performatives in the NZSL narratives examined in this research will be discussed at some length in later chapters.

More recent research has focussed on visual narratives and the utilisation of the spatial and morphological resources in ASL. Metzger’s research work describes the role play, role shift and the change of narrators within a story (1995). She concluded that ASL narrative employs the same linguistic construction that Tannen described in spoken discourse as constructed dialogue (1989). Metzger’s argument is that constructed dialogue is often conveyed in ASL as constructed action and that the range of forms in which the action is articulated is complex and varied. At one extreme, direct action is presented in constructed mime and pantomime through eye gaze and role shift with the limited use of lexical sign: the other extreme, indirect action, is marked by less body movement, less commentary and using more formal sign language forms (1995).
Liddell (2003) offers a broader perspective. He suggested that rather than seeing the gestural and non-verbal aspect of sign language as the feature that sets it apart, he proposed an approach in which sign language can offer insight into the gestural dimensions of all languages (2003). Liddell’s proposal complements the work of Goldin-Meadow, who investigated the field of hearing gesture, and how hand movements help to convey thought (Goldin-Meadow, 2003). She reported that Deaf children who have not had access to sign language use iconic and pointing gestures in the same way that hearing children do before the emergence of speech. These gestures resemble conventional sign but lack the structure of language. Yet even without sign language input, and left to their own devices, Deaf children play with signs in a comparable way that hearing children play with sounds (2003, p. 213). Goldin-Meadow’s findings validate Lane’s observation that Deaf youngsters at boarding school engage in “recounting in ASL the idiosyncratic mannerisms of hearing teachers” (Lane, et al., 1996, p. 153) as a means of exploring the language and learning the skill of storytelling. Their narratives develop parody and pantomime before the emergence of sophisticated linguistic accuracy.

Maxwell (1990) makes the point that narratives often appear incomprehensible to hearing adults. In her exploration of ASL visual narratives, Maxwell set out to discover the organisation of the visual images and scenarios produced by both Deaf children and Deaf adult narratives. Maxwell concluded that the basis of visual-centred narrative is not related to first or second language acquisition. She reported that children who are deaf develop what she terms “an organisational principle based on visual array” (1990, p. 227). As most of the research into sign language focuses on people who sign, Maxwell suggested that: “it may well be that many deaf children who do not sign (even those whose communication is
primarily in speech) also use visual organisational principles” (1990, p. 227). Other research findings support the notion that visual organisation is a key foundational aspect of signed narrative discourse.

Rayman concluded that “deaf people may be more visually orientated because of the way they experience the world” (1999, p. 80). She compared the structure of the same story told in English and ASL in order to discover how a visual linguistic modality influenced the shaping of the same information. She examined role shift, role play and characterisation as demonstrated in the ASL version.

Rayman found that even though the spoken English narrative rendered by an accomplished actress was entertaining, “she did not come close to the ways in which the Deaf storytellers embodied the facial expressions of the character in their role shifts” (1999, p. 79). Her conclusion reinforces Maxwell’s hypothesis that the reliance on a world that is visually organised may encourage and promote visual clarity and depth in storytelling (Maxwell, 1990). The narrative portrayal of the narrator’s visual organisation is implemented by use of the narrator eye gaze.

2.3.2.1  *The Role of Eye Gaze*

Eye gaze plays a pivotal role in narrative production and progression. Lane et al. (1996) suggested that eye gaze is a part of the grammar of ASL. With some signs, the eye gaze will indicate the direction of the action displayed in the manual sign. In other situations, eye gaze may modify the meaning of a sign. For example, a very young child will be signed as CHILD and eye gaze will be directed nearer to ground level to encourage the audience to envisage a young child. Lane et al. also described the use of an eye blink as a means of detailing the proximity or distance in association with a sign. (1996, pp. 92-93). As further evidence of the crucial role
of eye gaze, Lane et al. noted that a partial eye blink can often be used to indicate the degree of pain or discomfort accompanying an appropriate manual sign. Eye gaze can provide clarity as to the logic of sign placement, or instigate role shift. A narrowed eye is often used to create a sense of “far away” or distance from the narrator.

In narrative discourse, eye gaze linked to an individual sign can be used to accomplish a variety of other tasks. First, it can be used for emphasis, in order to direct audience attention to a designated aspect of the story. Alternatively, eye gaze indicates a pronominal reference within the signing space, a crucial feature of sign language discussed later in Chapter Three of this paper.

In narratives, eye gaze can also signal a change in the narrator’s role. As discussed earlier, in spoken language voice inflections can often indicate a change of speaker (Labov, 1972a). In storytelling eye gaze can be the primary indicator that the narrator is now another character. As Lane explained, “Shifting eye-gaze allows the storyteller to move rapidly between the narrator’s perspective and direct depiction of events through the eyes of a character” (1996, p. 93).

As will be seen later in this thesis, this strategy is frequently exploited in the narratives investigated in this research. The eye gaze “can stand in for the pointing finger” (Lane, et al., 1996, p. 93). The narrator can shift both the narration and the action between the narrator and the actor. The deliberate employment of eye gaze is the key to creating action performatives (Winston, 1991), a sign language construction discussed in more detail later in this chapter.
Lane et al., further asserted that “a kind of rhythm of the sort used in ASL poetry” can be achieved with eye-gaze (1996, p. 93). He suggested that the shifting of eye gaze from audience, to the character, and back to the narrator’s hands creates a poetic rhythm that emulates signed poetry. This supports Gee’s notion that prosodic patterning is a feature of narratives emanating from oral cultures (1986, p. 394). This will be explored in more detail later in the Discussion in Chapter Five.

It should be noted, however, that the visual is not completely ignored in spoken language narratives.

2.3.2.2  **Focalisation**

Focalisation offers a visual model to represent the elements present in storytelling and perhaps can offer a perspective on signed narrative construction. Focalisation suggests that the narrative has a “point of view” which is distinct and independent of the narrator. Cohan and Shires (1988) described the manner in which the narrator creates a vantage point which orientates, and subsequently dictates, the structure and temporality of the story about to be told. To illustrate this point, they use the analogy of a movie camera as the narrator of the story.

Every story must have a setting, a time and place from which the story is being told. This is analogous to the camera, which is set up strategically to capture the best “view” of the action from the vantage point of the narrator. The camera has a physical location, from which the camera angle, the lighting and peripheral visual factors are set into a frame before filming the action begins. This is the equivalent function of the orientation segment in the Labov taxonomy. Having established the vantage point of the story, the camera operator or the narrator must capture
and relay a series of logical and significant images or events in order to engage the observer. Throughout the action sequences (the complicating action in Labov’s terms) it is possible either to suspend evaluation or to superimpose evaluation by manipulating other means of communication that are available in a visual medium. Thus, evaluation can be concurrent with or subsequent to the action, allowing the audience to assess the worthiness of the narrative. Action appropriate to resolution is then presented, and observers are left feeling that the dilemma has been resolved and they is back in the present time as the film is terminated.

The camera operator in this analogy shares common ground with a sign language storyteller. However, as has been discussed, the visual aspect of signed narratives does more than merely create perspective. The direction of the eye gaze in storytelling assumes a more crucial role than simply engage the audience. Eye gaze in sign language directs the audience to the narrator’s focal point at any given time in the storytelling process and can signal a change in character, place, and intensity.

These studies that suggest that while spoken language narrative research has much to offer, research into signed language narratives must also consider the unique features that the difference in modality brings to signed narratives.
2.4 Chapter Summary

This chapter has reviewed three main fields of study.

The two methodological approaches of Labov and Gee have been reviewed. Relevant research outcomes in signed language narratives based on both approaches have been summarised. The significance of prosody and pausing in oral and visual narratives have been explored and compared to spoken English equivalencies. The role of discourse marking and the inclusion of non-narrative lines have been explored in relation to the work of the Gee’s narrative methodology. The deployment of discourse markers in narrative delivery has also been briefly discussed. Finally, other research into the discourse of signed language narratives has been summarized. The role of eye gaze in particular has been discussed.

2.5 The Basis of the Current Study

This exploratory study employs two divergent approaches to narrative discourse in order to situate NZSL narratives within current sign language research inquiry.

Labov’s narrative taxonomy is based on vernacular storytelling (1967, p. 12). The NZSL narratives analysed here are presented in what Deaf people themselves have determined is the most natural language of their Deaf community. The narratives are collected from within their own speech community in their own Deaf territory (McKee, 2001, p. 35). Labov’s six taxonomic divisions will be applied to NZSL narratives.
Gee has applied his methodology to oral narratives and a signed language narrative, thus suggesting its suitability as a tool of inquiry into other non-verbal language. Gee’s Big D Discourse and little d discourse model (1986, 1989; 1983) provides a template that can accommodate the linguistic features of a non-verbal Big D Discourse as well as providing a method of examining the little d discourse within it. His seminal work in the prosodic structures present in oral narratives (1986) and his investigation into an ASL narrative (1983) also inform and guide the research that follows.

The initial task of NZSL narrative discourse analysis must begin by attempting to understand both the textual shape and contextual parameters in a visual linguistic modality and the speech community in which it is formulated and articulated. Chapter Three describes the philosophical and historical rationale for deciding to investigate NZSL narratives based on the literature available and described here. The chapter will make reference to the way the two research methodologies provide the platform on which the research is organised. It also enunciates the questions addressed by the research, and describes the process of data selection and data reporting.
CHAPTER THREE - Methodology

3 Introduction

The chapter will set the research stage. by outlining the paradigmatic parameters, the environment in which the data was collected, and introduce the raw data. The chapter will also state the research questions and explain the processes undertaken to answer them.

Section 3.1 describes the background and rationale for undertaking the study. Sub-section 3.1.1 describes the research paradigms that guided the research. Sub-section 3.1.2 sets out the research questions that the study attempts to answer.

Section 3.2 describes the environment and context in which the study was conducted, with particular emphasis on describing the New Zealand Sign Language speech community in sub-section 3.2.1.

Section 3.3 describes the data collection procedures in sub-section 3.3.1. Sub-section 3.3.2 describes the larger data sample from which the two narratives have been selected.

Section 3.4 describes data recording and discusses the issues raised by the process of transcription (sub-section 3.4.1) and of translation (sub-section 3.4.2).

Section 3.5 describes the application of Labov’s taxonomy and Gee’s units of production, stanza prosody and pausal structure to the NZSL data.
3.1 Setting the Research Stage

The study of sign languages is a very recent development in the field of linguistics. Prior to the publication of Stokoe’s work, sign language was believed to be a gestural communicative system valuable only within narrow parameters. The accepted view was that sign language was related to, and dependent on, its surrounding spoken language. The publication of *The ASL Dictionary* in 1965 was the breakthrough that established the independence of signed languages from spoken languages. In 1992, in the preface to *The Dictionary of British Sign Language/English (BSL)* credit is given to the ASL Dictionary for its role in establishing sign lexicography: "It provided a means to view signs as linguistic phenomena rather than as a characteristic of Deaf people which served only to confirm the severity of their disability" (Brien, 1992, p. [x]).

Research inquiries into sign languages to date have pursued two different directions: linguistic analysis on the one hand, and, on the other, exploring the character of Deaf communities. The in-depth analyses of ASL (Klima & Bellugi, 1979) and the detailed grammatical explorations of BSL (Kyle & Woll, 1989, 1983) laid the foundations for academic inquiry to be expanded into textual analysis.

The linguistic inquiry into sign languages is still in its infancy. Wolfram stated in the Foreword to *The Sociolinguistics of Sign Languages*:

> While there is still a paucity of research on the full range of discourse topics, we have seen an encouraging burst of activity on the discourse of sign languages in the last decade. This trend bodes well for the future of discourse analysis in the study of sign languages. (Lucas, 2001, p. xv)
In New Zealand, sign language inquiry has followed the same progression as ASL and BSL inquiry (Monaghan, 1996). NZSL linguistic groundwork is largely credited to Collin-Ahlgren’s PhD dissertation on *Aspects of New Zealand Sign Language* (1989). Collins-Ahlgren studied and documented the vocabulary, grammar and morphology of NZSL by studying the language of the Deaf community in the Wellington area. She employed the template proposed by Stokoe in his work with ASL.

Collins-Ahlgren found a cohesive and proud Deaf community that was conversing in a national sign language. She noted that the community had little in common with the English-based speech community in which it is situated, but a close affinity with other signing communities from which it was geographically isolated.

Monaghan (1996, p. 419) confirmed this finding in her thesis detailing the historical development of NZSL. Her doctoral dissertation entitled *Signing, oralism and the development of the New Zealand Deaf community* (1996) provides a comprehensive history of New Zealand Sign Language.

Collins-Ahlgren and Monaghan’s work is significant for two reasons. First, as with the development of academic inquiry into ASL and BSL, detailed linguistic analysis is essential foundational work on which to build further investigation into NZSL. Secondly, as Monaghan stated in her thesis, “the patterns of these [ASL and BSL] communities and the New Zealand Deaf community are remarkably similar” (Monaghan, 1996, p. 61).
This is an important discovery. The similarities between the American and New Zealand signing communities meant that the advanced status of ASL epistemology could be used as a reliable historical and methodological guide to NZSL study. *A Dictionary of New Zealand Sign Language* (Kennedy, 2002) published by the team at the Deaf Studies Research Unit (DSRU) established in 1995, at Victoria University, Wellington. As with the American and British Sign languages, publication of the dictionary, establishing New Zealand Sign Language as an independent fully formed language was the necessary precursor to legal recognition.

Linguistic features of conversational discourse have much in common with the characteristics of narrative discourse. The thesis will be informed and guided by ASL research data gathered from the investigation into both conversational and narrative discourse.

Story telling is an activity found in most established Deaf communities (Eastman, 1980). As described earlier in this paper, storytelling competitions are now an eagerly anticipated event at Deaf clubs in New Zealand (see Figure 1). These competitive evenings are a feature of American Deaf culture and are now replicated here, due to the initiative of a Deaf American who immigrated to New Zealand in the 1990’s. Given the growing tradition of storytelling in sign language communities, the study of sign language discourse fittingly begins with narratives.

To date, only one major collection of Deaf narratives has been published in written form. A compilation of New Zealand authored stories has been translated and published in *People of the Eye: Stories from the Deaf World* (McKee, 2001). The 16
personal narratives, as told by Deaf community members, afford a rare glimpse into their experience of the educational and social conditions of New Zealand over the last 100 years.

This project will look at the way that two representative narratives are organised by storytellers from the NZSL community. The grounds for pursuing such a project are three-fold. First, knowledge about the narrative structure of NZSL narratives will create greater understanding about NZSL as the indigenous sign language of New Zealand. Secondly, it is hoped that this introductory project will stimulate interest from a variety of academic disciplines to consider adding to our understanding of New Zealand’s third official language. Thirdly, as has been suggested by Liddell (2003), sign language research as a field of study can also offer greater awareness into the gestural dimensions of all languages.

3.1.1 **The Research Paradigms**

This project investigates the applicability of two methodological approaches to narrative construction as proposed by Labov (1967) and Gee (1986, 2005, 1983).

The study adopts a sociolinguistic perspective drawing on the process models established by Labov’s structural taxonomy (2003, 1967) and by Gee’s units of production, stanza prosody and pausing analysis (1989a, 1989b, 2005, 1983, 1986). Analysing the data using two diverse perspectives offers the opportunity to report both qualitative and quantitative findings from the data.

The two paradigms represent two divergent methodologies. Labov started from the clausal categorisation; Gee started by identifying the arrangement of idea units into stanzas and sections. Labov’s six structural components describe a pattern of
narrative formation that is based on clausal structures (Labov & Waletzky, 1967). Gee argued that ideas, expressed in lines, stanzas, and sections are the units of narrative production (1986). Gee also investigated the pause structure of an ASL narrative (1983). His investigations led him to suggest that a hierarchical analysis of pause structure within a story will imitate the overt narrative structure of the text (1983, p. 256). The congruent and the contrasting features of Labov’s taxonomy and Gee’s pause analysis findings will be examined in relation to the two NZSL narratives.

A similar research project has been completed with an ASL narrative Tobacco Story (Wilson, 1966) in the United States. Wilson’s objective was to discover whether these approaches would work with a non-verbal language. She applied both Labov’s taxonomy and Gee’s notion of stanza units based on prosody and pausing. Wilson found that the ASL narrative contained Labov’s narrative divisions with the exception of an abstract. Further, she observed that evaluative statements tended to be embedded in the complicating action (1966). She concluded that the ASL narrative exhibited an internal structure that broadly corresponded to textual divisions suggested by both Labov and Gee. She also discussed a unique ASL linguistic strategy she observed called constructed dialogue (Metzger, 1995). This linguistic construction, which enacts the switching of speakers or protagonists, is a unique linguistic technique in signed discourse. Wilson concluded that constructed dialogue as it is employed in storytelling should be a key consideration when analysing narratives in ASL (1966, p. 175).

This project will apply both the Labov and Gee approaches taxonomies to two NZSL narratives, in a manner that closely resembles the ASL Tobacco Story methodology. In addition, this project will replicate the hierarchical pause tree
structure that Gee devised (1983, p. 248) as a means of exhibiting the relationship between pausing structure and over-all narrative structure. Finally, Gee’s pause structure and Labov’s taxonomy will be compared across the NZSL narrative data.

3.1.2 The Research Questions

This study was guided by the process undertaken with an ASL narrative and described in an earlier section (Wilson, 1966). The research posed the following four questions:

1. To what extent do the features of NZSL narratives reflect Labov’s analytical framework?

2. To what extent do NZSL narratives replicate Gee’s units of production?

3. To what extent does the analysis of pausing indicate the textual boundaries in NZSL narratives?

4. To what degree does the pause analysis replicate Labov’s structural analysis discovered in question one?

The first question addresses the applicability of Labov’s structural methodology to two unrehearsed narratives, one articulated in a code-mix narrative, referred to as Signs Supporting English (SSE) and one delivered in fluent NZSL.
The second question examines the role and significance of structural parallelism and prosody in determining lines and stanzas in an SSE narrative and in a fluent NZSL narrative.

The third question is answered by the creation of hierarchal pause tree structures for both the SSE narrative and the NZSL narrative.

The fourth question seeks to combine the approaches of Labov and Gee by overlaying the Labov taxonomy onto the hierarchal pause structure tree proposed by Gee.

3.2 The Context of the Study

The narratives from which the two exemplary narratives were drawn were collected at a local Deaf club celebration. The age of the participants ranged from 25 – 66 years of age. Six of the participants were male, six were female. They are all known to each other, many having a long association with each other dating back to school days. The narrators most often told stories about events in which Deaf people who were present at the Deaf club were involved.

All the participants were educated in mainstream schools, when oralism was the dominant philosophy and sign language was not permitted. Only two of them, both competent NZSL users, achieved a tertiary level qualification. Some of the stories in the larger sample were delivered by adults who completed their schooling at the Van Asch Deaf Education Centre in Christchurch. and thus had adolescent exposure to some manual communication in the form of Total Communication (TC). The impact of oralism and the introduction of TC in New Zealand will be discussed in the following section.
The two narrators chosen for in-depth study are Participant A and Participant E (see Appendix B). The backgrounds of the two participants are described in more detail in the introduction to their narratives in Chapter Four.

The narratives emanate from a distinct speech community, which has developed because of its unusual position within a larger speaking community. This speech community has particular features that impact on narrative discourse production. The next section will take a closer look at the speech community in which NZSL narratives are formulated and articulated.

### 3.2.1 The New Zealand Sign Language Speech Community

Learning their natural language as a second language, and acquiring it in adolescence or later, is reflected in the manner in which Deaf people’s narratives are formulated and produced. For those who learned and practised sign language at a younger age, the results are remarkably different.

Prinz and Prinz (1985) watched profoundly Deaf children conversing with each other in ASL. The children, aged 3 – 11, had been attending a residential school for the Deaf for at least two consecutive years. The results show that the older the Deaf child, the greater their ability to produce traditional discourse structural features. They were consistently able to introduce, maintain and terminate topics in discourse. Prinz and Prinz commented, “In analyzing the data, it was found that several adult discourse devices were employed by children as young as seven years” (1985, p. 17).

Even though statistically the children were the progeny of hearing parents, the early contact with other signers appears to have enabled them to employ formal
narrative structures and ordering equivalent to skill levels exhibited by hearing children at a similar age. Prinz and Prinz concluded, “The findings of his study suggest that deaf children of hearing parents acquire many of their sign communication discourse skills from their deaf peers and from older deaf children” (1985, p. 17).

Not able to hear everyday talk, and struggling to master a written text in a language in which they have little lexical depth or confidence, Deaf people acquire NZSL through social contact within the “speech” community in which they feel recognised (Gee, 2005). This is contrary to the traditional view of bilingual communities. Rather than depicting a speech community that has linguistic competency in two languages, the New Zealand Sign Language speech community is populated by Deaf people who may not have had previous contact with the pivotal language of the community. The obvious question is why should this be the case? The answer is historical.

In 1880 the International Congress on Education of the Deaf in Milan passed a resolution that attempted to eliminate the use of sign language in education, and promote oralism. Oralism advocated that deaf children be refused access to sign language and be taught to speak and lip-read. This ideology was the prevailing educational approach until the middle of the 20th century (Armstrong, 1999; McKee, 2001). The prevailing philosophy was that signed languages were inferior to spoken language, and that education must not only be “in” spoken language, but it must be “about” making Deaf people speak and write.

For nearly 100 years in New Zealand, until 1979, oralism was the only approved pedagogical means, since signing was regarded as a threat to the acquisition of
both speech and writing, and thought to create an obstacle for Deaf people interacting with mainstream society. In 1979, a Manually Coded English, called either Total Communication (TC) or Australasian Signed English, was introduced. This form of instruction, employing an arbitrary manual sign to accompany each spoken word, was instituted in the three New Zealand residential Deaf schools.

Australasian Signed English or TC are best described as speaking English and manually signing each word on the hands simultaneously. Teachers were expected to speak and sign at the same time. Not only was it impractical, it was indecipherable to most Deaf people:

Signed English lacks the grammatical structures that exist in naturally developed sign languages, which take advantage of space and movement for visual efficiency. In its pure form, Signed English is generally seen by Deaf people as alien (being initiated by hearing people and based on a lexicon of signs adopted from Australia or invented by hearing people) cumbersome to use (being based on English grammar, which doesn’t fit visual modality) and frequently incomprehensible. (McKee, 2001, p. 22)

It soon became clear that TC was not a language and was not providing either linguistic competency, discourse strategies, or an education. It was employed in Deaf educational settings for over 10 years, but never fully adopted by the Deaf community. However, the consequences can be observed in the way in which Deaf people tell their stories. There are older members of the Deaf community who were prohibited from signing in their school years, and the dictum persists in their adulthood. Their signing is frequently accompanied by speech, either audible or by unvoiced English word lip patterning (McKee, 2001).
The English language hegemony demands that Deaf people gain knowledge, if not fluent mastery, of the dominant language. The majority of Deaf people are individuals who are caught in the middle, who do not know a natural sign language, and who are physically unable to master a spoken language. Ann (2002) has researched the effects of this social environment on the Deaf community and makes this observation:

Most deaf people live in societies that are dominated in every aspect by hearing people and their values. That fact that there is such highly sustained contact with spoken languages ensures that most deaf people are bilingual to some extent in a spoken language in some form. (2002, p. 41)

Ann also made the observation that most natural sign language users who have learned some aspects of spoken and written English language may not be considered to be bilingual by the hearing population with whom they interact (2002, p. 42). She did concede that most bilinguals have a dominant and a non-dominant language, and suggested a system of classifying the degree of bilingualism amongst ASL users. Her list includes sign language users who first learned a signed version of a spoken language, as was the case for many members of the New Zealand Deaf speech community today.

Labov suggested that members of bilingual communities will develop varying degrees of communicative competency and linguistic resources. He suggested that members of a bilingual community will develop a linguistic repertoire:

Such repertoires may include a wide range of styles in one language and a narrow range in another. The sum
total of styles and languages occupies a given range of situations or contexts in which the person interacts with others. (2003, p. 236)

In the case of the New Zealand Deaf speech community, a diverse range of knowledge and use of both English and NZSL is apparent. Deaf people historically alternate between using an English-based language and a visual and gestural language (McKee, 2001). It is inevitable that the necessity to switch codes plays a crucial role in the stylistic variations found in NZSL narratives.

The evidence of code-switching is a striking characteristic of the communicative language of Deaf children born to Hearing parents. Ninety percent of Deaf children are born to hearing parents and do not share a language with their families and communities in their formative years. Communication with their parents depended on a home-grown devised system of communication that was neither English nor sign language (McKee, 2001, p. 32). Prinz and Prinz (1990) observed that when there is a common language shared by parent and child, children of Deaf parents exhibit discourse conventions in an equivalent manner to hearing children of hearing parents.

Monaghan made the observation that when Deaf people are together:

Emphasis by the authorities on the importance of spoken English as a tool for operating within hearing society is replaced by a language ideology that emphasizes the affordances of the communication system. People value being able to tell stories, having turn-allocation rules that allows them to address large groups and to convey experiences that are meaningful to them. (Monaghan, 1996, p. 334)
When ASL was formally recognised as a language, Deaf people began to embrace the fact that they were part of a legitimate speech community. They had intuitively known it to be a complete communicative system, but their response is recorded by Tom Humphries in *Signs & Voices*:

Early talk about ASL was an invitation to argument or at least a spirited discussion among Deaf people. Most Deaf people had to have it explained to them that Stokoe had shown that ASL has linguistic structure, just as spoken languages do . . . It’s not that Deaf people had to be told that signs had parts. We can see in creative play with signs, which was a part of Deaf peoples’ lives, that they knew what the parts were and how to manipulate them. This knowledge is evident in such play as the tradition “ABC” stories, which attempted to tell a story by linking the manual alphabet to handshapes that Stokoe was to identify as “cheremes” (the equivalent of phonemes). (Lindgren, DeLuca, & Napoli, 2008, p. 6)

Different genres of stories began to emerge as ASL users began to explore the freedom to use their “natural” language. Humphries goes on:

Deaf people began to perform the language in public. And not just to perform it but also to foreground, highlight and dissect it. The ABC stories, for example, were not inherently self-conscious, meaning they did not call attention to the parts of a language even though the production of them involved a lot of thought about the parts of signs. These ABC stories were rarely performed for anyone other than Deaf people, and they did not say “Look at me, I am showing you my language”. (2008, p. 7)
Discourse analysis needed to recognise and include discourse generated in visual speech communities. In 1979 the authoritative journal *Discourse Processes* published an article by Erting and Woodward which suggested that:

> . . . theories of language have to be developed from observation of languages in different modalities because of the possibility of a great influence of channel on code form. (Erting & Woodward, 1979, p. 297)

Peter’s (2000) book, *Deaf American Literature: from Carnival to the Canon*, suggests that carnival discourse is a valid archetype for looking at Deaf discourse. Members of an oral culture are required to meet and interact face-to-face as happens at carnival time. Carnival time means a break from school or work in the hearing world. The carnival atmosphere gives licence to act and communicate without formal structure and literature. The occasion provides a time to laugh and make fun of mainstream society.

When people are communicating in sign language, the whole body of the participants is involved in the communication, and it becomes a spectacle. To a hearing eye, Deaf people telling a story can appear exaggerated and intense, lacking the restraint and formality that characterises some spoken narratives. The spectacular nature of sign language storytelling is an integral part of language fluency and narrative expertise, a skill honed from an early age in Deaf children, and highly valued in Deaf adult signers and storytellers.

Residential schools and Deaf clubs provide the incubation and the practice for NZSL narratives. They provide a safe environment where Deaf people meet and
communicate in their preferred language. Deaf people can indulge one of their favoured activities, storytelling, without the constraints of the speech community that surrounds them and without being judged by hearing peers (Monaghan, 1996). In a Deaf environment, where the dominant language is NZSL, there is no linguistic or structural model that predetermines what is the acceptable style of narrative production. Narratives are one of the vehicles they use to express themselves and build their communal Big D Discourse. The Big D Discourse is created by the telling and re-telling of shared personal experiences in their interaction with each other and the Hearing world. For the Deaf community, as with other oral cultures, traditions, historical events, and attitudes are passed down through the building of a repertoire of stories. The Big D Discourse builds and informs the notion of what the Discourse defines as “being a Deaf person” (Gee, 2005, p. 37). The speech community is populated by those who recognize and embrace their identity as being a Deaf person.

The next section will detail the procedures within the NZSL speech community that dictated the collection and recording of the data for this study.

3.3 The Data Collection Procedures

The following two sub-sections describe the process of data collection, and general characteristics of the data sample.

3.3.1 Data Collection

All the participants in the data sample were volunteers. They were present at a Deaf club for social reasons, and prior to the event, they were not aware that they might be asked to share a story. The request for their participation was prefaced
by being informed that it might form part of this research project and that their video-recorded story would only be viewed by me and two bilingual research assistants who would be able corroborate the accuracy of the translation. Details about the two participants whose narratives were selected for this study are included in Chapter Four at the beginnings of the respective sections that examine their narratives.

Fifteen different stories and 12 different storytellers were videotaped at the local Deaf club rooms in Dunedin, New Zealand. The total videotape recording time was one hour and ten minutes. One further story was subsequently recorded at a different venue. From this data sample of fifteen stories, six were selected and subsequently glossed and translated into informal written English. The selection criteria are described in Section 3.3.2.

The filming took place at the local Deaf club during the 50th Otago Deaf Society anniversary celebrations. A large number of Deaf people were present at the time of filming, but not as a formal audience for the storytelling activity. The narrators positioned themselves in front of a stationary video camera. Consequently the eye gaze in the initial frames of the recorded narrative was directed toward the camera. The stories were told from the same location on the stage at one end of the room. It should be pointed out that mounting a stage is a normal precursor to communicating with a group of Deaf people in a Deaf environment. Assuming an elevated position for the signer attracts the attention of the audience and enhances visibility. Furthermore, the presence of a video camera is not unusual in Deaf gatherings. Video recording is ubiquitous in Deaf clubs now, as Deaf people can create a permanent record of events, replicating the function of written language in hearing gatherings (Lucas, 2001, p. 21). Being recorded is commonplace in Deaf
gatherings and it is not likely to have interfered with the linguistic choices of the narrator.

The stories were solicited by asking the question: “Would you like to tell us a story about one of your favourite memories?” The stories were recollections of personal experiences and were being signed to a fluctuating number of spectators. Other conversations and activities were taking place at the same time as the filming.

All the narratives were recorded consecutively and on the same video camera. The video camera was manned by a hearing person, an individual who was not personally involved with the project and who did not interact with the participants.

From this data sample, two of the narratives were selected as representative of the linguistic variations as assessed for NZSL fluency by two Deaf bilingual assistants who were not contributors to the data sample.

None of the stories was edited, corrected or revised after the initial recording. No direction or prompting was offered, and no constraints imposed as to subject matter, signing style or narrative length. For example, in one of the narratives, the narrator stops telling her story to make sure that her drink is not confiscated from a table near the stage. The general atmosphere was relaxed and unstructured.

3.3.2 Data Distribution

From the raw data, the 15 narratives were mapped along a continuum from the “least fluent” NZSL presentation to the “most fluent” NZSL production. The
extremes of the continuum represent communication modes from Signed English manual communication to NZSL fluency. The continuum can be found in Appendix B.

NZSL fluency was assessed by two bilingual Deaf people and one bilingual hearing person. Six narratives from the continuum were then selected based on their position on the continuum. The intention was to analyse narratives that appeared at different points on the continuum to allow for the linguistic variations naturally present in the local Deaf community. The six narratives were transcribed and translated into informal written English. The written English translations were validated by a bilingual Deaf assistant.

The six unrehearsed narrators were identified as Participants A through F. A continuum was created to display the range of vernacular NZSL from which selection could be made. Their predisposition to employing voiced speech, Signs Supporting English (SSE) or fluent NZSL were the criteria employed to determine their location on the data sample continuum. The continuum is presented in Appendix B.

Participants A and B used a Signed English communication system, simultaneously using unvoiced English lip-patterning corresponding with manual signs. Participants C and D used audible English and gestural movements in their storytelling. By contrast, Participants E and F are fluent NZSL signers and would seldom use voiced communication or finger-spelling in their communication. The narratives delivered by Participant A and Participant E were selected for in-depth analysis, as they appeared to represent the range of NZSL employed within the data sample.
There are significant issues to be dealt with in preserving semantic accuracy without compromising the raw textual form and structure. The next section describes the issues of recording, translating and transcribing the raw data.

3.4 Data Recording

The analysis of the data required the results to be documented in written English from raw data presented in NZSL. Altering the modality of the data from visual and gestural to written English raises the problem of preserving both the semantics and the integrity of the original narrative. The complexities of transcription and translation are discussed in the following sections.

3.4.1 Transcription

Transcription is normally understood to be the process of recording spoken data as written data within the confines of one language. This is more straightforward when the language is the same, or if the two languages exist in the same modality. NZSL is transmitted in a visual mode, is unspoken, and has no written form. It was therefore imperative to standardize transcription guidelines and formatting that would preserve as much of the meaning and intent of the signed language without altering its textual shape.

To address this issue the researcher designed a simplistic set of notational conventions so that the structure of the text becomes as transparent as possible. Transcription conventions currently prescribe individual English word glossing to approximate the meaning of the manual signs. For this research project I added a third column in the transcription document to describe the non-lexical features of the individual sign or word utterances. In this way, the salient facial expressions,
body movements and positioning are described in written English alongside the English gloss. This strategy for recording visual information is unwieldy and needs to be addressed. A list of the conventions and symbols that have been used in this analysis are to be found in Appendix A.

The three-dimensional realm employed in sign language cannot be fully reproduced in a one-dimensional linear form. The most usual system for sign language transcription adopts a gloss convention. Glosses are the semantic approximations of the signs and do not always provide the flow and grammatical order and coherence that is expected in written English text. Gee uses this technique in his analysis of an ASL narrative (1983) and a short extract of the transcription is reproduced here:

```
UH ME FIND POEM SOMEWHERE FASCINATED MIND-IMPRESS PIERCE IN ME MIND WHEW (1983, p. 244).
```

The glossing is lexically accurate but lacks coherence and meaning. Even if the audience has been orientated to the topic or subject of the discourse, transcription may not be sufficient to decipher the actual message. A further example from Gee illustrates this point:

```
LONG TIME AGO GIRL SMALL DECIDE WALK IN WOODS INTO WOODS SEE HOUSE (1983, p. 251).
```

This is the tale of Goldilocks. Even with that knowledge, the English glosses lack connection and meaning, and the transcription does not capture the essence of the
narrative. Customary practice in English would present a traditional beginning “Once upon a time” or the naming of the protagonist, Goldilocks. Without such indications of the genre and the characters, the narrative loses much of its significance in English.

By definition, narratives involve interactional events, progression of a theme, and variations in pace and intensity. How these constituents are represented in transcription is different for spoken and signed narratives. In spoken narratives, the unfolding of the action is linear and usually structured to have a beginning, middle and end. The characters are identified, usually named, and then subsequently referred to by a pronoun. Voice intonation, pitch, and volume are utilised in oral narratives to convey pace, intensity and to distinguish between characters. In signed narratives, the story unfolds in a visual and gestural modality, and the action unfolds in the signing space. The signing space is the equivalent of the spoken voice: the entire narrative is produced, modulated, given its uniqueness and meaning by signing space manipulation.

3.4.1  The Signing Space

The signing space resembles a spherical area centring on the face. (see Figure 2). The manual configurations are produced in this space. The non-manual features, including facial grammar, are also produced in this space (Lane, et al., 1996, p. 91). The “intonation” of the narrator and emotive aspects of the action are conveyed by the speed and direction of the movement, and the general demeanour of the signer, as well as manual signs and facial grammar. The signing space indicates the outer framing of signed discourse by setting out the virtual boundaries within which the action, emotion, characterisation and comment are articulated. If the signer moves, turns her shoulders, shifts her feet, or moves her entire body, the
signing space moves with the signer, staying spherical and located in front of them.

Figure 2: The Signing Space
Photo with kind permission of Jolanta Lapiak
(Handspeak.com)
3.4.2 **Translation**

The process of translation presents difficulties for all language researchers. In this study, the processes were further complicated by the change of modality.

The written English translation of the data is presented in Appendices C and E. The written text is taken verbatim from the voice-over interpretation provided by a qualified Sign Language Interpreter. The voice recording was made on the first viewing of the video after the evening at the Deaf club and was not revisited after the initial recording. This was a deliberate strategy in order to preserve the naturalness and flow of the translated narrative and to preclude the temptation to “polish up” or alter the initial English voice-over. The written English text taken directly from the voice-over reflects the casual nature of the occasion and the informal style of delivery.

Translation seeks to produce equivalency of meaning between the source and the target language. The stark difference in modality, physical parameters, and the crucial contribution of non-manual features in NZSL, suggest inherent problems when seeking to approximate meaning while keeping narrative integrity across both languages. Dealing with concepts articulated in space creates particular issues when attempting written translation. One such issue is deixis.

3.4.2.1 **Deixis**

Deictic referencing is a prevalent feature in NZSL. The identification of actors, the location of both action and objects are indicated by placement within specific deictic fields. There are three specific deictic fields that require consideration when
undertaking written translation: personal deixis, spatial deixis, and spatial mapping.

3.4.2.1.i Personal deixis

Personal deixis provides a means to identify characters in discourse. Once identified, they are placed in a prescribed position within the signing space (see Figure 2).

Pronominal referencing is efficiently accommodated in sign language and is translated by an approximate English pronoun (he, we, they, us, etc.). In sign language, pronominal referencing ensures that the actors are unambiguously identified usually by a clear pointing gesture, often with an accompanying direct eye gaze. In written English, pronouns are less precise and have no visual component, thus allowing room for confusion in the translation as to which actor is being referred to.

As the characters are introduced by the narrator, they are assigned a pre-determined place in the signing space, and are subsequently recalled by an eye gaze or an index finger pointing to the assigned location. Non-manual features often are presented simultaneously to further develop the characterisation or the action of the narrative. For example, if the person being indicated is the antagonist in the discourse, an appropriate facial expression may indicate the fact as part of the identification of the actor.

Figure 3 shows a bird’s eye view of the signing space in which the pronominal referencing is performed. By way of explanation, an index finger to the chest (a) would signify, “I or me”; a pointing gesture to the pre-assigned locations of (b)
would indicate “you” singular. If two digits are extended and moved between (a) and (c), this would indicate “me and him”.

3.4.2.1.ii  **Spatial deixis**

Spatial deixis most closely resembles spoken deixis. It can be conveyed by a gesture, an open hand, or index finger point to indicate the previously assigned site of an event, concept or subject. The manner of execution may appear to be casual, but the direction and ultimate destination are contextually determined.

3.4.2.1.iii  **Spatial mapping**

Spatial mapping is the template created by deictic referencing. By definition, the template is a map, created by a virtual schema in the signing that remains constant throughout the narrative.
Figure 3: Pronominal References
Reproduced from Kyle and Woll:
*Sign Language: the study of deaf people and their language* 1985: p. 138)
An example of spatial mapping is described by Winston (1993) in her examination of a lecture on ASL poetry. She noted the Deaf lecturer was deliberate in using the signing space on one side of the body to refer to poetry as art, and space on the other side of her body to discuss poetry as science. Once established, these connected spatial references are “fixed” for the duration of the discourse, and can be referred to with impunity with a finger, a hand or an arm gesture, causing no ambiguity for either narrator or audience. In her later research, Winston substantiated this by recording a quantitatively observed phenomenon where “the signer refers to his introductory spatial map as many as 700 utterances later, even when it is embedded within a separate comparative discourse frame” (Winston, 1995, p.96).

To accurately approximate objects, actors, and relationships articulated in virtual space was one of the transcription dilemma faced by the researcher. I attempted to represent the spatial direction by the symbol >> or << (see Appendix A) and by adding a fourth column, called Non-Manual Features to the transcription documentation found in Appendices D and F.

3.5 Data Analysis

Section 3.5.1 describes how Labov’s taxonomy was applied to the transcript of NZSL narratives. The subsections deal with methodological processes of syntax, temporal order, and NZSL sign order.

Section 3.5.2 applies Gee’s research methodologies to NZSL narratives. Subsection 3.5.2.1 states the process of analysing NZSL narratives in accordance with Gee’s units of production and stanza prosody.
Sub-section 3.5.2.2 describes the replication of Gee’s procedure for creating a hierarchical pause trees as a representation of narrative structure.

3.5.1 Applying Labov’s Taxonomy

Labov stated that a fully formed narrative will exhibit five sections; abstract, orientation, complicating action, evaluation and a coda. A sixth division, a resolution, will also be present but may be embedded in the complicating action (Labov, 1972a). Labov based his classifications on his analysis of clausal syntactic structure.

Three characteristics of sign language may be key factors in the application of Labov’s taxonomy. NZSL syntax, temporal order and NZSL sign order are described here.

3.5.1.1 NZSL Syntax

First, ASL and BSL are grammatically aligned to the topic-comment syntactic convention (Coulter, 1979; Deuchar, 1983; Friedman, 1976). NZSL syntax follows the convention that NZSL is a strongly topicalised language, meaning that signers often begin a sentence by establishing the main topic or focus, and then add information or comment about it.

Labov’s analysis is based on clausal composition, type and placement. The declaration of topic followed by comment in NZSL discourse facilitates identification of clause-like formations that mirror Labov’s narrative segmentation.
3.5.1.2  **NZSL Temporal Order**

Secondly, traditional sign order may offer guidance in determining temporal juncture. Sign order in discourse traditionally offers orientation information before activity because “contextual information about time, place and participants is usually expressed before action or comment” (McKee & Kennedy, 2005, p. 291).

If the narrative order differs from the actual sequencing of the action, this patterning may be informative in maintaining temporal juncture.

3.5.1.3  **NZSL Sign Order in Discourse**

Thirdly, NZSL sign order may help to make narrative divisions between orientation and complicating action more transparent. Sign language convention dictates that once orientation has been established, it is usual to assume that the setting remains the same until it is explicitly changed. A change of character, scene or action is signalled at the beginning of the passage of sign, and thus may be useful in identifying narrative sections or events within the complicating action.

The identification of the key components of NZSL, syntax, temporal and sign ordering may facilitate the research process undertaken in applying Labov’s taxonomy in this project.
3.5.2 **Applying Gee’s Paradigms**

The following two sub-sections describe Gee’s work with narrative production and pausal structure.

3.5.2.1 **Gee’s Units of Production**

Gee’s investigation into narratives was in part prompted by his interest in discovering what patterns or differences would emerge across cultures and languages (1986, p. 393). Gee designed a generic system of narrative production units, based on the identification of lines, stanzas, and sections, and that avoided reliance on formal linguistic syntactical analysis.

Gee begins with Chafe’s notion of an idea unit as the equivalent of a line. Chafe’s suggestion that an idea unit presents a single focus, or idea, is congruent with Gee’s argument that lines are short, articulated in a particular way, and are often terminated with junctural phenomena such as a hesitation or pause (1986, p. 396).

The notion of an “idea” rather than a “clause” may offer a viable approach for the analysis of discourse presented in a visual language. Identifying formal clauses would require prosodic analysis of clause boundaries found in the NZSL narrative form as opposed to a glossing transcription. Thus, adopting a clause-based analysis based on the English language translation could distort the original structural composition and may lead to misinterpretation of narrator intent.

Gee also investigated the role of prosody in narratives articulated by speakers from an oral culture. Applying Gee’s rubric to the transcription of the NZSL stories may reveal prosodic and structural patterning within the narratives.
3.5.2.2 Gee’s Pausing Structural Analysis

When Gee analysed a story performed in ASL (1983), his objective was to explore the possibility that narrative structure would be influenced by a change of modality. He quantified the pauses in an unrehearsed ASL narrative, to discover if ASL uses pausing as a linguistic device in the formation of the narrative (1983, p. 243).

This research project analyses the pause structure of the NZSL narratives to discover if the pause structure of a narrative in ASL is comparable to a NZSL narrative.

The narratives were transcribed using English glosses. The original video tape was then examined and indexed frame by frame (30 frames to a second = each frame approx. 0.005 of a second) to determine the length of each sign and the pauses between word/sign boundaries. The first priority was to define “a pause”.

A pause is defined as a measurable time in the narrative when the hands were inactive, either by the side of the narrator’s body, or when there was a visible hiatus in the narrative’s progression. It should be noted that sign production requires transitional time to move from one place of articulation to the next; these transitions were not counted as pauses. When one hand, usually the non-dominant hand, was “perseverating” (Gee & Kegl, 1983, p. 402) and the narrative was simultaneously progressing using the other hand, this was not considered a pause. Sign inflection, where signs are held for a prolonged time, were not counted as pauses.
The entire text was analysed frame by frame (30 frames to one second) to map the deliberate pauses. Each pause was timed for its length. Starting with the longest pause, the text was then bisected from that point. From each of the pauses within the bisection, the text was bisected again, until there were no more large pauses and the story continued in a continuous flow without significant gaps in the narration. This procedure replicates Gee’s procedure as described in his research (1983, p. 247) and closely models the process undertaken by Wilson in Tobacco Story (1966, p. 166). Wilson did not publish a hierarchical tree representation of the pause results of her data. This project will include the construction of a hierarchical tree structure to illustrate the pause data resulting from the bisection process and compare them.
CHAPTER FOUR - The Narratives

4 Introduction

This chapter will describe the results of the narrative analysis applied to the two selected narratives. Participant A and Participant E are introduced and a brief synopsis of their stories is provided. The chapter will then report the results of the narrative data according to Labov and Gee’s methodological models.

The chapter divides into two distinct sections. Each section will begin with an overview of the two paradigmatic approaches, and continue by reporting the results of their application to the narratives of Participant A and Participant E. The two approaches will then be diagrammatically combined to assess their compatibility when concurrently applied to the data.

Labov Analysis

Section 4.1.1 begins with a synopsis of Labov’s narrative structural taxonomy (Labov and Waletzky, 1967).

Section 4.1.1.1 introduces Participant A and Section 4.1.1.2 describes the analysis of her story based on the Labov taxonomy. Section 4.1.1.3 introduces Participant E and the following section 4.1.1.4 reports the results of the Participant E’s narrative based on Labov’s narrative taxonomy.

Gee Analysis

Section 4.2.1 begins with a methodological overview of Gee’s paradigmatic approach to narrative discourse, summarising both the units of production model (Gee, 1986) and Gee’s pausal analysis methodology (Gee & Kegl, 1983).
Section 4.2.1.1 discusses units of narrative production in relation to Participant A’s narrative followed by Section 4.2.1.2 reporting the pausing structure analysis of Participant A’s narrative. Section 4.2.1.3 illustrates the results of simultaneously applying Gee’s pausal structural model and Labov’s taxonomy to Participant A’s narrative. Section 4.2.1.4 describes the results of analysing the units of production in Participant E’s narrative, and Section 4.2.1.5 details the pausal structure revealed in Participant E’s narrative. Section 4.2.1.6 will report the results of combining Gee’s pausal hierarchal tree with Labov’s taxonomy to Participant E’s narrative.

4.1 **Labov Analysis**

4.1.1 **Methodological Overview**

Labov and Waletzky (1967) are widely acknowledged for devising the most influential and widely applied model for narrative analysis. The methodology was based on clausal analysis of personal oral narratives, by analysing clausal functions and their relationships to each other. They originated the term “temporal juncture” to describe how cohesion and meaning are achieved between clauses (1967, p. 25). They proposed a taxonomy of six narrative units that together become a fully formed narrative. The key components of narrative are the abstract, orientation, complicating action terminating in a resolution, evaluation and coda. For a more detailed explanation of the Labov taxonomy, see Chapter Two, sub-section 2.1.2.

Later sociolinguistic work of Labov’s discusses the notion of style shift, the way that language shows variations dependent on the context in which it is being used (2003). Labov’s comprehensive narrative taxonomy and the phenomenon of style
shift will be investigated in relation to the two NZSL narratives of Participant A and Participant E.

4.1.1.1  *Introducing Participant A*

Participant A is in her early 40s and is not a fluent NZSL signer. Participant A traditionally communicates using the English language, although she comprehends NZSL. Her normal mode of communication relies on lipreading to which she responds with gesture with some English vocalisation. She is the mother of two hearing children and works part-time in a team of hearing colleagues.

Her narrative is delivered in English word order with full English lip patterning or “cueing” (McKee & Kennedy, 2005). This is a communicative style where the signer is in effect “speaking” the English word and simultaneously producing a manual sign. The substance of her story can be followed by observing an unvoiced English word lip pattern, accompanied by a manual sign, or by signing the first letter of the word she is mouthing. Her position on the data continuum is shown in Appendix B and her general language background is described in sub-section 3.3.2.

Participant A’s narrative is two minutes 32 seconds in length. The largest pause was sustained for three seconds (98 frames) and the shortest pause was timed to be eight frames (approximately .029 seconds). The entire text was bisected from the longest to the shortest pause (see Chapter Three: Methodology) and the hierarchical ordering of the pauses within is illustrated in the pause tree Figure 5.
Participant A tells a story about meeting and marrying her husband, having the wedding and the honeymoon, buying a house, and then producing two children. She ends her story by telling her audience her current situation and how long she has been married.

The full transcription and translation of her story appears in Appendix C and D.

4.1.1.2 *Labov and Participant A*

Participant A presents the abstract by articulating a title:

```
ME I MEET HOW MEET MEET MEET R-R
How I met [R-R] my husband
```

The abstract delivers the title of the narrative in a classic English conventional form, “How I met my husband” declaring a title for the story. It also exemplifies what has been described as “one of the optional margins of a narrative” (Toolan, 1988, p. 153).

The abstract is delivered directly to the video camera. She summarily states the purpose of the narrative without any attempt to engage with her potential audience. This narrator does not employ any interactional antecedents normally observed in visual communication (Lane, et al., 1996) but instead she directs her eye gaze towards the camera for the majority of her storytelling time. She then establishes the parameters of her story, the orientation. She begins by giving the details of the setting for the meeting:
OLD DEAF CLUB

It was the old Deaf club we used to go to

.G. STREET >>

in .G. Street over there

Orientation at the beginning of the narrative performs a distinct role in sign language: “Establishing time, place, and subject at the beginning of a sentence or a narrative is important because it is common for this information to be assumed from context thereafter, until it is changed” (McKee & Kennedy, 2005, p. 291).

The orientation may also be accomplishing a personal objective. Participant A does not habitually communicate in NZSL. Her husband is a Deaf man, and she does engage in NZSL communication when interacting with him. This narrative orientation segment may also be to re-orientate herself to the NZSL lexicon, a process of cognitively recalling and then performing remembered signs that she might employ in another setting.

Participant A’s orientation achieves two further purposes. First, it helps the narrator to engage the Deaf audience by pinpointing an historically shared venue. Secondly, Participant A herself is getting accustomed to a Deaf audience in a Deaf environment.

Having sensed that she has satisfactorily engaged her audience and has situated the location for the story, she now produces an emphatic double handed sign RIGHT! This is a sign she uses on repeated occasions in the narrative.
This manual lexical choice of *RIGHT!* serves several purposes. First, it functions as a discourse marker (Schiffrin, 2001) or, more precisely, a discourse connective (Blakemore, 2002). The sign *RIGHT!* creates a connection between narrative segments. In this case, she indicates she is about to move on to the action, or body, of her story. Fraser suggests that this type of marker is “discourse glue” (1990, p. 385). Discourse glue indicates to the audience that a new event is about to unfold and that it is connected to the previous event. Secondly, it provides a brief temporal pause for the narrator, who is telling the story in front of a Deaf audience, a speech community characterized by its preference for a signed rather than a spoken language.

The narrator then shifts her weight to her front foot, and raises her eye gaze to the general direction of the audience, towards the rear of the hall. She starts the complicating action (I MEET) when a distraction arises about the location of her drink. She engages in a conversation with someone in the audience for a full five seconds. This distracts her from focussing on the video camera but she does not physically re-orientate herself “out of” her story during the interruption. Her conversation with the audience member looks like this:

```
ME MINE MINE OK OK OK
(hey that is mine OK? Ok, ok)
```

There is no NZSL noun or verb sign produced to clarify the interaction. The meaning is conveyed by simultaneous finger pointing to self (hand to her chest) and to the drink (a finger point), accompanied by direct eye contact, an affirmative head nod and brief eye closure, informally decoded to mean “*Mine, OK? you*
understand, don’t touch. OK?” This distraction does not form part of the narrative as it does not progress the story. However, it does serve an important function within the discourse. The positive outcome of the distraction is that the narrator ceases to perform to the video camera and instead takes the opportunity to engage with her audience. Also the converse is true: the necessity of making purposeful eye contact with a member of her audience creates an opportunity for the wider audience to engage with her. This connection was not evident in the preceding abstract introductory segment of the narration.

Participant A now begins to display typical eye gaze behaviour employed in Deaf interaction when “gazing to the audience is a marker of the fact that the signer is narrating the story” (Metzger & Bahan, 2001, p. 141)

After a short repeat of the manual sign MEET she moves the time frame forward by using the conventional time marker in sign languages, the time line (see Figure 4). She does this by moving her hands in a forward direction, parallel to the floor and to each other, in the manual formation glossed as POSTPONE. She is indicating that time has passed since she met her husband. She then begins the first of six events, which together make up the complicating action.

ENGAGED CONGRATULATIONS

... we got engaged. And everyone congratulated us

SURPRISED GOSSIP

Everyone was surprised, but word soon got around
ENGAGED  SURPRISE  RIGHT!

We are engaged . . . what a surprise!

In this first event, ENGAGED, there is a marked increase in facial expression and body movement. She shows excitement, surprise, mimes showing off her engagement ring and shaking hands in a circular motion with the “group” she has now placed around her in the signing space (See Chapter Two). She is animated and less English word lip patterning accompanies her signs. The inclusion of deliberate facial expression would indicate she may cognitively be shifting to a more visual language. The shift is evidenced by her increasing employment of non-manual features to convey information, and the greater involvement of face and body movement. (Lane, et al., 1996, p. 91). The narrator may also be showing evidence of her growing confidence in her presentation and a greater identification with NZSL and her Deaf audience.

Her face becomes impassive as she signs RIGHT! with pursed lips, employing both a manual sign and a neutral facial expression. It appears she is using the combination of a held sign RIGHT! and an impassive face as a discourse marker or connective (Schiffrin, 1987; Fraser, 1990; Blakemore, 2002) to join the sequence of events together and to progress the narrative.

As further evidence of style shift, the NZSL sign POSTPONE is executed without an English lip pattern. She places and moves the sign on a future time line (see Figure 4. below) by moving the manual sign forward away from her body. NZSL,
in common with other sign languages, relies on the visual field, or signing space, to indicate time:

Rather than using linguistic features of tense and gender that are prevalent in English, ASL relies heavily on space to represent these concepts. In facing the problem of tense, ASL relies on its tools of spatial relationships to represent time, locating the past behind the signer and the future in front of the signer. (Rayman, 1999, p. 63)
Figure 4: Time Lines
Participant A is using NZSL signs and movement along the time line “between” narrative episodes to serve two distinct purposes. First, the time line creates a new orientation for the new event. It also provides a distinct discourse marker to indicate a temporal connection between preceding and future episodes of the narrative. In a later event in the complicating action, Participant A uses the same sign, an equivalent movement forward and a downward gaze away from the audience, to re-orientate her story. In the later example, the lip pattern “one year” is cued as the sign for ONE YEAR is signed. She signs POSTPONE with no lip pattern to indicate the temporal progression in the sequence of events.

Each of the six events in the complicating action is preceded by a time marker. The story progresses through the events of the complicating action by repeatedly being positioned on the time line. Participant A consistently uses a combination of NZSL sign and an English language word such as RIGHT! to structure the events of the complicating action. At other points in the narrative, Participant A chooses the same cued English word (FINISH/NEXT/RIGHT) and the comparable manual signs to indicate a boundary between events. Her lip pattern is not always congruent with the manual sign she displays. She appears to call on the different discourse conventions of both modalities.

As the complicating action progresses, signs become more flowing and are produced more quickly. The clear English lip pattern continues throughout, but the use of face, body and eye movements are more frequently employed. For example, a wide range of the NZSL repertoire is exhibited in the MARRIED episode of the narrative. At the wedding reception episode, she recalls:

HAPPY LOOK LAUGHING DANCING
[everybody was] very happy, enjoying themselves, dancing, looked like they were having a great time.

The translation suggested above for this passage of signed text is dependent on two different discourse features. The passage is articulated by both conventional NZSL signs, as well as utilizing non-manual constituents of NZSL, such as facial expression and body movement. The strategic use of the signing space (see Figure 2) indicates the presence and involvement of a group. The collective activity of the group in the action is conveyed through a happy facial expression, roving eye gazes, shifting shoulders, and simulated dance movements in her upper body.

The above passage demonstrates the way in which signed narratives most often present a “description or a transformation” of the action (Maxwell, 1990). In other words, the audience is told what the story “looks like”. Maxwell’s analysis of a Deaf child’s story in ASL about a movie concludes that:

... through the use of storytelling, linguistic features of ASL and through the use of mime and exaggeration, what the movie scenes looked like. (1990, p. 218)

[author’s bolding]

The descriptive nature of NZSL storytelling is borne out by the amount of English words needed to translate four manually presented concepts: in effect, needing to express what the reception event “looked like”:

HAPPY LOOK LAUGHING DANCING
[everybody was] very happy, enjoying themselves, dancing, looked like they were having a great time.

THEN FINISHED RIGHT NEXT

Then, after that . . .

The narrator uses an emphatic mouthing of English words to terminate this event in the complicating action: THEN FINISHED RIGHT NEXT. This is a strategy she uses repeatedly between events. While chronology is maintained, it inhibits a narrative flow from one event to the other. The less fluid delivery may be a consequence of the language mix that is typical of the narrator. The same signs mark the transition from MARRIED event (signs FINISHED /NEXT) to HONEYMOON event (signs FINISHED/HOME).

THEN FINISHED RIGHT NEXT

Then, after that . . .

Similarly at the end of the HONEYMOON event:

HOLIDAY HOLIDAY

Holiday honeymoon

FINISHED HOME

When that was over, we came home

The sign HOME is executed in a very large space, moved emphatically into her body as she visibly shifts her weight to her back foot.
This leads to the fourth event of the complicating action, which is the longest passage of NZSL signing. This event, POST-HONEYMOON, describing the search for a house to buy, is terminated by signing the location of the purchased house, mouthing the location and initialising the name of the road.

GET/WON/FIND HAVE BEAUTIFUL HOUSE

We finally found it, a beautiful home it was!

.T. ROAD >> DUNEDIN

It was on .T. Road Dunedin

The .T.ROAD is accompanied by a mouthing of the full name of the road, a full arm pointing gesture, indicated by the >> above, as a new orientation and deliberate eye gaze scanning across the audience, followed by a head nod. This complies with the conventional NZSL practice for context to be expressed before action (McKee & Kennedy, 2005, p.290). It can now be assumed by the audience that future episodes will take place at the new location.

The deliberate and definitive re-orientation checks audience engagement, a feature of her presentation that was not evident at the start of her story. It also reinforces the notion of HOME which was so emphatically signed close to her body at the end of the preceding event. At this point, Participant A then rests her hands on her chest and then opens both palms in front of her facing upwards. This pause in her delivery continues for four seconds.
Then follows a recap of the resolution of the last event of POST-HONEYMOON/BUY HOUSE before she indicates the passage of time by signing ONE YEAR. She executes this orientation with a lip pattern “one year” formed twice and the accompanying NZSL sign for YEAR. This is a further example of her reliance on code-switching, bringing into play two modalities consecutively, first a reference to an NZSL time line and then a mouthed English word.

The complicating action continues with two further events (FIRST BABY, SECOND BABY) interspersed with a “yay” gesture (raised fists, mouthed YAY). After delivering the information, there follows an emphatic and lengthy evaluation of her situation:

NO MORE BABY TWO CHILDREN

No more babies, I already have two children..

NO MORE ENOUGH STOP

Two is enough children, no more . . . that’s enough . . .

This event ends with another open handed gesture and mouthed lip pattern “then” without a manual component. The simultaneity of two communicative modes is again employed to mark a temporal change in the discourse: another event in the complicating action is completed, there is more to come, signified by the narrator’s open handed gesture.

The resolution follows quickly and starts the process of bringing the audience up to the present time. The sign NOW is located in the space immediately in front of
the body, in accordance with time line convention and the conclusion of a sequence of past events:

THEN . . . NOW

I GOT I JOB

MONEY HELP MY HUSBAND

PUT TOGETHER GIVE

Then . . . Now I have a job, for the money, to help my husband.

We put our money together to be able to cover the bills

This signed and mouthed sequence combines the use of English tense marking (past tense THEN and present continuous tense NOW) follows NZSL time-before-action convention described by McKee and Kennedy (2005, p.290).

The next three segments of the Labov taxonomy are presented in conventional order. There is limited eye contact or engagement with the audience in these segments.

The evaluation does not form part of the narrative in the earlier events of the action, although there are numerous pauses when the narrator may be reflecting on her narrative delivery. These hesitations could be due to searching for the right manual sign rather than a taking stock of the progression of the narrative. No personal reflections are formally expressed in sign until the narrator describes her reaction to the two babies in similar fashion (BABY/YAY).
The resolution is delivered in signed English word order and exhibiting a more pronounced lip pattern. She executes the manual sign NOW to introduce the coda, returning the audience to the here and now. There is a reversal of the style shift taking place (William Labov, 2003) as the narrator herself is returning to the “hearing” world and into an English-based linguistic domain. This supports the observation made in the experiment cited earlier with Deaf children in an American school (Christie, et al., 1999). When these Deaf students were asked to write their signed story in English, they reported that ending the essay felt like a “slow moving away from the topic” (1999, p. 174). There is evidence that this narrator is performing the same withdrawal in her resolution: moving away from the formation of her family from meeting her husband to producing a family together, and now she moves on to her personal current status.

The story ends with a coda:

**NOW WE 23 YEARS MARRIED**

We have been married for 23 years, can you believe that!

...that’s all.

The coda is delivered at a slower and more deliberate pace and relies heavily on non-manual constituents of NZSL. She concludes her story with slapping herself on the side of the face, as if to say “can you believe it”. She then mouths the words “that’s all”. Her signing reverts to more idiomatic English gesturing, perhaps indicated a return of a personal self-consciousness that has been suppressed in the complicating action. The audience is returned to the here and now and to the more recognisable everyday personality of the narrator. The largest portion of the coda is conveyed in non-verbal facial and gestural movements, making the
English translation lengthy by comparison. She finishes her story and her gaze returns to the video camera.

To summarise, Participant A’s narrative represents an NZSL story delivered in English grammatical order and accompanied by an English lip pattern. There is constant lip movement throughout the narrative, and heavy reliance on cueing (McKee & Kennedy, 2005, p. 290) and mouthing (Lucas & Valli, 1992). There is minimal strategic use of the conventional signing space and yet identifiable manual and non-manual features of NZSL are present at times throughout the narrative.

In conclusion, Participant A’s narrative follows the structural narrative pattern proposed by Labov, including the optional coda. Temporal juncture is satisfied by the historical nature of the narrative, and by the occasional use of a conventional NZSL time line.

4.1.1.3 **Introducing Participant E**

Participant E is fluent in NZSL, a confident story teller and presenter. He has recently retired, aged in his early 60s. He is married to a Deaf woman and they communicate in NZSL as their everyday language. He is used to presenting material to both hearing and Deaf audiences. He presents his narrative confidently and does not appear to be aware of, or inhibited by, the presence of a video camera. It is important to note that a Deaf woman, a major contributor in the narrative, remains on the stage to his left and within range of the video recording. The story is about a night out with his mates, and the events that arise due to interference of the Deaf woman standing on the stage with him.
4.1.1.4  *Labov and Participant E*

The abstract and orientation segments are not presented in the conventional manner. A different storyteller, a Deaf woman, had taken the stage prior to the start of this narrative. In NZSL she has started to tell a story about a few of the men being at a mate’s farm, but then she indicates that she has forgotten the story. Participant E arrives on the stage to take up the story. The instigator of the story remains on stage throughout Participant E’s presentation and reference is made to her during the story. She has already informed the audience that this is a story about a group of Deaf friends; some are present in the audience. He begins the narrative with:

\[ \text{HER  HER >>} \]
\[ \text{She . . . she} \]

The opening deictic reference to HER fulfils several discourse functions. Firstly, it connects the two actors and insinuates the message “I remember . . . I know the occasion she is talking about”. Secondly, it serves to indicate she is going to be an important factor in the story. Her continued presence on the stage tells the audience that her involvement goes beyond introducing the story. Thirdly, it could be suggested that the deictic reference to HER is part of the orientation as it alludes to the fact that the story will include her as an actor. Lastly, the deictic HER connects the abstract and the orientation segments of the narrative.
The orientation follows without any hesitation or significant pausing. Participant E starts by identifying the farm and the farm owner, using a deictic and a name sign (Lane, et al., 1996, p. 74). This will be sufficient identification of the venue for the Deaf audience.

THERE >>

[NAME SIGN]  FARM
DEAF
ASSEMBLED
ADULTS .. ADULTS
ALL COME

We were all gathered there. . .
All adults of course
A whole group of Deaf people
To [name sign]'s farm
We all went over there . . . yeah, there . . .

The orientation suggests that the conventional sign language topic-comment syntactic order is used (Deuchar, 1983) by introducing the location before the participants or the action. Participant E establishes the genre (an ADULT story) repeated twice before he introduces the focal point of the story, again utilizing topic-comment syntax:

KEG (cl)
KEG (cl)
BEER
KEG (cl)

We had this big keg, a big beer keg . . .

The placement of the keg of beer in the centre of the space directly in front of the narrator unambiguously creates a focal point for the story and begins to create the spatial map for the narrative. KEG is presented as an oval hand shaped classifier (Supalla, 1986) and placed in the centre of the stage and directly in front of the signer. The contents are established by the sign for BEER articulated after two repetitions of KEG. The KEG is manually signed three times to emphasise its centrality to the story. This strategic and symbolic placement of KEG in the centre of the audience’s visual field directs the audience’s attention to the focal point before commencing the complicating action.

The scene is set and the key actors have been identified. The KEG has been established as the focal point of the story. Spatial mapping (Winston, 1993) is now being charted in the narrative. The spatial map that has been created allows subsequent referrals to both the actors and the KEG to be indicated by pointing or by a deliberate eye gaze. The sign classifier KEG is not manually presented again until the resolution and the participating actor is referred to by conventional pronominal referencing in the signing space (see Chapter Three). Participant E has set the story, established the genre, and partially set up the signing space. The audience is orientated to the time, place and nature of the story to be told.

Before the complicating action commences, the narrator repeatedly rubs his hands together. This repeated and unhurried gesture creates an effective discourse marker between the orientation and complicating action units of the narrative as well as creating a sense of “here we go!”.
The complicating action begins by employing non-manual features of visual language: eye gaze and body alignment. He directs his eye gaze to the KEG, he leans his body slightly forward over the KEG and accompanies this action with a slight smirk on his face. The action commences with a rapid and repeated manual sign sequence. With his cheeks puffed out, and his eyes on the KEG:

PULL GIVE
PULL GIVE
PULL GIVE
PULL GIVE
PULL GIVE
PULL GIVE
PULL

Beers are distributed around the group, using pronominal directional reference points in the signing space to indicate different recipients. The cheek puff indicates a glass being filled and the non-dominant hand rests on the spigot below the hand holding the classifier “drinking container” (Supalla, 1986), translated as a pint glass in this context. The direction of the verb GIVE is repeated to participants in the signing space in front of the KEG.

The narrator then raises his eye gaze to the audience and using his thumb he points to:

HER >>

She . . . (the woman standing to his left)
The sign is accompanied with pursed lips, a slight head tilt to his left and a derisive facial expression directed toward the audience. Her physical presence on the left of the stage negates the need to place her within the signing space. The deictic thumb reference establishes HER as the other actor in the next complicating event:

PULL GIVE

COME ON/HURRY UP

PULL GIVE

COME ON/HURRY UP/DRINK

I am passing out the pints
She is saying “come on, hurry up”
I pull another pint and give it to the next fella
And she is still nagging “come on, hurry and drink up”

The sign phrases are executed in two opposite directions. PULL GIVE is directed to the narrator’s left, and the gestural COME ON/HURRY UP sequence is angled to the narrator’s right. The implication is that he is passing out pints, and, at the same time, she is urging them to hurry and finish their drinking session. The narrator has begun to relay two perspectives on the same activity. The deliberate deictic reference to HER is articulated only once at the beginning of the event. A slight head tilt to the left functions as a role shift indicator to show that the woman is the originator of the second and fourth lines of the sequence.
Participant E begins to build tension throughout the complicating action by repeating the attitudes and actions of the two opposing forces present in the narrative: the men repeatedly drinking pints of beer and an increasingly agitated antagonist. As the situation gets more intense, he executes a fully extended arm pointing motion with a flat hand held up toward her. He is representing the growing tension by a bigger deictic and also creating a sense of the increasing distance between the two factions:

SHE >>

COME ON

Her . . .

she keeps telling us all to come on, drink up!

The recurring deixis SHE acts as discourse glue (Fraser, 1990) connecting the reiterative action of the drinking session and her unwelcome intervention. Having established the casual nature of the ongoing drinking activity, the narrator now adds an evaluative comment by way of an adjectival sign:

SHE >>

BOSSY

She is getting really bossy . . .

Facial grammar (Lane et al., 1996, p. 91) adds two more discriminating features of the two narrators. When SHE is narrating, her actions are accompanied by a furrowed brow; for him, in his role as the narrator/barman, his actions are
complemented by a smirk. On one occasion, he turns his body to her, but
maintains the furrowed brow and the eye contact with the audience. He signs two
flat handed movements in her direction to suggest she needs to calm down. He
continues the dual characterisation and poses a rhetorical question:

WHY/ SHE
SHE
WANT GO
BED

We carry on drinking beer (g) . . .
But there she is, she rabbits on . . .
What is the problem?
She wants to go . . .
To bed!!

The last sign, BED is signed emphatically by both hands and is held momentarily
close to his head. The sign is reminiscent of a child asleep. The exaggerated
performance of the sign and its accompanying facial expression and eye gaze
demonstrate the childlike attitude that the narrator believes she is displaying.

The narrator redirects his eye gaze to the keg:

KEG (cl)
IMPOSSIBLE
KEG FULL
KEG STILL FULL
HOURS AND HOURS

Impossible!
The keg was full to here
. . . and there is still this much to go . . .
Plenty of beer and plenty of time yet

IMPOSSIBLE and the HOURS AND HOURS are expressed in NZSL sign, but the qualifying commentary is communicated by gesture and facial expression. To indicate the level of liquid left in the keg the cheeks are puffed out to indicate how full the keg is, and the arms are held parallel to the floor and to one another, in a pincer movement, indicating there is still a volume of beer left. The evaluative comment is made by the tongue poked into the cheek, to reinforce the sentiment that there is plenty of beer and the night is still young. The double characterisation is continued:

HER >> . . .
FRUSTRATED
COME ON
COME ON

But she . . .
. . . we are getting more and more frustrated with her . . .
She goes on and one “Come on you lot . . .
Come on” . . .

In this passage, as the tension is building, the deictic reference to HER is a small gesture, using only an index finger held close to the narrator’s body. He repeats the FRUSTRATED sign as a representative sentiment of the group, gritting his teeth and offering no eye contact with the antagonist. The COME ON gesture is
delivered with a large arm movement and an angry expression to suggest that her frustration level with the drinkers is also mounting. This use of the non-manual markers separate the individual utterances, and also begin to signal the primary narrator distancing himself both from the antagonist and the sentiments she is portraying.

The tension is built through two more similar sequences until it the final event in the complicating action is presented:

**KEG HALF GONE**

_Bugger!!_ (g)

TIME

ELEVEN

TIME

CLOSE OFF KEG

WHAT TO DO?

The keg was only half finished . . .

_Bugger!!_ (g)

What time is it? [rhetorical]
It’s only eleven o’clock
I guess it’s time . . .
I will tap off the keg . . .
What shall we do [with it] now?
The dilemma is restated and the conflict that has been building through the scenes of the complicating action needs to be resolved. By his eye gaze and a WHAT TO DO gesture conveyed by the stroking of his chin, the narrator invites audience engagement and creates anticipation of an impending resolution. As the tension is held constant and with a solution pending, he introduces a sub-plot activated by her:

SHE >>
TURNS SPIGOT
PULL GIVE
COME ON(g)

PULL GIVE
COME ON(g)

I GO BED
COME ON COME ON
WHAT . . .

Now she . . .
Gets hold of the spigot
Fills up a glass
And hands it to one of the lads
Fills up another glass
And hands it to the next lad.
“Come on you lot . . .
I wanna go to bed!”
The storyteller adopts the perspective of the woman and she becomes the central character. Stated again and in character, her motivation is reiterated I GO BED. The signs are smaller, befitting the time of night and the beer that has already been consumed. In this role shift, the gesture COME ON is a smaller movement, created by a flicking upwards motion of the fingers, placed at hip level. There are several types of information being offered in this passage. The woman is still the antagonist but the smaller signs indicate that they are all finding her intervention (COME ON DRINK UP) tedious and repetitive. This provides a clear example of Lane’s comment on visual narratives:

... incorporating right into the sign who is doing what to whom, and in what ways, is a great time-saver. Because signed languages are visual languages, and with vision you can follow many simultaneous streams of information, it is possible for them to have all these different kinds of information displayed simultaneously. (Lane, et al., 1996, p. 91)

The events of the complicating action have proceeded fluently and with total clarity of character and event. Mounting tension has been created through each scene leading towards a resolution which is about to be articulated.

The narrator prepares to deliver the resolution to the dilemma. After a lengthy pause, the narrator articulates the only transparently English word discourse marker in the narrative. The sign BUT, a traditional discourse marker in spoken narrative production (Schiffrin 2001), is accompanied by a full English word lip pattern. The cessation of manual activity in the pause time allows for a narrator role shift. He points to her, with both index fingers and proceeds to describe HER attitude and demeanour. The non-manual depiction of her response precedes the
articulation of the events to which she is reacting. The narrator, in his role as HER, leans his body forward, his face elongating into an astonished expression. He imitates her eyes gradually widening in astonishment and maintains a very still body position. The concluding signed passage of the sub-plot still does not explain her demeanour and response:

BUT
PULL GIVE
SHE
. . .
WHAT?

But she
starts passing out the beer . . .
. . . and guess what?

The expressive attitudes conveyed by both the face and body posturing is terminated by a long pause and the execution of the sign WHAT? The rhetorical question implies that the audience is about to be told why she was so astonished, and what event concluded the story. The sign WHAT creates the boundary between the complicating action and the resolution. The complicating action sequences have been completed and an answer to the dilemma is about to relayed.
The resolution is sudden, unexpected and humorous. The narrator resumes the narrator role, stands up straight and points again to HER. His non-manual characterisation of her demeanour has already been established. He articulates the resolution:

VOMIT (L/H)
VOMIT (R/H)
NEXT, NEXT
VOMIT VOMIT
NEXT, NEXT
NEXT VOMIT

One of the boys is sick . . .
Then another one vomits
And the next, and the next
Everyone is being sick
Another one sick
And so it goes on
The next drinker also is sick . . .

The conflict has brought a result.

After a brief pause, during which the narrator drops his hands to his sides, he smiles at his fellow narrator. He offers an assessment of her state of mind at the time of the demise of the drinkers, and also gives an explanation for the earlier portrayal of her facial expression and physical demeanour:
EMBARRASSED
SHE/HERSELF
GIVE X 2
TOO MUCH

She was so embarrassed
Because it was her [fault]
She was the one to give out the last rounds
Just too much beer too fast --

Evaluation is found both embedded and external to the complicating action and resolution. Using frequent role shifts and detailed characterisation as well as the utilisation of the spatial map that was created at the beginning of the narrative, the evaluative commentary about the story is interwoven with the activity as well as being expressed as a separate segment at the end of the story.

Labov states that the evaluative segments of a narrative must tell the audience why the narrative is important and how it affects the narrator. As Labov states, the purpose of evaluation “delays the forward movement of the narrative at a certain point by the use of non-narrative clauses, which hold the listener suspended at that point in time” (1972a, p. 108).

Some of the non-narrative commentary is contingent on pointing to the person, the “her” who is still present on the stage as he tells the story. The frequent deictic referencing and accompanying facial grammar provide a running evaluative commentary as each of the 11 scenes of the complicating action is recounted. Her “real time” facial expressions, as distinct from the facial expressions of the
narrator as he tells the story, provide contextual information that contribute to the meaning and impact of the story. In this way, evaluation is evident within and about every scene of the complicating action.

The coda follows. As Labov and Waletzky have described, the coda is a “functional device for returning the verbal perceptive to the present moment” (1967, p. 39). The coda is marked by a body shift towards the protagonist standing on the stage, and eye gaze toward the audience, as if to say “that’s her story . . . .” This satisfies the need to return the audience to the present time and place and to bring SHE, the originator of the story, back into the current environment. There is no NZSL manually coded information in the coda, but the message is clearly expressed through a wry facial expression, followed by a smile and a deliberate body turn towards “her”. The verbal equivalent would perhaps be “Well, that’s it, that’s her story”.

In conclusion, Participant E exhibits all five elements of narrative structural patterning described by Labov and Waletzky (1967) and satisfies the criteria of a fully-formed narrative. The abstract is not presented by Participant E but a titular reference is embedded in the orientation, loosely translated would read: “this is an adult drinking story”. Deliberate and directed eye gaze, body positioning and the linguistic parameters of a visual language provide a consummate orientation. The events of the complicating action proceed fluently and with total clarity of character and event. The 11 scenes are of similar length, giving a sense of balance and achieving temporal juncture. There is a mounting tension created through each scene leading towards a resolution. The resolution is unexpected and visually startling, but it is a result of the conflict and brings closure to the narrative. Evaluative content is presented both intrinsically through the
complicating action and as a separate unit at the end of the narrative. The coda returns the audience to the “here and now” and restores the relationship between the narrator and the instigator of the narrative.

4.2 **Gee Analysis**

4.2.1 **Methodological overview**

Gee suggests an approach to narrative construction based on the identification of lines, strophes, stanzas, and sections within the narrative. Gee’s body of work on narrative research included an exploration of prosody and poetic patterning in the narrative of an unrehearsed spoken narrative (1986, p. 397). Section 4.2.1.1 will apply the units of production to the textual structure of Participant A’s narrative. This section will also refer to the role of prosody in her delivery.

In other research, Gee explored the correlation of pause structure to overall narrative structure by analysing an unspoken narrative in ASL (Gee & Kegl, 1983) He clarified his quantitative findings by employing an hierarchal tree structure to illustrate the significance of pausing in the overall shape and construction of the narrative. The same methodology will be applied to Participant A, and the results are reported in Section 4.2.1.2.

4.2.1.1 **Units of Production and Participant A**

Participant A’s narrative is delivered in relatively less fluent NZSL as she does not associate regularly with the Deaf community. As discussed earlier, her delivery is a code-mix of English lexical features and the syntactical features of NZSL. As a consequence, it may be that the English and NZSL codes and the contradictory language conventions will have an influence on the narrative units of production.
Participant A’s narrative is two minutes 32 seconds in length. The narrative is composed of 29 stanzas. Stanzas provide the shaping of the narrative, the composite structure resulting from the grouping together of lines delivering a complete thought (Gee, 1986). This is described in some detail in Sub-section 2.2.2.2. Ninety percent of the stanzas are composed of three lines. Ten percent of the stanzas are of one line in length. The one-line stanzas function as headliners at the commencement of new episodes of the action. The regularity and significance of stanza patterning will be reviewed again in the Discussion Chapter.

Participant A begins her story:

ME/I
MEET
I
HOW
MEET/MEET/MEET
How I met . . .
R.R.
OLD DEAF CLUB
G STREET
over there . . .

. . . [name sign] at the old Deaf Club in .G. Street --- over there, remember?

The narrator employs very short lines to move from declaring her intention to introducing the elements of character and setting. These two stanzas form a strophe, reiterating the place of the action but not forwarding the narrative in any
significant manner. At this juncture, Participant A pauses, and then repeats the half formed signs I MEET. These two lines set the introductory strophe apart from an unexpected interruption. The narrator is distracted and moves out of narrator role for five seconds while sorting out some personal confusion in the space occupied by the audience.

Gee noted that hesitations and false starts are often noted in the beginning of narratives and frequently when moving to a new section (1986). In the opening lines of the narrative, the sign MEET is repeated four times in the first three seconds before the narrator’s attention is distracted. She re-orientates herself by repeating the sign MEET MEET twice and drops her eye gaze to the floor. The change in the direction of the eye gaze divides the five second “aside” from the start of the events of the story.

The stanzas that combine to form sections are well marked in this narrative. The first section commences:

   TIME PASSED
   ENGAGED
   We met, and a bit later, we got engaged.

The second section begins:

   ONE YEAR PASSED
   MARRIED
   One year later, we got married
These two sections are separated from each other by a pause and by the discourse marker **RIGHT!** The emphatically signed **RIGHT!** in conjunction with the English lip pattern does more than transition the narrative from one section to the next.

Schiffrin has argued that in the English language, discourse markers can fulfill more than one function (2001). Roy discovered the same was true of discourse marking in ASL. Roy (1989) investigated the role of discourse markers in the segmentation of a lecture delivered in ASL. In the course of her investigation she discovered that a single sign discourse marker can have more than one function. She found that the single sign NOW in the lecture was fulfilling a dual function. The sign NOW marked a point in real time as well as marking the end of one section and a readiness to proceed to the next. The strategic placement of the single sign NOW simultaneously fulfilled a syntactic and discourse management. In Participant A’s narrative, the single sign **RIGHT!** accomplishes the same objectives as Roy outlines above. Its placement marks a meaningful point in time, and simultaneously conveys the fact she is ready to proceed with the next scenario.

In Gee’s analysis of a narrative based within an oral culture, he remarks that sections often end on summaries (1986). The emphatic declaration **RIGHT!** acts as a one word summary conclusion, implying the conclusion of the episode and summarizing the completed action as “Right - that’s done and finished”.

The third section begins with two three-line stanza, forming a strophe. Participant A is describing the guest selection for the wedding:
We got married and invited a few . . .

DEAF
SIX
DEAF PEOPLE
deaf, about six deaf people

The next stanza in the MARRIED section is separated from the above stanza by a long pause and the discourse marker OK. The marker OK is not a query, nor is it a ploy to check audience comprehension. The single marker appears in the middle of the MARRIAGE section for another purpose. Her audience are primarily members of the Deaf community and it appears she is trying to defend the fact that the guest list included only six Deaf people. Having said it, she wants to move on. She repeats her subject line MARRIED and describes the physical event of the wedding. She begins her description in a gestural fashion, but after signing WEDDING she begins to use NZSL signs and non-manual expressions in a more fluent sequence:

MARRIED
BIG WEDDING
BEAUTIFUL

So we got married, it was a wonderful big wedding, everything was beautiful.
DANCE NICE

FUN/HAPPY/

LAUGHING/DANCING

We were all dancing, everybody was having fun, everyone was happy, laughing and dancing together.

FINISH

Then . . .

The section ends with a single sign FINISH to mark the conclusion of the MARRIED section. After a prolonged pause, she commences the next section with NEXT as a sentence-initial discourse marker (Fraser, 1993) as a transition and as a progression in time. The sign FINISH would translate into “then” in an English word version. The sign FINISH is used again at the termination of the adjacent section (transcribed below). In both cases the sign is achieving the dual purpose as both a temporal and a discourse marker.

The following section exhibits a strophe construction describing the honeymoon:

NEXT

GO AWAY

HOLIDAY

The next thing that happened was we went away on a honeymoon (lp) signed holiday
QUEENSTOWN

FIVE

ONE WEEK .W.

We went to Queenstown, for one week, five days

QUEENSTOWN

HOLIDAY HOLIDAY

HOME

Queenstown, for our holiday our honeymoon, then we came home.

FINISH

Then . . .

The section HONEYMOON is terminated with a pause of half a second and then she performs the discourse and temporal marker FINISH.

The next section of the narrative is the longest of the entire text and appears to be the passage that is least influenced by English:

PATIENT GIRL

MONEY

BUY HOUSE

I had to be very patient, to save up the money, to buy a house
LOOK    LOOK
GOOD HOUSE
LOOK    LOOK
RIGHT HOUSE

We looked and looked, everywhere, for ages to find a house: we had to buy the right house; we looked for a long time to find the right one.

RIGHT!

LOOK    LOOK
FIND    HAVE
BEAUTIFUL HOUSE
.T. ROAD DUNEDIN

We kept looking and looking and finally found it! A beautiful home it was, on .T. Road, Dunedin

The alternating repetition of the signs for looked or looking and house through which the duration of the action is portrayed also creates a sense of prosody not unlike the abab rhyme scheme that Gee noted in his inquiry into an oral narrative (Gee, 1986, p. 397). This passage is the narrator’s most fluent signing in NZSL and shows the least English/NZSL code-switching, which may account for the emergence of prosodic composition.
The narrative flow is dissected by the discourse marker **RIGHT!** The sign **RIGHT!** in this section does not fulfil either a temporal or discourse marking function. **RIGHT!** may be performing a different function at this juncture. Gee argued that the “performance phenomena” such as hesitations and nonclausal idea units, such as **RIGHT!**, appear in the narrative he analysed for the following reason:

> When L (the orator) has finished a major segment of the narrative and must move on to (plan) the next one she displays these sorts of phenomena, perhaps because of cognitive load at these points or because her attention is shifting from content back to audience (or both). (1986, p. 396)

The narrator has been engaging more fully with NZSL than with English at this certain point in the narrative. The cognitive effort for Participant A to maintain NZSL fluency may explain the need for the frequency of hesitations and pauses.

At the end of the section (‘T’ ROAD DUNEDIN) her attention shifts back to the audience, as she looks for visual affirmation that they have understood the location of her beautiful house. The last two lines are accompanied by a full arm gesture pointing in a direction towards the back of the hall, and her eye gaze scans the audience to make sure her explanation is clear. This supports Gee’s argument that when the focal point has changed from content to audience this will be reflected in the narrative production.

This section is concluded by the longest pause in the entire narrative. Participant A rests her hands on her chest and takes a deep breath. When she is ready to
Then . . .

we can start.

Then . . .

I found I was pregnant with my first baby.

The manual sign THEN leads to the next section PREGNANT. The sign PREGNANT marks both a sectional transition and a chronological event in the action. Here it functions to express the passage of time (ONE YEAR) and links the event of a house purchase to the event of pregnancy. This creates continuity between these different events to achieve what was earlier referred to as discourse glue (Fraser, 1990).

The final narrative section is also introduced by the single sign THEN:
THEN
Then after that
I GOT I
JOB
MONEY
I got a job, to earn some money
HELP
MY HUSBAND
PUT TOGETHER
GIVE
to help my husband to put our earnings together.

In this section, however, Participant A’s reliance on English word patterning and English word order creates a prosaic delivery, with little evidence of the prosody that characterises the narratives of storytellers from an oral community such as that of sign language users (Gee, 1986).

The final section employs NOW as a sentence-initial marker and provides a conclusion to the story of her married life:

NOW
WE
23 YEARS MARRIED
Now we have been married for 23 years!
In conclusion, Participant A’s reliance on English word patterning and English word order creates a prosaic delivery, with only limited evidence of the prosody that characterises the narratives of storytellers from an oral community such as might be found among fluent sign language users (Gee, 1986). Participant A’s paragraph style of delivery resembles the structure of a written narrative. The use of English language grammar and English word cueing shape the narrative units and preclude employing the linguistic devices such as space, movement, and aspectual sign modifications available in NZSL narrative delivery. The absence of these features will become more evident when compared to the analysis of Participant E’s narrative.

4.2.1.2 Pausing Structure and Participant A

The research described here replicates the methodology described in the analysis of the pause structure in an ASL narrative (Gee & Kegl, 1983). This investigation is illustrated graphically in Figure 5. The pause analysis is then compared to Labov’s narrative taxonomy applied to the same narrative, and the result is discussed in sub-section 4.2.1.3.

Participant A’s narrative is two minutes 32 seconds in length. The largest pause was sustained for three seconds (98 frames) and the shortest pause was timed to be eight frames (approximately .029 seconds). The entire text was bisected from the longest to the shortest pause (see Chapter Three) and the hierarchical ordering of the pauses within is illustrated in the pause tree Figure 5.

Participant A presented her story in less fluent NZSL. The narrative style is characterised by a code-mix of non-vocalised English and NZSL and code-
switching in the larger textual arrangements. A blending of the linguistic features of both languages occurs within sentences and in the larger syntactic structures of the narrative. The frequent employment of English language discourse markers will be discussed in the larger context of the pausal analysis which follows.
Figure 5: Hierarchical Structure for Participant A
Reading Figure 5 from the left of the hierarchical tree, there is one lengthy pause (50 frames = 1.75 seconds). Examining the narrative content before the pause, the text provides an introduction of the time, place, and people (MEET HOW MEET name sign OLD DEAF CLUB OVER THERE).

The long pause (50 frames) marks the end of the introduction and the beginning of the story. The 50 frame pause may have been influenced by an interruption by someone in the audience to which the narrator attends. The non-narrative interruption derails her for a full five seconds. She then resumes the story by directing her eye gaze toward the audience and reiterating MEET MEET. Prior to the interruption she has relayed the information as to spatial setting and characters.

The 50 frame pause is concluded by the English lip patterning of the words **RIGHT...OK.** This emphatic discourse marker appears in the sentence-final position (Fraser, 1993) and is accompanied by a slight head nod, her body moving backwards and her eye gaze spanning the room. These non-manual expressions may be an indication that she is moving back into narrator mode, and verifying that the audience is still engaged with the story.

Moving to the right, the bulk of the story unfolds as if in paragraphs. Prior to the 28 frame pause, the story has the events leading up to the event (MARRIED) told in a mixture of English and NZSL. At each of the three pauses (8, 25, and 28) the hiatus is marked by a repeat English lip pattern articulation. The three pauses are marked similarly but fulfil different functions.
At 8 and 25 frame pauses, the lip pattern for **RIGHT!** is emphatically articulated. At the 8 frame pause she is marking a finished event; at the 25 frame pause she is marking a new subject (MARRIED). In the latter case, the marker appears in the sentence-initial position. **OK** is the articulated English lip pattern at the 28 frame pause as she embarks on the description of the wedding (BIG WEDDING BEAUTIFUL DANCE FUN HAPPY).

Continuing to read toward the right, the branches from the 18 frame node show a quicker pace of completing the narrative in two temporally ordered sub-plots: one branch recounts the story of the honeymoon (QUEENSTOWN) and purchasing a house (BUY HOUSE . T. ROAD DUNEDIN) and the other branch recounts chronological developments (HOUSE BOUGHT PREGNANT BABIES). Distinct English word discourse markers in the sentence-initial or sentence-final positions are consistently associated with the larger pauses. These markers are most often unvoiced English lip patterns. For example, immediately following the 18 frame pause there is an emphatic lip pattern **FINISHED THEN** followed by a large manual sign for HOME; at the 13 frame pause, the hand and body are static while the lip pattern for **NEXT** consuming 10 frames of the pause.

Moving further to the right, the same correlation of pausing and English word discourse marking is presented in the 10 and 16 frame pauses, using the same unvoiced lip pattern for **THEN**, articulated in the sentence-initial position. The narrator does not make reference to an NZSL time line or other NZSL devices. This is in contrast to the employment of both the time line and the NZSL signs for TIME PASSED and POSTPONE which were both articulated in the first part of the narrative when talking about engagement and marriage. While temporal juncture is being maintained, it appears to be an irregular narrative pattern with both
English and NZSL features being employed within an idea unit and within larger textual units.

The last significant pauses (23 frames) divides into the two longest periods of NZSL production. One node leads to the description of the babies (FIRST BABY SECOND BABY) and the other node leads to a return to the “here and now” (I JOB MONEY THANK HUSBAND PUT TOGETHER).

The last pause of the narrative is the shortest (11 frames) and leads the narrator to concluding the story with a gesture and a lip pattern “that’s all”.

The pause analysis indicates a patterning in the narrative units of production that is significant. Each narrative section is organised around time, place and a main event. Gee observed the same phenomena in the oral narrative of a retired teacher (1986). Gee suggests that “these elements – theme, time and location – are the hinges around which the teacher organised her stanzas” (1986, p. 407). This appears to be true in Participant A’s narrative. She organises her stanzas based on a specific point in time, in a clearly articulated venue, for a discrete event.

Gee suggests that a structural parallelism is achieved through the repetition of these three elements, although it is not the traditional parallelism associated with more prosodic texts (1986). The same parallelism is evident in Participant A’s story. In most cases, the pauses coincide with the shift in the orientation of the action. The boundaries between individual scenes are marked out by pause and English word discourse markers, the pauses creating the boundaries between the parallel stanzas in the story. Also, the regularity and similarity of pause lengths in
the two main episodes of the action suggest that Participant A is creating equally balanced topical segments.

However, there is little evidence of poetic patterning in her stanzas, and a parallel stanza of abab cadence appears only once in the narrative. The pauses and English discourse markers are the key indicators of section divisions. There is minimal engagement of space and movement resources available in NZSL although some of the NZSL sign lexicon is used. This supports Gee’s assertion that prosody in narrative is influenced by the linguistic community of the storyteller (1986). In this case, the narrator appears to be using English language construction and a code-mix of English and NZSL in her narrative delivery. The code-mixing is a major factor in the shape and production of her narrative.

4.2.1.3  *Labov Taxonomy And Gee Pausal Analysis Participant A*

Participant A’s pausing structure has been graphically presented in a hierarchical tree in Figure 5. Each of the narrative units that Labov describes in a fully formed narrative are present in this narrative. The compatibility of the two textual taxonomic approaches is tested by superimposing the Labov taxonomy upon Gee’s structural pause hierarchy. The results are illustrated by the hierarchal tree, Figure 6 to be found in this chapter (p. 134).

Starting at the left of the compilation, Labov taxonomy is evident. The abstract resembles an English language format HOW I MET MY HUSBAND. It is presented as a titular declaration stated at the outset of her narration. She proceeds from this point to develop her narrative.
The orientation describes the setting for the meeting. She introduces the venue after introducing the activity. This is not the usual sign order in NZSL (McKee & Kennedy, 2005, p. 290). The narrative does not display this NZSL convention; rather the activity is introduced before the location.

One feature of the complicating action is particularly significant. As McKee explains, “Narrative and descriptions of physical scenes in NZSL tend to proceed – first establishing the background setting, next the large features of the scene, then the addition of increasingly fine details” (2005, p. 290). Participant A describes her house purchase in this order: BUY HOUSE .T. ROAD DUNEDIN. Although this is appropriate, it is a less typical chronology in NZSL narrative discourse.

The complicating action delivers a chronological progression of the narrator’s experience that typically involve dilemmas such as who to marry, which house to buy, how many babies and so on. The series of events ends with the statement I JOB MONEY HELP HUSBAND in which the many typical life dilemmas revolve and are resolved by her conclusion, NOW 23 YEARS MARRIED.

The coda is expressed with atypical expression “that’s all”, a self-conscious smile and an open arm gesture. The open arm gesture is also an expression of closure often seen in NZSL narratives.

In summary, both Labov’s taxonomy and Gee’s pausal analysis can be applied to Participant A’s narrative. Furthermore, as illustrated, the Labov taxonomic divisions and Gee’s pausal boundaries appear to be interchangeable as boundaries marking the structural divisions of the narrative text.
Figure 6: Hierarchical Structure for Participant A
4.2.1.4  Units of Production and Participant E

Participant E tells his story in fluent NZSL. He is a self-assured raconteur and the audience is familiar with his presentation style. He presents a story in which he was a participant, but which is introduced by another person. The initiator then invites him to come and tell the story.

The narrative is one minute and 33 seconds in length. The narrative is composed of 17 stanzas grouped into five sections. Two of the five sections can be attributed to HER/SHE as chief antagonist and two to the narrator as the main actor. The fifth section performs a separate non-narrative evaluative function.

The majority (48%) of stanzas are four lines in length. Three-line stanzas form 29% of the total narrative. At three crucial points in the narrative, a five-line stanza appears accounting for 18% of the total narrative. A one-line stanza is used infrequently, accounting for only 6% of the narrative structure. The significance of stanza length and its influence on production and prosody will be revisited again in the Discussion chapter.

Participant E’s narrative is made up of a series of short NZSL sequences. These idea units (Chafe, 1980) conform to Gee’s definition of lines. In order to comply with the notion of idea unit, signs are transcribed as lines when they convey completion of an idea, or concept. The lines in NZSL transcription therefore appear to conform to being short, and displaying syntactic and semantic congruence with the lines that surround them (Gee, 1986). The narrative opens with:
THERE
[name sign] FARM
DEAF
ASSEMBLED
ADULTS
ADULTS

These lines are relatively short, and show “a good deal of syntactic and semantic parallelism with the lines adjacent or near to them” (1986, p. 394). The lines offer a logical grouping of ideas and show a progressive setting out of the location and agents of the story. By Gee’s definition, these lines constitute a stanza: language is produced at the same rate, with no hesitations or pauses between signs. An English translation would read:

We were at one of our mate’s farms,
a whole bunch of us,
all adults;
we are all gathered there . . .

This is adjacent to the following stanza:

KEG (cl)
KEG (cl)
BEER
KEG (cl)
In Gee’s description of a stanza “the lines are fully saturated with pattern and tightly knit together” (1986, p. 397). The sign KEG is repeated three times, with the clarification of its contents (beer) inserted between the repetitions. This stanza shows a structure and pattern not unlike that of poetry. The rhythm of the NZSL sign production and the timing of the accompanying non-manual features display the kind of regularity often associated with poetry. The straightforward “sign to word” glossing transcription (as above) reveals linguistic parallelism and rhythm often associated with poetry. These features also appear when the stanza is translated into English:

We had this big keg
Yup, a full keg
Full of beer
A keg full of beer

This kind of parallelism through repetition appears elsewhere as well

pulling a pint
GIVE TO “him”
pulling a pint
GIVE TO “him”
pulling a pint
GIVE TO “him”

The sense of poetry is created by both the parallelism and repetition, perhaps because it such features are readily employed in a visual language. However, translation into English does not always preserve these features.

Beers are poured and passed around to everyone.
The signed stanza does not merely communicate a recurrent action. The apparent syntactic simplicity belies the amount of information being conveyed. The multi-layered linguistic properties of NZSL are well exploited in this stanza:

GIVE TO “him”  
pulling a pint  
GIVE TO “him”  
pulling a pint  
GIVE TO “him”

Pronominal referencing in the signing space “in front” of the keg (him, him, him) and the manual performance of the same NZSL sequence creates more than three distinct events in the story. The story involves more than three drinkers, but the fact that all the adults receive a drink is inferred by three repetitions. The narrator’s shifting eye gaze and direction, directional sign movement, the use of the signing space, body posture, facial expression, and the subtle variation in hand shape are the constituents of NZSL that combine to communicate information, provide drama, and carry the narrative forward.

The “pulling a pint” is expressed by the dominant right hand pulling down the spigot, while the non-dominant left hand remains stationary, positioned under or “below” the spigot through the sequence. This visual perseverating of the non-dominant hand is comparable to that of the sign KEG as described by Gee: “This is an extremely effective device as it keeps the sign literally in front of our eyes while the narrative that centres around goes on” (1983, p. 246).
The pint glass is held below the spigot by the left hand, a slight puffing of one cheek indicates the glass is being filled, and the eye gaze remains on the glass under the spigot. Then the full pint glass is handed to each of three different characters positioned in the signing space “in front” of the keg and eye gaze shifts from one to the next as the pint glasses are handed round the group. The left hand remains perseverating on the spigot thereby keeping the keg at the centre of the story. The repetition and sense of movement created by a four-line stanza in aabb or abab patterning creates the liveliness of the group drinking. Winston (1998) explored the use of prosody in ASL narratives. Her observations were reviewed and recorded by Metzger & Bahan in their contribution to The Sociolinguistics of Sign Languages (2001):

Non-manual information conveyed by eyes, head, face, shoulders, torso and arms/hands can be altered qualitatively in terms of their movement in space, and in terms of features, such as speed, tenseness, size direction and repetition of movement. (Metzger & Bahan, 2001, p. 137)

A rhythm, using a four-line stanza in aabb or abab structure, creates the momentum for a group drinking session. Characterisation of the actors has been expressed by the non-manual information inherently part of an NZSL narrative delivery.

The next development in the narrative introduces a new actor by using a one line stanza:

HER >>
The pace of the narrative is moved to a more dramatic pitch by the abrupt change in stanza length and the prosaic nature of the one sign delivery. The sign is executed by a deictic reference to the person standing on the stage to the left of the narrator. A slight inclination of the head and the choice of a thumb to point to “her” (a less formal pronominal form) imply a negative response to her involvement in the main activity. The one-word stanza signals a transition of focus and narrator. The one-line stanza also furnishes an evaluative comment about ”her”, using expressive non-manual information.

Having created a sense of drama, by the abrupt one line inclusion, the story resumes with a different stanza pattern:

pulling a pint:
GIVE TO “him”
Come on! Hurry up!
pulling a pint
GIVE TO “him”
Come on! Hurry up!

DRINK UP
pulling a pint
GIVE TO “him”
Come on! Hurry up!
pulling a pint
GIVE TO “him”
The story develops because SHE takes hold of the spigot and starts handing out the beer. Some of the NZSL linguistic constituents remain the same (the manual handshape, direction and perseverating handshape denoting the glass of beer).

There are also qualitative changes in the NZSL delivery to better suit the personality of the new character pulling the pints. “She” is not a participant in the main action and is expressing her urgency to see it terminated. The execution of the NZSL sign sequences and the structure of the stanzas convey these changes. The NZSL signs are bigger and less precise in their execution. The glasses are filled up quickly and carelessly, the beers are not “given” to the recipients: there is a more open-handed “throwing” of the glass towards the drinker. Exaggerated gestural movements and pronounced English lip patterning (DRINK UP!) are exaggerated to reflect the character of the one who has now taken the lead role in the story.

The stanzas are now three lines long, and exhibit a less rhythmic flow. The previous abab poetic pattern is made less transparent by the insertion of DRINK UP before the sequence is repeated. The shorter stanza and more prosaic delivery are in contrast to the principal narrator’s style and the atmosphere of the main activity of the story. However, maintenance of a structural parallelism is crucial, as Gee suggests, because “movement forward narratively is always done by holding a good bit of the structure and content constant” (1986, p. 399).

The same NZSL manual components (pulling a pint GIVE TO) and the abab prosody are maintained. The addition of a non-manual gesture and English lip pattern between the ab couplets adds to the drama and moves the story forward. The change in stanza length anticipates a crisis by altering the symmetry of
delivery. The abrupt change confirms to the audience that this is a different perspective on the main event, yet keeps constant the scene location and physical artefacts of the story.

The construction of the narrative illustrates that lines “cluster into thematically constant units that [we have] called stanzas” (1986, p. 403). Combining adjacent stanzas forms sections. By Gee’s definition, the four stanzas (pulling a pint, GIVE TO “him”) combine to form a section of narrative (1986, p. 399). The section commences with the introduction of a new character, and there are no subsequent internal changes of place or of characters. The stanzas within the section show robust parallelism in rhythm and in execution. Sections show consistency of topic, character and location (1986, p. 400).

Gee further suggests that sections frequently terminate with a summary of the action just concluded (1986, p. 400).

R/H GLASS : L/H STOP

R/H GLASS : L/H behind signer

STOP : (both hands)

The information would be translated into informal English in this vein:

We are all pretty drunk by now, feeling the effects alright, and there she is still nagging on at us . . . she just wouldn’t quit!
and in a subsequent section:

    TURN OFF
    (hand stroking the chin)
    WHAT TO DO?

In a translation fitting to the genre of the narrative, an English translation would read:

    So we turned off the keg. We are all just
    sitting around trying to decide what to do. . .

In these two examples, the segment of action is concluded and the narrative can move onto another episode. In the first example, the pantomimic presentation of being drunk (body weave, a smirk on his face, and the GLASS in his hand) show that drinking has been going on for some time. The perseveration of the GLASS shifts the focal point of the story from KEG. The exaggerated mime of drunkenness describes the state of the ADULT(S). These two distinct narrative developments are executed simultaneously and in combination serve to switch the visual focus from the KEG to the ADULTS.

The second example summarises the dilemma that has subsequently arisen. The long pause, the stroking of his chin and the rhetorical question (WHAT TO DO?) invite the engagement of the audience and pique their curiosity as to what will happen next. The audience is made aware that a crossroads has been reached. The three-line stanzas at the conclusion of these two separate sections transition the story from describing the problem to finding a solution. The stanza length impacts
on the reiterative and rhythmic nature of the narrative up to this point. The switch to a more prosaic delivery has the effect of increasing the sense of crisis and confrontation.

The necessity to resolve the conflict is highlighted by the articulation of the two opposing viewpoints:

TURN OFF
(hand rubbing the chin)
WHAT TO DO?

“come on . . .”

I GO BED

“come on . . .”

She is still hassling us “come on, come on . . .

I wanna go to bed!”

These two stanzas are not adjacent: they are the summary stanzas articulated at the conclusion of contiguous sections in the narrative. They are both delivered in a three-line stanza. First, the main character presents his dilemma, and the second summarises “her” dilemma.

This latter stanza is presented in the antagonist’s style, contrasting markedly with the strong NZSL performance of the main actor in his summation. The three-line stanzas are used to good effect to summarise the dilemma without weakening the tension, slowing the progression of the narrative, or disclosing the solution. The
rhythm created by the abruptness of a three-line stanza quickens the sense of urgency, and makes it clear that both parties have recognised the dilemma. The slower pace of NZSL delivery, the sense of deliberation, and the use of fewer NZSL features combine to create a sense of a crucial hiatus in the story.

The resolution is presented in stanza length and rhythm and that then echoes the original stanza construction exhibited in the earlier part of the narrative:

R/H VOMIT
NEXT, NEXT
L/H VOMIT
NEXT NEXT

NEXT VOMIT

One by one we all start being sick, vomiting up the beer – every last one of us, puking up, one after another, being sick . . ., one after the other, all of us being sick

The abab prosody is perhaps reinforced or highlighted with both signs repeated in the last line. All the participants in the drinking session are included by using pronominal referencing in the signing space, and a forward body movement ‘past’ the KEG and toward the audience. The forward movement past the KEG implies the story is no longer focussed on the KEG. A smile appears on the narrator’s face as he appears to be acknowledging the laughter that is now emanating from the audience.
Divisions between line, stanza and section are unambiguous and their structural integrity remains when the story is translated into written English. Stanza length and prosody are used to great narrative advantage, creating flow and building tension. As Gee has noted in his analysis of a spoken narrative, “Stanzas show intricate structure and patterning, taking on some of the properties of stanzas in poetry” (1986, p. 396)

Having concluded the action and resolved the situation, the narrator steps out of narrator role to make a comment on the story. He physically moves backwards and with a glance toward “her” he signs a four line evaluative statement:

```
EMBARRASSED
SHE/HERSELF
GIVE BEERS
TOO MUCH
```

Oh boy! was she ever embarrassed . . . she had totally humiliated herself – she was the one feeding us too much beer so that everyone was sick.

He exits from the stage, having completed the narrative initiated by “her”.

The unit structure is maintained in translation; however, the prosody in the NZSL narrative does not carry over to the written English translation. Gee argued that the distinct prosodic patterning in the ASL narrative he investigated reflected the linguistic performances found in most oral cultures (1986). He suggested that this might be accounted for because the narrator was part of a “residually oral
community’, that is a community that is less influenced by written-languages than middle-class communities, and one that still retains its oral tradition” (1986, p. 402). The transparent prosody and patterning found in this NZSL narrative may be due to its non-verbal visual modality.

Another feature that may reflect non-verbal visual modality is in Participant E’s early employment of a name sign. The use of a name sign (McKee & McKee, 2000), as opposed to initialisation or an unvoiced English lip pattern, is significant in three respects. First, it determines the narrator and the actor’s membership in the Deaf (Big D) Discourse. As Lane et al. explain in their exploration of the DEAF-WORLD: “The giving of a name sign is a rite of passage” (Lane, et al., 1996, p. 76). Secondly, the audience is now orientated to the fact that this is a Deaf story about Deaf people. The appearance of a name sign identifies the Big D Discourse in which the little d discourse is situated: “The giving and receiving of a name sign is also an important event in acculturation in the DEAF-WORLD and the name sign itself frequently reveals much about Deaf culture “(Lane, et al., 1996, p. 74). Thirdly, the appearance of a name sign so early in the story supports the interrelatedness of the little d discourse and Big D Discourse framework. Name signs are a linguistic resource peculiar to the speech community in which they are being assigned and recognised (McKee & McKee, 2000).

In conclusion, the spatial and aspectual properties available in NZSL for storytelling are exploited well by Participant E. Analysis by examining units of production reveals a robust complicated structure and reiterative patterning. The variation in stanza length is used to great effect, favouring a four-line stanza following an abab or aabb poetic cadence.
4.2.1.5  *Pause Structure and Participant E*

Gee investigated the pause structure of an ASL narrative (Gee & Kegl, 1983). The analysis described in this section replicates the methodology described in his analysis. The results of the quantitative analysis are represented in a hierarchical tree structure (see Figure 5). Labov’s narrative taxonomy and the resulting narrative pause structure will then be compared in sub-section 4.2.1.6.

Participant E’s narrative is one minute and 33 seconds in length. The pauses were identified by counting frames within each second (approximating 30 frames to one second of video recording). Participant E’s narrative contains 12 significant pauses, the longest being 1.7 seconds or 51 frames (30 frames = approximately one second) and the shortest pause being .029 seconds or seven frames.
Figure 7: Hierarchical Structure for Participant E
Reading from the left of the diagram, there are two significant pauses (22 and 13 frames). Examining the narrative content of the stanzas bounded by the pauses, the narrator has completed his introduction of the story. He has established the setting (FARM) the characters (ADULTS) and hinted at the activity to follow (KEG).

Moving toward the right, the branches extending from the 22 frame pause lead to a shorter pause of 17 frames. The main episodes of the action have commenced and consequently the narrative displays fewer pauses. The central activity is established (PULLING PINTS) and the narrator introduces the source of the ensuing dilemma (HER). Labov and Waletzky suggested that the narrator is setting out “to emphasize the strange and unusual character of the situation – there is an appeal to the element of mystery in most of (the) narratives” (1967, p. 34).

The other branch of the node (25 frames) keeps the main storyline going (HALF KEG TO GO). Simultaneously, another narrative development leads to the main characters’ deliberations about the impending conflict (CHECK THE KEG).

Continuing to move to the right across the tree structure, the audience is drawn in by the rhetorical question (WHAT TO DO?). This narrative climax is marked by the longest pause (51 frames) found in the narrative. At this point, the narrator resumes an upright stance standing back from the keg, he strokes his chin, and a familiar hand gesture and lip pattern “bugger!” combine to cause the audience to anticipate a change in the direction of the story. The salient factors in the conflict are being presented from both sides.
The basic narrative components of a story are all present: a situation, a dilemma and a resolution. However, Labov and Waletzky suggested that “a narrative which contains an orientation, complicating action and result is not a complete narrative. Such a narrative lacks significance: it has no point” (1967, p. 33).

The narrator has not yet established significance. He turns to the “she” on the stage, and articulates how her perception of her contribution to its resolution. He suggests that her actions have (EMBARRASSED HERSELF). The story is concluded by a non-narrative evaluation of the effect of the story on “her”. This is a crucial inclusion as “she” was the instigator of the narration and invited the narrator to tell the story. The narrator succeeds in portraying a level of self-aggrandisement (Gee, 2005; Labov & Waletzky, 1967) as well as providing an amusing and satisfactory conclusion to the story. Labov and Waletzky point out that “narratives are usually told in answer to some stimulus from outside, and to establish some point of personal interest” (1967, p.34).

These conditions that determine a fully formed narrative are met. The narrator was one of the ADULTS, and SHE was the antagonist. Labov’s suggestion of both external stimulus and personal interest are borne out in this fully formed narrative.

4.2.1.6  Labov Taxonomy And Gee Pausal Analysis Participant E

The placement and length of pausing in Participant E’s total narrative text provide a pattern that can be illustrated by means of a hierarchical tree structure. The pause structure proves to be equivalent to the traditional divisions as described by L&W in spoken narratives (1967). The appropriate Labovian classifications have been appended to the hierarchal representation of Gee’s pausal structure to
illustrate the compatibility. The results of this comparison are illustrated in Figure 8 in this chapter.

The significant pauses appear to delineate the narrative units found in fully formed narratives, insofar as those units are found in the NZSL narrative. In this example, an abstract is not evident in a textual analysis and hence is not represented in the hierarchal tree structure. The absence of an abstract can be explained by the fact that Participant E was invited to tell the story, and the general overview of what was to follow had been introduced by another person, prior to commencement of his narration.

The NZSL narrative provides a flow from an orientation, through a series of events within the complicating action, toward a resolution and an evaluation and a non-linguistic coda. The coda is presented visually: the narrator simply smiles at “her” and with a deliberate glance towards the audience, exits the stage.

The structural divisions are indicated by significant pauses in the stream of the narrative, and employ the canonical linguistic devices available in a visual modality such as NZSL. The alteration in pitch or falling contours in spoken narration is replaced in NZSL by visual performance, such as dropped hands, change in eye gaze, or alterations in body posture. These visual constituents create pauses which in turn can be used to indicate transitional points in the story. These pauses correlate with the taxonomic divisions suggested in the Labov narrative analysis.
Gee’s hypothesis is that:

\[ \ldots \text{major transitions or breaks in the plot of a story} \]
\[ \text{tend to have longer pauses than more minor transitions or breaks. If this is indeed true, we can use pausing as evidence of larger units in the construction of a text, or, put another way, as evidence of major discourse level transitions or boundaries in the text.} \]
\[ (1986, \text{p. 393}) \]

Gee’s pause analysis methodology and production unit taxonomy proved to be fitting approaches to examining this narrative in NZSL. Furthermore, by superimposing the hierarchical pause tree designed by Gee onto Labov’s textual unit structure, clear parallels can be drawn between the two methodological approaches.

Figure 8 is the tree structure that results from Gee’s methodology. It can be seen that the pauses faithfully corresponds to the boundaries between segments and between episodes. The tree clearly demarcates the high point of the story, the climax, and graphically illustrates the momentum in resolution and conclusion of the story. The second half of the story is characterised by fewer pauses, as the events of the story have been recounted and there is less need to provide dramatic pauses to sustain interest.
4.3 Chapter Summary

This chapter has described the results of the analysis led by the four research questions posed by the researcher. It has described the results of applying two different methodologies and taxonomies to two different NZSL narratives.

The Labov taxonomy has been applied to the data, indicating there may be a significant correlation between the structural units of oral narratives and those in a visual modality. Gee’s units of production may also be able to provide a suitable vehicle to describe sign language narrative structures. Gee’s pausal analysis methodology was replicated with both the narratives in order to detail the pauses within the narrative. By using quantitative analysis, the chapter then graphically illustrated the shape of the narratives based on pausal length and position. Finally, the chapter describes the result of superimposing the Labov taxonomy onto the pausal tree analysis, with a view to discovering if the location of the pauses were representative of the narrative divisions of the Labov taxonomy.

Chapter Five will discuss the results of the analysis presented in this chapter. The results of this research will then be situated within other research in the field of visual narratives and consider some of the sign language features that have come to light in this analysis.
Figure 8: Hierarchical Structure for Participant E
5 Introduction

This chapter will begin by responding to the research questions that the project set out to answer. The four questions are re-stated here:

1. To what extent do the features of NZSL narratives reflect Labov’s analytical framework?

2. To what extent do NZSL narratives replicate Gee’s units of production?

3. To what extent does the analysis of pausing indicate the textual boundaries in NZSL narratives?

4. To what degree does the pause analysis replicate Labov’s structural analysis discovered in question one?

Each question will be addressed in individual sub-sections 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, and 5.4 respectively.

Section 5.5 will attempt to shed further light on the research findings by referring to other research in the field of visual narratives and will discuss some of the narrative structural features that have come to light in the investigative process.

In conclusion, Section 5.6 will summarise the investigative process and the notable results of the research.
5.1  Answering Question One

The first question asked is to what extent do the features of NZSL narratives reflect Labov’s analytical framework?

The question was addressed by analysing the suitability of Labov’s structural methodology with one SSE narrative and one NZSL narrative. The analysis of the data showed that Labov’s narrative structure is compatible with the structure of non-verbal narratives in NZSL. It also indicates that fluency in NZSL influences how the different parts of a narrative were articulated. The key factor appears to be narrator familiarity with, and communicative competency in, the NZSL lexicon and non-lexical constituents. Participant A is first presented, then Participant E.

5.1.1  Participant A

As Chapter Four has shown, Participant A’s story is expressed in Signs Supporting English (SSE) (McKee & Kennedy 2005). Signs Supporting English (SSE) is a communicative system based on following English word order and simultaneously supplementing the English word with a manual sign or gesture. This is traditionally executed in one of two ways. In the first instance, the Deaf person will fingerspell the first letter of the word, a process known as initialisation. This occurs when the signer uses the first initial of the concept and proceeds to mouth the entire word (McKee & Kennedy, 2005, p. 290). The manual signing of the letter will be synchronised with an unvoiced English lip-pattern of the complete word. Alternatively, the English word may be formed on the lips without initialisation and the NZSL manual sign produced simultaneously. SSE characteristically does not use other sign linguistic resources such as location and movement.
Fluent NZSL users display distinct English lip patterns and initialisation when the concept is a new one, or if the audience is unfamiliar with sign language. This is commonly referred to as cueing (McKee & Kennedy, 2005). Cueing, the silent lip patterning of an English word while simultaneously producing the sign manually, expresses a single concept. SSE is a persistent communicative code-mix strategy employed throughout Participant A’s narrative.

The subject of Participant A’s story, her journey from single girl to marriage and motherhood, suggests events will be ordered chronologically. The historical nature of the story appears to impact both the linguistic repertoire available to her and the overall structure of her story, as shown in the findings discussed below.

First, there is less opportunity to exploit the expressive visual properties of NZSL when the script of the story calls for a recounting of a chronological sequence. Secondly, the participant may be inhibited about including evaluative comments expressing her own personal views. Her husband and many of her friends were in the audience and therefore she may have felt less able to inject personal comments in her presentation. Both these factors may have influenced the articulation and the evaluative content of her story. For example, her facial expression remains neutral and somewhat impassive through most of the narrative with one notable exception. When she is describing the wedding reception, she involves her face and body to convey the response of her guests (FUN/HAPPY LOOK LAUGHING/DANCING). A personal evaluative comment is expressed on only one other occasion when she comments on the birth of her two babies (YAY!).

Participant A’s narrative presents one orientation at the commencement of the narrative, and fresh orientations between episodes in her story, as previously
described. The two principal actors remain constant throughout the narrative, but each narrative episode is introduced by a temporal re-orientation. In typical SSE communication style, she initialises G as she forms the full unvoiced lip pattern for the name of the street (G-STREET). She follows this with the NZSL sign STREET, and she accompanies this by a full arm extension pointing in the general direction of the street. This combination is duplicated later in the story to indicate T. ROAD, with the full lip pattern of the road name, the NZSL sign ROAD and a directional full arm point.

As has also been shown in Chapter Four, the individual events of the complicating action are most commonly separated by English discourse markers such as RIGHT! THEN, NEXT. On one occasion an episode is concluded with the sign FINISH. The use of FINISH communicates the end of an episode as well as an intentional sectional break. There are only two episodes in the complicating action where she employs NZSL resources to indicate episodic completion. In both cases, she uses an exaggerated NZSL time line to display POSTPONE/ ONE YEAR in combination with an intentional pause.

Temporal juncture is crucial to the flow and sense of this narrative. Participant A is employing a “technique of constructing narrative units which match the temporal sequence of that experience” (Labov & Waletzky, 1967, p.13). A reversal or reordering of events would alter the meaning of the account. By employing a combination of NZSL devices, English word discourse markers with unvoiced English lip patterning, Participant A achieves narrative progression.
5.1.2 **Participant E**

Chapter Four has shown that Participant E is a fluent signer and seldom exhibits any reference to English in his delivery. His narrative employs the full linguistic repertoire of NZSL to create a fully-formed story, as is discussed below.

Evidence of his fluency includes his quick and confident signing, and his use of a name sign for the owner of the venue. He also makes effective use of topic-comment syntax (Deuchar, 1983) to orientate the audience. A spatial map centres of the focal point of the KEG, using repetition to indicate its centrality to the story as the focal point, through spatial mapping and eye gaze (Winston, 1993). Because of this the sign classifier KEG does not have to be used again until resolution. Non-manual visual features, such as gestures, eye gaze, and body alignment, are used to signal the complicating action, as previously described. For example, the narrator repeatedly rubs his hands together as a discourse marker to signal the beginning of the complicating action. Facial grammar is also used to distinguish between the narrator, shown through a smirk, and SHE, shown through a furrowed brow. Alternating between them propels the action forward.

One distinctive way in which Participant E uses sign resources to progress the action of his narrative is through reported language or constructed dialogue. In signed language, constructed dialogue is achieved through morphological inflection and augmented by a non-manual constituent. The information and the characterisation are expressed simultaneously, in much the same way that pitch, accent or voice modulation accomplish them in speech. Aspects of constructed dialogue in ASL have been researched by Winston (1991) and Metzger (1995) and both agree that action as well as dialogue appear to be constructed phenomena in ASL. As Metzger describes it, “Reported actions in ASL seem to be similar to the
notion of reported speech in that events in one context are reported in another” (1995, p. 256)

Constructed action is enacted in ASL narratives when the actions of the characters within the story are directly articulated by the narrator rather than merely being demonstrated by the narrator (Metzger & Bahan, 2001, p. 134). Constructed action achieves both characterisation and the imitation of the actual events. The narrator takes on a complete role shift, and “becomes” the other actor and performs his/her actions, as has been described in Chapter Four.

There is extensive use of constructed action in Participant E’s narrative. He builds the action, dialogue and the character of SHE simultaneously. For example, the antagonist exclaims COME ON/DRINK/Come ON: the narrator employs a double handed exaggerated gesture which clearly is not the narrator’s personal sentiment or style of delivery. As the complicating action builds, the reiterative sign COME ON gets large and more hurried, directed at the “drinkers” by the antagonist and signer. Later in the story, the same double-handed gestural movement COME ON is accompanied by a clear English lip pattern and a scowl on his face. The English lip patterning is a further indication of the alternative role the narrator is playing and of the difference and distance between the two actors.

He moves back into the role representing the group of drinkers and signs on their behalf:

CALM DOWN

CALM DOWN
CALM DOWN is expressed with a double-handed movement, but the orientation of the palms is toward the floor, the opposite palm orientation to the previously signed COME ON COME ON. This phonological phenomenon has been described by Brennan as a “Palm Ori” (Brennan, Colville, & Lawson, 1990, p. 125). Palm Ori describes the orientation of the palm in relation to the signer’s body. Participant E uses this “flipping” of the sign to great dramatic advantage. In addition to the sign, his eye gaze is directed at her, and his face scolds, as if she were a naughty child. He thus creatively presents constructed dialogue, with an embedded critical comment as well as continuing the complicating action. This passage of text exemplifies the notion of expressive phonology as well as combining the techniques of constructed dialogue and constructed action.

Winston (1991) suggests that both constructed dialogue and constructed action can be used in parallel in ASL, as Participant E’s narrative has shown. Metzger (1995) agrees that not only do constructed dialogue and constructed action work together but that the narrator has a further option. According to Metzger, the signer can be presenting action from “within” the story, the worldview and characters created by the narrative, or can choose to stand “outside” the story and relate the events in a narrator role. The first technique she describes as direct action, and the second technique as indirect action (1995, p. 134). Participant E’s narrative exhibits both direct and indirect action.

Direct action reconstructs events using body, limbs, face and eyes to convey the activity. Direct action is exhibited by Participant E as he reports the main activity by reiteratively signing PULL GIVE. He avoids ambiguity by using pronominal referencing, eye gaze, and perseveration with his non-dominant hand. Perseveration (Gee & Kegl, 1983) and purposeful eye gaze keeps the KEG fixed in
the space in front of the narrator, thus symbolically holding the KEG in the centre of the story. (The importance of KEG placement will be explored in more detail later in the section.)

Indirect action involves minimal use of the body to express the activity. Using a neutral facial expression and a single manual deictic, the narrator shifts the narrator role to the antagonist, who is standing on the stage beside him. He refers to SHE/HER seven times in the narrative, always with a similar deictic movement of varying intensity. As he shifts the narrator role to her, his head and body are squarely facing the audience, and there is no attempt to interact with her or make eye contact with her. There is a slight head nodding movement in her direction on two occasions, supporting the intention to convey that SHE is interfering in the direct action but that she is about to make some contribution to the development of the storyline.

The spatial map created by the centrality of the KEG provides the crucial connection between the scenes in the complicating action. Talking about the KEG does not progress the narrative, but its commonality to all the activity of the story facilitates the sequencing, so that there is progression and synthesis (Todorov, 1977, p. 233). This is not temporal juncture in terms of before-and-after clausal relationship (Labov, 2006, p. 37), but it is transformation (Todorov, 1977). Todorov suggests that transformation describes the presence of some common element in the narrative sequence, in this instance the KEG, to not only create narrative, but also to bring both cohesion and progression in the narrative.

Participant E anticipates the resolution through the gesture of rubbing his chin. Through his only use of an English word discourse marker, BUT, with full lip
patterning, Participant E takes up the role of SHE. This is accompanied by a number of non-manual features. The resolution itself is clearly signalled with the narrator taking his own role in the story again, again through non-manual features.

Chapter Four has shown that non-manual features also signal Participant E stepping out of his role in the narrative as he delivers evaluative statements. As Labov (1972a) describes, the progression of the story is stopped to evaluate it. For example, throughout the narrative the narrator uses deictic referencing and facial grammar to refer to SHE, without impacting on the progression of the action of the story.

Evaluation in Participant E’s narrative is often executed non-lexically, that is, not using actual signs in the morphological sense. Evaluations are conveyed through phonological inflections, which most often involve gesture, facial expression and eye gaze. Wilson makes the same observation about evaluation in the ASL narrative the Tobacco Story. Wilson suggests that the evaluation embedded in the action is a form of evaluation based on using ”expressive phonology instead of lexical signs” (1966, p. 163).

This is also true of Participant E’s narrative. Extensive use of facial expression, pantomime and exaggerated gesture produce evaluative comments that permeate the complicating action. Evaluation of the ongoing drama is often revealed on the face. Facial grammar when expressing character development can be regarded as adjectival (Lane, et al., 1996) and is most often conveyed by the mouth and eyes. For example, at the commencement of the complicating action, the NZSL sign sequence is PULL GIVE, and the facial grammar indicates pleasure and
anticipation by purposeful eye gaze and a smile on his lips. Later the same sign sequence PULL GIVE is performed, but the facial grammar indicates displeasure with an eye gaze directed downwards and a grimace on the face.

When Participant E concludes his narrative, the coda is expressed non-lexically by the dropping of both of his hands, and he directs a wry smile towards her as he exits the stage. Even in the last utterance, both evaluative and concluding remarks are communicated to the audience by non-lexical devices. The narrator takes on a complete role shift, and “becomes” the other actor and performs his/her actions, not unlike Goffman’s (1955; 1959, 1963), definition of role shift in effecting narrative closure:

A conclusion is part way between the curtain call through which a stage actor finally appears outside of the character he has been portraying and the coda (to use Labov’s term) by which a storyteller throws up a bridge between the situation he was in as protagonist in the narrative, and his current situation as someone who stands before his listeners. (1981, p. 176)

Goffman’s definition is describing the dynamics of narrative closure, but the same dynamic governs the numerous role shifts, or constructed action, delivered throughout a narrative in visual non-verbal modality, such as those of Participant E.
5.1.3 **Comparison of the two Narratives**

Both narratives followed Labov’s structure, but they used different techniques to accomplish them. For example, the complicating action and resolution were present in both narratives but were accomplished by different techniques.

In the SSE narrative, by Participant A, the use of cueing, initialisation, and unvoiced English lip patterns are key determinants in the ordering and combining of narrative units. In the NZSL story, Participant E extensively employed expressive non-manual features to shape the narrative structure. The SSE narrative relied on chronological detailing; the NZSL narrative employed constructed dialogue and action. Temporal juncture was marked in the SSE narrative by the occasional use of timelines and English word discourse markers. Transformation and progression was accomplished in the NZSL narrative by use of the morphological inflection of signs. Inflection is created by making the sign larger, smaller or moving it in a particular direction or altering the speed at which it is performed.

5.2 **Answering Question Two**

Question Two asked to what extent do NZSL narratives replicate Gee’s units of production?

Gee’s units of production suggest that the stanza is the most revealing structure of the narrative as it is at the stanza level that syntax gives way to the shape and character of the discourse (1986, p. 409). Gee’s units of production uncover the structural skeleton of the discourse which then permits investigation of the more stylistic features of the language in use. In his taxonomy, Gee approached the task
by quantifying the units of a spontaneous oral narrative into its lines, stanzas and sections. In the resulting textual segmentation, the role and significance of structural parallelism and prosody in determining lines and stanzas can also be exposed and discussed.

5.2.1 **Participant A**

Participant A’s stanza and line formation are remarkably uniform. Each stanza consists of three idea units of three lines with little variation in any section of the narrative. The sectional divisions within the body of the narrative appear at equal intervals, at lines 13, 26, and 54.

Gee’s work on units of production compared the narrative of a young girl from an oral community to a narrative elicited from a retired school teacher. Participant A’s narrative production shows greater similarity to the structure of the retired school teacher than to the narrative structure articulated by the young girl from an oral community. Gee’s observations about the production and shape of the school teacher’s narrative can also be applied to Participant A’s storytelling structure. This is explained below.

Gee states that the teacher’s text had more idea units that were expressed individually (1986). Similarly, Participant A’s transcription reveals small idea units articulated in individual lines rather than a full clause-like structure that incorporate a pronominal subject and an action.

Gee’s analysis of the teacher’s story notes that each stanza provided a theme, time, and location (1986). Parallelism in her narrative emerges from the patterning of theme, time and location, rather than by the use of internal linguistic parallelism
within stanzas. Participant A’s narrative frequently relies on English discourse markers to progress from one section of the narrative to the next. (The role of discourse markers is discussed in Chapter Four.) By way of summary, the pauses in the narrative are invariably accompanied by an unvoiced English lip pattern.

Participant A uses English language discourse markers extensively for transition and for evaluative interjection. Her paragraph style of delivery resembles the structure of a written narrative and the use of English language grammar and English word cueing dominate the narrative.

5.2.2 Participant E

In the NZSL narrative of Participant E, there is greater variety of stanza length and prosodic patterning. The narrative can be divided into six sections, approximately corresponding to the Labov taxonomy. The third section divides into two distinct episodes, each one describing the constructed action of each party, and interspersed with constructed dialogue between the two opposing participants in the narrative. Three-line stanzas are also used to build up and to summarise the main episodes of the complicating action. My analysis of an NZSL narrative suggests that it exhibits Gee’s units of production and is comparable to an ASL narrative that Gee investigated.

Prosody is consistently evident in the narrative. As Gee commented on the ASL narrative, the articulation is rich in prosody and the units of production align themselves into sections which have much in common with the acts of a play (1986).
One of the unique features that Gee noted in the ASL narrative analysis is perseveration (1983). Gee et al. comment on its effectiveness at keeping the audience focussed on the object by its appearance of being “frozen” in space. This notion of perseveration plays a crucial role in Participant E’s narrative. The first task in the narration is to place the KEG in the signing space. The KEG is placed strategically in the centre of the stage, directly in front of the narrator. Participant E tells his story from behind the KEG, his eye gaze frequently resting on it, and NZSL sign sequences flow from his deliberate eye gaze. By shifting his body position backwards at the crisis point of the story, WHAT TO DO? he suggests creating distance from the problem KEG so that the matter can be considered.

5.2.3 **Comparison of the two Narratives**

Both the narratives exploit the spatial and lexical freedom afforded by having two articulators (two hands) and a range of non-manual devices to express and create structural parallelism and rhythmic stanza formation.

Stanza length appears to be the primary determinant in creating relationship between prosody and narrative composition. In the two narratives analysed here, one is a code-mix SSE narrative and the other a fluent NZSL narrative. They exhibit markedly different stanza lengths. The following section will discuss the consequences of stanza length and composition on the units of production evident in the two narratives.

The graphic representation of the contrast between the two narrative stanza constructions is revealing. The differences in the units of production are illustrated in Figure 9.
Participant A’s narrative is twice as long as Participant E’s story, 29 stanzas as opposed to 17. In spite of the huge disparity in the length (2 min 32 sec and 1 min 33 seconds), there is less variety of stanza length in the longer narrative. Participant A, a less fluent signer, shows less stanza variety and uses only one stanza length throughout the narrative. Participant E, who is the more fluent
NZSL signer, uses a wider variety of stanza length and employs different patterning in the stanzas for different purposes.

As has been suggested, this may in part be due to the different genres of the two narratives. Participant A’s story is a life story account; Participant E is telling an anecdotal story.

Gee comments on narratives originating in an oral culture that “Such language tends to have rich prosodic and temporal markers of structure, much of which is tied to discourse not the syntax on the sentence” (1986, p. 392).

In conclusion, Gee’s units of production provided a useful analytical approach for the two signed narratives. An examination of line and stanza patterning gives a greater understanding of the structural variance between the two narratives.

5.3 Answering Question Three

The third question set out to what extent pausal analysis would indicate the textual boundaries in NZSL narratives.

The results from this investigation support Gee’s conclusion that “the higher order pause structure reflects narrative/story structure” (1983, p. 256).

The methodology employed to quantify pauses is described in Chapter Three, and was followed as faithfully as possible to replicate Gee’s procedures employed with an ASL narrative (1983). In accordance with Gee’s approach, the findings of pausal analysis, as presented as hierarchical trees according to Gee’s
methodology, was constructed and the two narratives appear in Chapter Four, as Figure 5 and Figure 7.

5.3.1 **Participant A**

Figure 5 in Chapter Four is the hierarchical tree structure resulting from the pause analysis in Participant A’s story. The longest pause was 98 frames (approximately five seconds). The pause occurs at the end of what she has determined is the climax of her story, the acquisition of a house. The stanza preceding it deals with HOUSE BUY, and the section ends with its specific geographical location, ROAD DUNEDIN. Having completed the section she pauses and rests with her hands on her chest, and is seen to be catching her breath. In a structural and semantic sense the mid-point longest pause seems to be imitating the physical time lapse between life as a couple and life as parents, before children and after children, the midpoint of her life story.

When she does resume the story she begins with a sentence-initial discourse marker THEN (Fraser, 1993). Previous to this, she has employed RIGHT! OK FINISHED and NEXT as sentence-final English markers accompanying a pause. From this point, she uses the English marker THEN exclusively in conjunction with pauses. The pause indicates time is passing, and THEN keeps the events in chronological sequence. No dilemma has been presented, and there is no expectation from the audience that there will be a surprising conclusion. The pausing and the discourse marker combine to define the boundaries between events. The pauses are the key constituent to provide narrative sense and to separate narrative units in Participant A’s story.
5.3.2 **Participant E**

In Participant E’s NZSL narrative, the longest pause fulfils a different function than for Participant A. Figure 7 in Chapter Four shows the pause tree for Participant E and the narrative delivered in NZSL. In the NZSL narrative, the longest pause of 51 frames (approximately 1.8 seconds) follows the signing of the rhetorical question WHAT TO DO?

The long pause in Participant E’s NZSL narrative precedes the articulation of the crisis question. The pause creates dramatic effect and makes the point that it is too early to end the party. The pause also invites the audience to get involved with the outcome of the story.

The lengthy pause summarises the situation HALF TO GO and then invites the audience to consider the question of WHAT TO DO? Using eye gaze and body language to invite a response, the narrator marks the pause with rubbing of his chin and gesturing “bugger!” The longest pause leaves the dilemma unsettled and heightens the dilemma. The reiterative sign sequences PULL GIVE gives way to new sign sequences. The COME ON sequence is used once more in the closing stanzas of the story. As the resolution unfolds, the pauses between stanzas are longer than before the crisis loomed. The pauses in the NZSL narrative are an essential element to create narrative sense and to create narrative structure in Participant E’s story.

In addition, the poetic cadence and patterning in Participant E’s NZSL narrative, (when viewed in its sign language form) strongly supports both Hoffmeister, Lane and Bahan’s (1996) observations about ASL formations and Gee and Kegl’s (1983) conclusions in their analysis of an oral narrative. Participant E’s narrative
produces a poetic rhythm in both the manual production and the eye motion. He simultaneously shifts his eye gaze from the KEG, to the antagonist, to the audience, and back again, drawing all three elements into the story and emulating poetic formation in space.

5.3.3 Comparison of the Two Narratives

Figure 6 and Figure 8 in Chapter Four illustrate the shape of the narratives based on Gee’s pausal methodology. The English glosses at the base of the pause trees illustrate where pauses are positioned in relation to the stanza boundaries. The pausal features of the two narratives will be compared in this section, in an attempt to discover the significance of pausing on narrative sense and narrative structure.

In this research, it appears that pausal analysis does reflect the textual boundaries in both the SSE and NZSL narrative deliveries. Also, in both Participant A and E’s narratives, the shorter nodal pauses coincide with sectional and episodic divisions, defining boundaries between stanzas. In both narratives pauses appear to be a vital contributor to the shape and structure of the narrative.

Pausal analysis of an ASL narrative reported different results. Wilson’s conclusions about pauses in the ASL narrative the Tobacco Story suggest that the pauses “are not as strongly traceable to structural entities such as theme/theme, act/result, and so on, as they are to shifts in speaker” (1966, p. 167). This is only partly true in the NZSL narrative of Participant E. Shifts in speaker are more often accomplished by the use of a deictic reference to HER/SHE. In one instance SHE (deictic) precedes a one second pause which leads to the solution. In this situation SHE is not the speaker/signer, but the narrator chooses the use of the pause to
indicate her indirect involvement, and subsequent responsibility, for the outcome of the drinking session.

The differences in pausal function between the NZSL and the ASL Tobacco Story may be due to the fact that SHE, the antagonist, is physically present and deictic referencing is the most efficient way to indicate a shift in speaker. However, the over-all hierarchal tree would indicate that the pauses in the NZSL narrative usually signal narrative units of production.

In summary, the pausal analysis in this investigation has led to three observations.

First, pause analysis indicates that placement and function of pauses in narrative delivery appears to be dependent on the narrator’s choice of linguistic resources in English or in NZSL. Secondly, pausing appears to be influenced by the narrative timeframe: in this research, one story embraces a life story, the other a single incident. Thirdly, and related to the second point, pauses as boundaries in narrative constructions appear to be contingent to some degree on the subject matter of the story. A chronological documentation does not require the same degree of dramatisation and narrative elaboration through pausing as a comical performance does.

5.4 **Answering Question Four**

Question Four set out to discover to what degree the Gee’s method of pause analysis replicated Labov’s structural analysis discovered in Question One?

The question was answered by combining the paradigmatic approach of Labov and Gee by overlaying the Labov taxonomy onto the hierarchal pause structure
tree configured by Gee. The correlation between the two methodologies is illustrated by the graphic overlay presented in Figure 6 and Figure 8 for Participant A and Participant E in Chapter Four.

5.4.1 Participant A

The SSE story is chronological and factual. The narrative uses English discourse markers, and extensive code-mixing in syntax and semantic patterning.

Participant A starts with a title: “How I met my husband” as a clear declaration, or abstract segment. At the end of her story she remains on the stage and gestures “that’s all” – which is decipherable by an unvoiced English lip pattern. Her linear narrative delivery permits unambiguous translation into written or spoken English.

In the SSE narrative, English language discourse markers and infrequent use of time lines keep the narrative moving forward. The discourse markers in Participant A’s story are indicated in Figure 6.

5.4.2 Participant E

Participant E’s story is anecdotal and humorous. The NZSL story exploits unique sign language features, such as constructed dialogue and constructed action. Participant E’s story contains no abstract as discussed earlier. The coda in the story is accomplished by the narrator physically removing himself from the stage, and the story. In the NZSL story, creating spatial relationships and using time lines make the progression of events clear and unambiguous.
To summarise, the Labov taxonomic boundaries coincide with the major pauses in both narratives. The two narrators use pausing to accomplish different narrative objectives, but it appears that the overall structural template is not altered by their differing communicative intents.

It is worth noting that the difference in narrative subject and intent did not appear to affect the overall structure of the narrative. Nor does the deployment of different linguistic devices as temporal markers appear to alter the taxonomic structure of the stories.

From this preliminary investigation, it can be concluded that the narrative pause structure (Gee & Kegl, 1983) and narrative unit structure (Labov & Waletzky, 1967) are compatible approaches to investigating the internal structural and stylistic determinants of both an SSE and an NZSL narrative. The over-arching paradigm of Big D Discourse and little d discourse has also provided a practical framework in which the NZSL narratives can be explored.

### 5.5 The Role of Narratives in NZSL Discourse

Big D Discourse and little d discourse is a fitting framework for another reason. The distinction between “Big D” and “little d” have particular significance in the field of Deaf Studies. This has been explained in Chapter Two, and is briefly summarised here.

The Deaf community is populated by Deaf and deaf individuals. The capitalised Deaf indicates those who would claim NZSL is their preferred language and their main social identity lies within a Deaf community. The deaf without a capital D also identify with the Deaf community, but may be deafened or hearing impaired,
and do not consider NZSL to be their first language. They may also self-identify with the hearing world. Yet together they form a speech community, as a distinct group who have similar expectations of the use of a language. Sign language fluency and stylistic considerations are not the chief criteria for members of the little d speech community. Social identity is the determining factor in Big D Discourse, the New Zealand Deaf community.

The Big D Discourse is not geographical and is not individual: Deaf identity and Deaf Discourse is collective. Yet Big D Discourse and little d discourse rely on individual contact through a small and highly organised network of Deaf institutions and traditional activities. With all oral communities, continuity depends on stories being told and re-told. It is in the recounting of shared histories that both the language and a Deaf identity is learned, practiced, and allowed to establish its own standards of expressive competence.

Narratives in the Deaf community are more than stories: they are the historical archives of Deaf life. The place of storytelling is a key component of the Big D Deaf Discourse. In the Introduction to DEAF-WORLD it is suggested that storytellers “are more than entertainers; they are the culture’s oral historians and teachers, and their stories have messages embedded in them about DEAF-WORLD values” (Lane, et al., 1996, p. 7). Storytellers weave their experiences together through language and experience, utilising a mixture of linguistic resources and personal testimony to produce their stories. Not all members of the New Zealand Deaf community are fluent signers, but they are full participants in the speech community and the creation of both Big D Deaf Discourse and little d sign language discourse.
My suggestion would be that the middle ground is where NZSL narratives are situated. I have attempted to illustrate this suggestion here:

The illustration presented above does not represent a continuum, but rather a blending of the language choices that are found in the New Zealand narratives. The two narratives in this data indicate both the direct and indirect action constituents of storytelling that are combined to retell personal stories in a way that calls on both formal sign language production and English language influences.
5.6 **Chapter Summary**

This chapter discusses the results of the four questions detailed at the beginning of this chapter and detailed in Chapter Three. The investigation sought to answer the questions by examining two NZSL narratives selected from a larger corpus of personal narratives videotaped at a local Deaf club. The two narratives were selected from a continuum of stories found in a local New Zealand Deaf community. The two narratives were analysed according to Labov’s canonical narrative taxonomy (1967) and Gee’s textual production units (1986) and pausal analytical taxonomies (1983). In spite of the differences in background, age, gender and language repertoire of the two signers, the narrative analysis results are similar. The SSE narrative structure closely resembles an English oral narrative and fits well with both the Labov and Gee textual and pausal analytical taxonomies. The fluent NZSL narrative structure is also compatible with Labov’s taxonomy as well as Gee’s production units and textual pausal analysis.

Situating the inquiry within the Big D Deaf Discourse and the little d sign language discourse paradigm facilitated the development of both sociolinguistic and structural textual understanding alongside each other. However, there are drawbacks in endeavouring to faithfully represent textual passages across the two modalities.

The reduction of a three-dimensional text to an English written form has interested one other Master’s student and who has published her findings. Amy Rosenberg set out to explore the creation of a writing system for ASL and she makes the draws these conclusions:
The American Deaf community takes pride in using a unique language to communicate, storytell, create poetry etc., but most of the members of this community write in English. If all members of this culture were sufficiently bilingual and literate in English, there might be no reason to question their mode of literacy. . . Those who observe signing, but who have no access to its meaning and who do not have the tools to analyze it linguistically, might miss the language on first glance. Instead, they may perceive an indiscriminate combination of hands, face and body *gesturing* in a way which seems discernible. They may feel certain that if they just watch carefully, the message will become clear to them. Furthermore, as they watch the signers face move, they may imagine that he is mouthing the English words for what he is signing . . . It is infinitely expressive and productive. Deaf people have Sign poetry and there are plays performed in ASL. The Deaf use their language to discuss language, to joke and pun and to educate on any subject. Yet, even as more linguists and more of the general public become aware of the idea of ASL as a language as full as and distinct from English, an enormous difference between spoken language and ASL remains. (Rosenberg, 1999)

The next chapter will attempt to draw some conclusions about the research and discuss some of the limitations of the approach taken in this project. Chapter Six will also make some suggestions for the direction of future research into NZSL narrative discourse.
CHAPTER SIX - CONCLUSION

6 Introduction

This thesis describes the results of an investigation into the narrative structure of two stories told by members of the New Zealand Deaf community. In the process of applying two narrative analysis research models, the thesis discovered and discussed narrative strategies and linguistic constructions that are employed by the narrators in the execution of their stories. The results of the analysis suggest similarities with ASL discourse structures, and also highlight the differences between narratives delivered in a spoken language and a visual modality. The Section 6.1 describes the investigative conclusions with specific reference to the four questions that were posed at the beginning of the project. This section is subdivided in accordance with the four research questions.

Section 6.2 summarises the contribution this research hopes to have made to the study of NZSL narrative discourse.

Section 6.3 outlines some of the limitations of the study and introduces some of the issues that need to be addressed in future research. The section is sub-divided to focus on issues related to the design of the study (sub-section 6.3.1) . Sub-section 6.3.2. addresses the issues posed by the visual/gestural linguistic medium.

Section 6.4 suggests two potential directions for future research into NZSL discourse. Sub-section 6.4.1 raises some suggestions to developing a process model for further study, and sub-section 6.4.2 suggests a direction for further linguistic investigation.
Section 6.5 contains my own concluding comments and reflections on the wider implications of narrative discourse analysis in signed languages.

6.1 Investigative Conclusions

The conclusions drawn from each of the leading research questions are stated below. Each sub-section discusses the conclusions to the individual questions.

6.1.1 Question One

Question One investigated the extent to which features of NZSL narratives reflect Labov’s structural taxonomy.

Both narratives exhibit the six part structural framework that Labov and Waletzky (1967) describe: abstract, orientation, complicating action, resolution, evaluation and coda. They also satisfy the Labovian principle of temporal juncture. Within the limitations of the sample, it can be concluded that the Labov taxonomy of narrative structuring provides a suitable classification system to describe the basic structural organisation of the NZSL narratives.

6.1.2 Question Two

Question two investigated whether NZSL narratives replicate Gee’s units of production.

Gee’s units of production provided a useful analytical strategy with both narratives, and led to the following conclusions. First, it was observed that the fluent NZSL signer used a wider variety of stanza length and used different patterned stanzas for different purposes. Secondly, the SSE narrative bore the
hallmarks of paragraph style stanzas, while the NZSL narrative displayed consistent poetic stanza patterning (see sub-sections 4.2.1.1 and 4.2.1.4). Thirdly, there were marked differences in stanza parallelism. The SSE narrative displayed some textual parallelism between stanzas. The NZSL narrative demonstrated regular prosodic rhythms in aabb or abab schemes in the majority of the stanzas even when demonstrating marked variation in stanza lengths (see sub-section 4.2.1.4).

6.1.3 **Question Three**

Question three explored the extent to which a hierarchical pausal analysis would indicate the textual boundaries in NZSL narratives (Gee & Kegl, 1983).

The SSE and NZSL narratives support this argument. In addition, structural and prosodic patterns emerged in the data that support Gee’s assertion that different portions of the story are presented in different linguistic styles. From the pause structure analysis it is possible to suggest that the more fluent the NZSL signer, the greater variation in stanza length and stanza patterning (see Figure 9). Moreover, the narrative structure of both participants appears to be able to exploit different stanza lengths and patterning to achieve different purposes.

6.1.4 **Question Four**

Question four attempted to merge Labov’s taxonomy and Gee’s pausal analysis to demonstrate that pausal structure would produce a faithful representation of narrative structure.
It can be concluded that superimposing Labov’s narrative taxonomy onto the hierarchal pause tree reliably duplicated the narrative formation for both the narratives (see Figures 6 and 8). It may therefore be concluded from this small sample that the change in linguistic medium (oral to visual) and the corresponding variation in linguistic and non-linguistic resources demonstrated that both narratives shared a common narrative structure. The conclusion that can be drawn from this investigation is that both methodologies offer suitable approaches to describing narrative structure for these two narratives emanating from the New Zealand Deaf community. It appears that the fundamental organisation of narrative units in this investigation was not dependent on linguistic fluency or modality.

6.2 Contributions Made by the Research

The ubiquitous nature of storytelling in Deaf communities suggests its importance as a textual phenomenon for sociolinguists. Therefore the design of an apt and malleable and precise methodological approach to narrative discourse seems a logical starting point to begin to understand discourse in NZSL.

The application of two narrative analysis paradigms, those of Labov and Gee, shows that the narrative structure in NZSL stories appears to conform to the structure of oral narratives. This is an important finding for several reasons. First, it allows for the investigation of narrative strategies in a visual medium to be set within a broader context. Secondly, it establishes common ground from which cross-linguistic study can proceed. By positioning NZSL within the larger context of more traditional narrative inquiry, the language becomes more accessible to researchers as a language for further investigation. Thirdly, NZSL is now firmly positioned for further study of its distinct discursive linguistic properties. And
lastly, and perhaps most importantly, the recognition of storytelling as such a distinctive form of discourse suggests that sign language narrative structural analysis must be taken into consideration when forming any larger undertaking to develop theories of language.

### 6.3 Limitations of the Research

This section will outline the limitations of this study, and then describe some of the broader research issues to be considered.

The broad brush taxonomy of Labov and the work of Gee into structure and prosody offered a basic framework to allow academic inquiry into NZSL discourse, and NZSL narratives in particular. However, this project was constrained by its limited data sample and by complications arising from the linguistic visual-gestural modality.

#### 6.3.1 The Design of the Study

The study was designed to investigate whether two different methodological approaches to oral narratives would be suitable for exploring narratives presented in a different modality. Based on the comprehensive taxonomies designed by Labov and Gee, the inquiry was designed to explore the possibility of employing them to reveal the structure of narratives found in the New Zealand Deaf community.

However, there might have been a more faithful translation of the original narratives if the voice-over were recorded synchronically as the narrators were telling the story. This immediacy and simultaneity would promote a closer affinity
with the narrative intent. Moreover, the presence of the voice-over interpreter at
the original event, experiencing the situational ambience, might have had a
bearing on the spoken translation. This in turn might have had repercussions for
the analysis of the narrative segmentation, particularly for evaluative comment
and structural parallelism.

6.3.1.1  The Data Sample

This study investigated two narratives emanating from the same Deaf community.
These two narratives represented the extremes of a continuum ranging from
presentation in SSE to fluent NZSL. The continuum disclosed a wide range of
linguistic competency and code-mixing found in one Deaf community. This
would suggest that a greater number of participants from different Deaf
communities in New Zealand would render a greater understanding of NZSL
narrative structures.

The narratives were recorded at a social function and the data collection was not
the central activity of the evening. All the participants voluntarily responded
when asked to tell a story about “One of My Favourite Memories”. Perhaps a
more focussed question would have resulted in different data sets, and
encouraged different narrative styles to emerge. This in turn could have an impact
on narrative structure.

6.3.2  The Linguistic Issues of the Study

There are facets of analysing in a visual narratives that are not accommodated by
a thematic structural approach. Three of these considerations are described here.
The first is the simultaneity of sign language communication, the second is the
6.3.2.1 NZSL Morphology

A unique property of a sign language production makes it possible to deliver several streams of information simultaneously. Morphological inflection such as speed and direction combined with non-manual information allow for place, time, person, and action to be conveyed simultaneously. In analysing the data I found the reduction of such simultaneity to a linear written format be a constant challenge. In carrying out the analysis I felt somewhat restricted by the conventions of spoken narratives and was aware that I may have been diminishing or inadvertently misinterpreting the intent of the NZSL narrator.

6.3.2.2 NZSL Performatives

The second issue is related to the first. Some of the linguistic resources that can be deployed in a visual gestural language system are not easily interpreted in a linear written form. For example, role play, dialogue, and adjectival non-manual characterisation require either aural-oral input or extensive formatting and punctuation in order to be understood in the English language.

Features such as constructed action and constructed dialogue (Metzger, 1995) and facial grammar (Lane, et al., 1996) played prominent roles in the NZSL narrative. English gloss transcription and vernacular English translation are not well suited to manage these visual performatives. To provide an accurate interpretation of these linguistic constructions requires wordy and subjectively interpreted English text.

interpretation of different (non-English) linguistic structures, and the last is the accommodation of a narrative delivered in a code-mix of English and NZSL.
In order to include the descriptive features in the written text analysis, I used the extra column entitled “non manual features” that is situated alongside the transcription of the English glosses (see Appendix D and F). This column was used not only to convey non-manual lexical features, but also to indicate a switch of narrator or sign language performatives that characterised either the antagonist or the protagonist in constructed dialogue. This proved to be a somewhat clumsy and inexact stratagem for representing the full original narrative input.

One of the limitations of the study was the translation and transcription strategies I adopted. For the translation, I chose to use the audiotaped voice recording of the stories provided to me after the video recording of the narratives had been completed. This was not the most accurate means of capturing the narrative content. It would have been better to employ an online translation application such as ELAN (see http://www.lat-mpi.eu/tools/elan/). Using ELAN might have proved less cumbersome and time-consuming to process the raw data and could have created a more transparent and objective documentation of the narratives. However, because I was unfamiliar with this software and had a limited amount of time available to acquaint myself with it, I relied on the resources I had at hand.

For the pausal analysis and documentation of sign length, the time counter provided on the video recording was used to measure the individual language features such as pauses, asides, and sign execution. It was a dilemma whether to include the details of timing in the analysis chapter of the data, rather than only in the transcription appendices. I decided not to include timings in the data analysis chapter, as I thought it might detract from the transparency of structural divisions such as lines and stanzas. However, the some of the issues of translation and
transcription as they relate to data recording could have been better managed by utilization of more sophisticated technology and software.

### 6.3.2.3 NZSL and English Code-mixing

One of the narratives used both English and NZSL and thus did not follow the syntactic or lexical conventions of either language. The lack of syntactic uniformity hindered the implementation of structural analysis, particularly in identifying lines and stanzas. The blending of NZSL and English concepts was unpredictable and varied in different segments of the narrative, making it difficult to apply line and stanza divisions consistently. However, this narrative (just like the NZSL one) represents a typical communicative system found in the Deaf community. This gives rise to the question of whether an oral narrative methodological approach is appropriate for the data, or to regard such code-mixed presentations as more suitable for analysis as a visual narrative (Maxwell, 1990).

### 6.4 Suggestions for Further Research

This preliminary investigation into NZSL narratives is unprecedented as far as the researcher knows. It is hoped that the findings of this small study will stimulate interest in the discourse properties of NZSL and precipitate further academic inquiry into narrative discourse in NZSL.

NZSL has only recently been included in the catalogue of human languages. It can therefore both contribute to, and draw from, other visual languages that have preceded it into the realm of academic inquiry.
I therefore propose two different directions that can be considered by potential researchers in this field: one avenue will contribute the development of a model for textual analysis, and the second route will pursue linguistic investigation guided by existing empirical research. The first option is to pursue the development of process methodology for visual linguistic study. The second option builds on the work on ASL narratives that is already in the public domain (Bahan & Supalla, 1995; Lane, et al., 1996; Rayman, 1999; Wilson, 1966; Winston, 1999).

6.4.1 **Process Methodology**

This path of academic inquiry would focus on the development of a notational system for use in sign language discourse analysis. A first notational system for describing individual ASL signs was pioneered by Stokoe et al. (1965) and concentrates on the sublexical, or phonological construction of sign languages. An alternative system employed in sign language transcription is the HamNoSys (Hamburg Notation System for Sign Languages), which is used in the NZSL Dictionary and which also details a phonetic transcription of individual sign production. A standardised system to transcribe morphological constructions and conventions of sign discourse, beyond the level of individual signs, has yet to be designed.

English glossing as a form of transcription is an imperfect science. It requires the transcriber to be highly versed in the lexicons of both languages. The process of choosing “word for sign” can overtake the recording of non-linguistic information being transmitted by the narrator. In addition, glossing is interpretative, and highly subjective. The dilemma persists even for a bilingual researcher, as the English lexicon and modulated signs do not match well (Stokoe, 1980). For these
reasons, a standardised set of conventions would help to ameliorate the subjectivity and ineptitude of replacing a single sign with a single word and improve the equivalency of the overall transcription.

Development of a set of standardised conventions for visual text transcription would promote greater interest in sign language research, as the analytical process model would become less daunting. Both designers of methodology and the academic community would find accommodating visual language data less cumbersome, resulting in truer representation of visual narrative constructions.

6.4.2 **Linguistic Methodology**

The second direction for researchers to pursue is related to NZSL linguistic phenomena.

As suggested earlier in the chapter, NZSL academic inquiry can benefit from the trailblazing provided by both ASL and BSL empirical research. I would propose that pursuing linguistic constructions above the level of sentential organisation is another direction for future research in NZSL.

The analysis of an NZSL narrative described in this paper drew attention to linguistic constructions that are present in NZSL text beyond the sentence. In subsection 5.5.2 it was proposed that the province of storytelling lies in the realm of constructed action, combining the streams of pantomime and formal sign language lexicon. Drawing on the work of Metzger et al. (1995) into direct and indirect action, combined with the notion of action performatives (Winston, 1991), future research into NZSL research can begin to expose the phenomena that are created beyond the single idea unit (Chafe, 1980). The exploration of the linguistic
features of NZSL will lead to a better understanding not only of the subject matter of the narrative, but also of the narrative structure being imposed by the sign linguistic features.

A different aspect of discourse analysis can be pursued by adopting a broader perspective. The centrality of storytelling to the Deaf community of New Zealand makes it worthy of attention, both for linguists and sociolinguists. The Big D Discourses and little d discourses model and the inherent interface between the two notions can be exploited as an approach well-suited to the cultural and linguistic interchange in Deaf communities in New Zealand. It is suggested that pursuing the relationship between the language and its natural community will contribute substantially to the understanding of all human languages and speech communities.

6.5 Concluding Comments

The first task of undertaking future NZSL narrative analysis must be to develop an appropriate methodology. The narratives of the New Zealand Deaf community exhibit a wide range of language ability and communicative competency. Therefore it appears that the adopted schemata must be able to accommodate a span of narratives from those articulated in a mixture of English and NZSL as well as those delivered in fluent NZSL.

Lucas (2001) argues that we must be careful not to confine sign language narrative structure to the conventions of spoken narrative (2001, p. 5). It must be considered that in the process of attempting to modify methodology designed for spoken language, we may circumvent linguistic anomalies of a narrative in sign language. It is true that there are linguistic equivalencies between English and sign
language, but are there additional sociolinguistic references that signed language can exploit that are not available or interpretable to spoken language users? Are we diminishing sign language’s inherent value as a language by trying to make sense of it in our own?

It is possible that the price of being recognised as a mainstream language is a loss of the individuality and uniqueness that first brought NZSL to the attention of the hearing community. It appears from my study that the NZSL narratives presented here show a similar textual structure to that of oral narratives. But will transcribing a visual gestural narrative into a linear written form lead to any greater understanding of the visual gestural language or its raw narrative formation?

The last word fittingly goes to the founding father of sign language analysis, the linguist who championed the recognition of ASL, and who worked collaboratively to produce the first dictionary of ASL. William Stokoe warned researchers they should be careful to remember that their linguistic probing was “the stuff of real life human beings” (1990, p. 7). It is a stark reminder that storytelling in Deaf communities is not only a form of discourse, but also reveals the essence of human experience. For Deaf communities, as for all oral communities, their stories record their history. In signing communities, narrators are historians, for as they tell their stories, simultaneously – like sign language itself – they are creating history, even as their narrative is making itself available for analysis.
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APPENDIX A: Glossing Conventions and Symbols

**KEY:** The word STORY is used to represent an English gloss

**TRANSCRIPTION CONVENTIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STORY</th>
<th>an English word equivalent to the NZSL sign</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STORY(g)</td>
<td>the sign is a gesture not a lexical sign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STORY(p)</td>
<td>the concept is pantomime, not a lexical sign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STORY(cl)</td>
<td>the sign is a classifier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.T.O.R.Y.=</td>
<td>the word has been fingerspelled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STORY</td>
<td>the sign is <strong>EMBOLDENED</strong> to reflect its intensity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[story]</td>
<td>English word insertion by researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STORY &gt;&gt;</td>
<td>the keystrokes &gt;&gt; or &lt;&lt; showing the sign direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>hesitation or pausing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B: Data Sample

Continuum of linguistic variations

KEY TO CONTINUUM

Participants 1 – 12 in order of presentation of their narrative in the data sample

Participants A – E based on demonstration of NZSL features
APPENDIX C: Participant A – English Vernacular Translation

This is the story of how I met my husband [initialised name sign].

It was the old Deaf club we used to go to, in George Street, over there – do you remember that? OK. Well, hey that is my drink OK? Ok, ok, I am just telling a story ok?

We met and became good close friends, and then after a while, we got engaged. Everyone seemed surprised, but they all congratulated us and we were very happy. Everybody was a bit shocked, they were all talking about it, word soon got around - we were engaged! And then time went by, and then one year later, we got married. I invited a few deaf people, about six deaf people, I think, came to our wedding – ok. So we got married, it was wonderful we had a big wedding, everything was beautiful, we had a lovely reception and lots of dancing, everybody was very happy, enjoying themselves, having a great time.

Then after that was over we went away on honeymoon to Queenstown for one week, Queenstown for a holiday, it was our honeymoon.

And then we got home and I had to be a very patient girl – had to save money - very patiently we saved up our money because we wanted to buy a house. We looked and looked for ages and finally found a house, we had to buy the right house, it had to be the right one. We finally found it, a beautiful home it was, it was on T [initialised name sign] Road, Dunedin, yeah, over there.
Then . . . well . . . that was the first time I had bought a house. Then one year later after we bought the house I found that I was pregnant with my first baby, and that was [initialised name sign]. When he was born, he was a happy boy YAY YAY! And then when he was five years old, I was pregnant for the second time and I gave birth to a hearing baby girl –YAAAAAY!

Then I had two children growing up. Then I decided no more babies, no more children, no, that’s enough, two’s enough, no more.

Then I got a job, for work, for the money I wanted to help my husband with the money. We wanted to put our money together be able to cover the costs. Now we have been married now for 23 years, can you believe that!! WOW –

Goodness – that’s all.
APPENDIX D: Participant A – Transcription

Participant A:

TRANSCRIPT showing PAUSES* in PARTICIPANT A’S NARRATIVE

MAY 2011

*approx 30 clicks per second
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>CLICK</th>
<th>ENGLISH GLOSS</th>
<th>NON MANUAL FEATURES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21.35.27</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>ME</td>
<td>foot shift, body moves right</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.28/29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>back to centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>eye close</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.31</td>
<td>14/15</td>
<td>MEET I HOW</td>
<td>different sign: hands together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.32</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>MEET</td>
<td>(lp)girlfriend/boyfriend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PRAY</td>
<td>Using PRAY sign, moved from side to side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.33</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>MEET</td>
<td>NZSL sign on one hand: one extended index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.33/34</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>R.R.</td>
<td>full name (lp)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.35</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>OLD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.36</td>
<td>13/13</td>
<td>DEAF CLUB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.38/39</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>PAUSE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.39</td>
<td>21/21</td>
<td>G. STREET</td>
<td>full name (lp)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIME</td>
<td>CLICK</td>
<td>ENGLISH GLOSS</td>
<td>NON MANUAL FEATURES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.39/40</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>OVER THERE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;&gt;</td>
<td>full arm pointing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.41</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>PAUSE</td>
<td>head nod, eye span of room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>body moving backwards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.42</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.43</td>
<td>16/13</td>
<td>I/ ME..ET *</td>
<td>*sign half formed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NON NARRATIVE INTERRUPTION – 5 SECONDS (in bold)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>CLICKS</th>
<th>ENGLISH GLOSS</th>
<th>NON MANUAL FEATURES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21.35.43</td>
<td></td>
<td>MEET</td>
<td>hand shape but disconnected, eye gaze right fix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.44</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>STOP (left hand)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME (right hand)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>tongue protruding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIME</td>
<td>CLICKS</td>
<td>ENGLISH GLOSS</td>
<td>NON MANUAL FEATURES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.45</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>MINE</td>
<td>eyes elevated and glaring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.45</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>MINE</td>
<td>eyes tracking/tongue protruding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.46</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>MINE OK</td>
<td>eyebrows raised ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.47</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>OK OK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>CLICKS</th>
<th>ENGLISH GLOSS</th>
<th>NON MANUAL FEATURES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.47</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>MEET</td>
<td>(lp) boyfriend/girlfriend eye gaze dropped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.48</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>MEET</td>
<td>gradual puffing out of cheeks hands move</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.49/50</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>POSTPONE then</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIME</td>
<td>CLICKS</td>
<td>ENGLISH GLOSS</td>
<td>NON MANUAL FEATURES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.51</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>ENGAGED</td>
<td>sign prolonged and facial grammar: wide eye gaze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.52</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>open mouth, small smile, body shift to right</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.35.53</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>congratulations: gaze at ring (p)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.53</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>CONGRATULATIONS (g)</td>
<td>handshaking motion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.54</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>AMAZED</td>
<td>Perseverating left hand, engaged finger raised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.55</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>eye gaze spanning room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.56</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>GOSSIP</td>
<td>sign is moved in semi-circle through signing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.56</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>ENGAGED (p)</td>
<td>holding ring finger: incredulous face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.57</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>SURPRISE</td>
<td>eye blink, head brought upright</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>PAUSE</strong></td>
<td><strong>RIGHT!</strong> (lp) <strong>DISCOURSE MARKER</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.58</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>finish (lp)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIME</td>
<td>CLICKS</td>
<td>ENGLISH GLOSS</td>
<td>NON MANUAL FEATURES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.59</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>gesture, hands moving together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.36.00/1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>POSTPONE (x2)</td>
<td>less puffed cheeks sign moves up then down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>almost a circular movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.02</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>ONE YEAR</td>
<td>repeated sign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.03/04</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>TIME PASSED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.04</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>PAUSE</td>
<td>full one second pause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.36.052</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.06</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>PICK X 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.07</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>FEW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.08</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>DEAF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.09</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>pursed lips : about</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RIGHT! (lp) DISCOURSE MARKER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIME</td>
<td>CLICKS</td>
<td>ENGLISH GLOSS</td>
<td>NON MANUAL FEATURES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>signed on two hands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.11</td>
<td>10/22</td>
<td>DEAF/ PEOPLE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.12/13</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>&quot;PAUSE&quot;</td>
<td>eyes closed, hands rested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.14</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>MARRIED</td>
<td>party(g) - congratulations (lp)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>BIG WEDDING</td>
<td>big</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.17</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>BEAUTIFUL</td>
<td>two handed sign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.18</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>DANCE</td>
<td>lovely (lp)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>NICE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.20</td>
<td>12/12</td>
<td>FUN/HAPPY</td>
<td>smiling face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>HAPPY</td>
<td>everyone (lp)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIME</td>
<td>CLICKS</td>
<td>ENGLISH GLOSS</td>
<td>NON MANUAL FEATURES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>LOOK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.36.22</td>
<td>13/22</td>
<td>LAUGHING/ DANCING</td>
<td>dancing body swaying (p)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.23</td>
<td></td>
<td>FINISHED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td><strong>PAUSE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.26</td>
<td>12/30</td>
<td>GO AWAY/ HOLIDAY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.27/28</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>QUEENSTOWN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.29</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>FIVE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.30</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>ONE WEEK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.31</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>.W.</td>
<td>initialised W, week (lp)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.32</td>
<td>17</td>
<td><strong>PAUSE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.32/33</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>QUEENSTOWN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIME</td>
<td>CLICKS</td>
<td>ENGLISH GLOSS</td>
<td>NON MANUAL FEATURES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.33</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>HOLIDAY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.34/35</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>HOLIDAY</td>
<td>Honeymoon(lp) head comes up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.35</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>PAUSE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.36</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>FINISHED</td>
<td>then (lp)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.37/38</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>HOME</td>
<td>huge sign, relieved face. sign moved into body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.38</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>PAUSE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.39</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>PATIENT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.40</td>
<td>15/14</td>
<td>GIRL MONEY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.41/42</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>BUY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.36.42</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>HOUSE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.43</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>LOOK LOOK</td>
<td>moves back and forth across body, face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIME</td>
<td>CLICKS</td>
<td>ENGLISH GLOSS</td>
<td>NON MANUAL FEATURES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.45/46</td>
<td>20/20</td>
<td>GOOD HOUSE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.47</td>
<td>14</td>
<td><strong>PAUSE</strong></td>
<td>(giggles)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.48</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>LOOK LOOK</td>
<td>face in grimace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.49</td>
<td>16/18</td>
<td>RIGHT HOUSE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.50</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.51</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>LOOK LOOK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.52</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>GET/WON/FIND</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.52/3</td>
<td></td>
<td>HAVE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.53</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>BEAUTIFUL</td>
<td>two handed sign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.54/55</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>HOUSE</td>
<td>home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.55/56</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>“T”</td>
<td>in a circular motion: full name (lp)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.57</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>ROAD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIME</td>
<td>CLICKS</td>
<td>ENGLISH GLOSS</td>
<td>NON MANUAL FEATURES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.58</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>&gt;&gt;&gt;</td>
<td>full arm gesture pointing in a direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.36.59</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>DUNEDIN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>|       |       | PAUSE                       | hands rest on chest                                      |
| 21.37.00 | 25     |                             |                                                          |
| .02    | 15     |                             | eye blink                                                |
| .03    | 31     |                             | umm                                                      |
| .04    | 52     | ...                         |                                                          |
| .06    | 17     | START                       | THEN (lp) DISCOURSE MARKER                               |
| .07    | 20     | FIRST TIME                  |                                                          |
| .08    | 12     | BUY                         |                                                          |
| .09    | 18     | HOUSE                       | (lp)the                                                  |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>CLICKS</th>
<th>ENGLISH GLOSS</th>
<th>NON MANUAL FEATURES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.10</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>ONE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>YEAR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td><strong>PAUSE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>PREGNANT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>FIRST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.15/16</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>BABY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.17</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>S.S.S.</td>
<td>full name (lp)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.18</td>
<td>30</td>
<td><strong>PAUSE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>BORN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.37.20</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>HAPPY BOY (g)</td>
<td>smile on face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>YAY(p)</td>
<td>raised fists, and Yay (lp)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIME</td>
<td>CLICKS</td>
<td>ENGLISH GLOSS</td>
<td>NON MANUAL FEATURES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.22</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>PAUSE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.22</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>GROW UP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.23</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>FIVE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>YEARS OLD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.24</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>SECOND</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.25/26</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>PREGNANT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.27</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>PAUSE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.28</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>BORN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.29</td>
<td>15/12</td>
<td>GIRL BABY</td>
<td>raised fists, and Yay (lp)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.30</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>GIRL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.31</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>YAY(p)</td>
<td>raised fists, and Yay (lp)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.31</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>GROW UP</td>
<td>double handed sign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIME</td>
<td>CLICKS</td>
<td>ENGLISH GLOSS</td>
<td>NON MANUAL FEATURES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.32</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>NO MORE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.33</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>BABY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.33</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>TWO CHILDREN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.34/35</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>NO MORE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.35</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>ENOUGH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.37.36</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>STOP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.38</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>PAUSE</td>
<td>THEN (lp) DISCOURSE MARKER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.39</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>I GET I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.40/41</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>JOB</td>
<td>for work (lp)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.41</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>MONEY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.42</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>HELP (old sign)</td>
<td>help (lp)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.43</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>MY HUSBAND</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIME</td>
<td>CLICKS</td>
<td>ENGLISH GLOSS</td>
<td>NON MANUAL FEATURES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.44/45</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>PUT TOGETHER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.46</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>GIVE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.47</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>PAUSE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.48</td>
<td>12/11</td>
<td>NOW WE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.49</td>
<td>10/12</td>
<td>23 YEARS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.50</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>MARRIED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.51</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>PAUSE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.51/2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>slaps side of face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>that’s all (lp/g) open handed gesture</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E: Participant E – English Vernacular Translation

It was at one of our mate’s [name sign] farm, and a whole bunch of us, all adults, had got together. We had brought this keg of beer, a big keg of beer, -- here we go! -- all ready for a good session. The beer is getting poured and passed out to all the guys, and she, well, we can see that she is impatient for us to drink up. We are downing the pints and she is nagging us to come on, hurry up and drink up – she is having a go at each one of us.

We are just wanting to chill out and have a few beers but she wants to go to bed! It is still really early, but she . . . well, it is just impossible! The keg is still nearly full . . . we have got a lot of beer to get through, there is plenty of beer and plenty of time!

We are all getting irritated with her nagging at us, but she keeps on and on at us. Meanwhile, we are all getting more and more drunk, but she keeps complaining. We are trying to keep her at bay, telling her to be patient and calm down, and we keep downing the pints, and we are pretty drunk by now. She is still hovering and getting more and more impatient.

The keg is still got lots of beer in it but we are fed up with her nagging us by now. So we check the level in the keg, and find that it is still half full!

By now, it is 11 o’clock so we tap off the keg. And we sit back to consider, what should we do with it now?
She steps in, untaps the keg, and starts filling up our glasses again, still harassing us “Come on, get this down ya! I wanna go to bed”.

Impossible! Of course we all keep drinking the stuff - and guess what?

One by one we all start being sick – puking up the beer, one after the other after the other, every last one of us, we are all sick and vomiting up the beer!

And there she stands, looking at us horrified and in complete disbelief.

Oh boy! She was so embarrassed – she was the one making us drink so much beer that everyone was sick!!

So that’s it, that the story.
APPENDIX F: Participant E – Transcription

Participant E:

TRANSCRIPT showing PAUSES*

in PARTICIPANT E’s NARRATIVE

MAY 2011

*approx 30 clicks per second
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>CLICKS</th>
<th>ENGLISH GLOSS</th>
<th>NON MANUAL FEATURES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22.18.55</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>THERE, OVER THERE &gt;&gt;</td>
<td>index pointer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.56</td>
<td></td>
<td>THERE &gt;&gt;</td>
<td>change of hands and direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.57</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>NAME SIGN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.58</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>FARM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.59</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>DEAF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.19.00</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>GATHER/ASSEMBLED(cl)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.01</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>ADULTS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.02</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>ADULTS</td>
<td>signed repeatedly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.03</td>
<td>22</td>
<td><strong>PAUSE</strong></td>
<td>rubbing hands together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.04</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>ALL COME</td>
<td>double handed, ‘welcome’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>pursed lips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.05</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>KEG (cl)</td>
<td>drawn in air/ eyes averted,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIME</td>
<td>CLICKS</td>
<td>ENGLISH GLOSS</td>
<td>NON MANUAL FEATURES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.06</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>KEG (cl)</td>
<td>bending forward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>continuing to draw shape,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>standing upright</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.07</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>BEER</td>
<td>non-dominant hand on ‘keg’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>drawn again, face smiling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>PAUSE</td>
<td>rubbing hands together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.08</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>PULL</td>
<td>cheeks puffed out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.09</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>GIVE TO ‘him’</td>
<td>eye gaze follows giving action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>PULL</td>
<td>cheeks puffed out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GIVE TO ‘him’</td>
<td>eye gaze follows giving action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.11</td>
<td>18 COMBINED</td>
<td>‘PULL’</td>
<td>cheeks puffed out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GIVE TO ‘him’</td>
<td>eye gaze follows giving action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIME</td>
<td>CLICKS</td>
<td>ENGLISH GLOSS</td>
<td>NON MANUAL FEATURES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>PULL</td>
<td>straighten body eye gaze to audience, left arm raising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>HER &gt;&gt;</td>
<td>pointing to her</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PULL</td>
<td>Using thumb, not index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pursed lips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>body shifts forward over keg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.13</td>
<td>10 COMBINED</td>
<td>GIVE TO 1st recipient</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>“come on !!/ hurry up”(p)</td>
<td>(lp)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.14</td>
<td>13 COMBINED</td>
<td>PULL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GIVE TO 2nd recipient</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>“come on !!/ hurry up”(p)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>GLASS: ”DRINK UP”</td>
<td>clear (lp): glass to mouth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIME</td>
<td>CLICKS</td>
<td>ENGLISH GLOSS</td>
<td>NON MANUAL FEATURES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.16</td>
<td>23 COMBINED</td>
<td>PULL GIVE TO 1st recipient</td>
<td>Combined with GIVE TO Cheeky grin growing to a smirk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.17</td>
<td>23 COMBINED</td>
<td>PULL GIVE TO 2nd recipient</td>
<td>smirky face/ grimacing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>BOSSY &quot;she&quot;</td>
<td>full arm indication deixis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.19</td>
<td>10/6/8</td>
<td>&quot;come on/drink/come on&quot;</td>
<td>double handed movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>PAUSE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>CALM DOWN</td>
<td>eye gaze at her</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CALM DOWN</td>
<td>2 handed movement, face scowl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>CALM DOWN</td>
<td>eye gaze toward audience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.22</td>
<td>10 /10</td>
<td>WHY? / SHE &gt;&gt;</td>
<td>WHY toward audience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>DRINKING BEER (g)</td>
<td>eyebrows down, puffed cheeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIME</td>
<td>CLICKS</td>
<td>ENGLISH GLOSS</td>
<td>NON MANUAL FEATURES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>SHE &gt;&gt;</td>
<td>index pointer to her</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>WANT GO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.25/26</td>
<td>32</td>
<td><strong>BED</strong> (elongated sign)</td>
<td>(clear lp) head tilted back</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Head moves forwarded and tilted to side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Incredulous look on face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.27</td>
<td>20/10/7</td>
<td><strong>EARLY/WANT/SHE</strong></td>
<td>(lp) early</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SHE &gt;&gt;</td>
<td>head tilt toward her</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>PAUSE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.28</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>IMPOSSIBLE</td>
<td>incomplete sign, one hand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LEVEL in KEG (cl)</td>
<td>eye follows hands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(lp ) PLENTY. arms wave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.29</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>LEVEL gets bigger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower hand drops</td>
<td>one cheek puffed out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIME</td>
<td>CLICKS</td>
<td>ENGLISH GLOSS</td>
<td>NON MANUAL FEATURES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.30</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>LEVEL gets smaller</td>
<td>both cheeks puffed eye gaze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Upper hand drops</td>
<td>returns to audience level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.31</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>implied ‘plenty’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>HOURS AND HOURS</td>
<td>tongue poked to side of cheek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.32</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>FRUSTRATED (rpt)</td>
<td>flat mouth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.33</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>“come on!!”(g)</td>
<td>scowl face, angry look, body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>angled slightly toward Mary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.34</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>“come on!!”(g)</td>
<td>angry face, body lean forward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.35</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>WE</td>
<td>body weaving as if drunk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GLASS (cl) in hand</td>
<td>body lean backwards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.36</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>R/H glass (cl) in hand</td>
<td>weaving upper body, ‘drunk’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>L/H STOP</td>
<td>angled toward Mary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.37</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>R/H GLASS (cl) in hand</td>
<td>exaggerated ‘drunk’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIME</td>
<td>CLICKS</td>
<td>ENGLISH GLOSS</td>
<td>NON MANUAL FEATURES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.38</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>L/H swept behind signer</td>
<td>Smile, one eye closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.39</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>both hands STOP</td>
<td>angled toward Mary; grimace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.39</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>SHE &gt;&gt;&gt;</td>
<td>index pointer: face change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.40</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>“COME ON!!”</td>
<td>both hands full gesture: gritted teeth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.41</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>“drink up!” (x3)</td>
<td>body moving around group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.42</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>pouring 2 beers from keg (g)</td>
<td>head forward, body lean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.42</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>pouring 2 beers from keg (g)</td>
<td>body bent double over keg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.43</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>passes 2 full beers from keg (g)</td>
<td>smile begins, body more upright</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.44</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>LH “come on”</td>
<td>(lp) - body tilt forward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.45/46</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>KEG (cl) getting emptier</td>
<td>face to audience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>LEVEL gets smaller held</td>
<td>Upper hand drops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIME</td>
<td>CLICKS</td>
<td>ENGLISH GLOSS</td>
<td>NON MANUAL FEATURES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.46</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>PAUSE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.47/48</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>checking the keg (p)</td>
<td>pantomime bent over the keg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.49</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>PAUSE</td>
<td>eye gaze at audience stands up straight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.50</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>HALF TO GO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.51</td>
<td>51 COMBINED</td>
<td>PAUSE/ GESTURE</td>
<td>grimace on face, eyes drop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.52</td>
<td>21 FOR GESTURE</td>
<td>gesture: bugger !!</td>
<td>one hand in fist rising on chest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.53</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>looking at wrist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.54</td>
<td>20/10</td>
<td>ELEVEN x 2</td>
<td>(lp) eleven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.55</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>TIME (on wrist)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.56</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>PAUSE</td>
<td>hands drop to sides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.57/58</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>tap off keg (p)</td>
<td>grimace on face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.59</td>
<td>60 COMBINED</td>
<td>ummm.</td>
<td>rub chin with hand: body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIME</td>
<td>CLICKS</td>
<td>ENGLISH GLOSS</td>
<td>NON MANUAL FEATURES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.20.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>WHAT TO DO</td>
<td>upright, downward gaze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.01/02</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>GLASS (cl)</td>
<td>R/H on hip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.03</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>SHE &gt;&gt;</td>
<td>glass in hand, drunk and body weaving (p)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.04</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>turns spigot (p)</td>
<td>smirk on face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.05/06</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>hands out beers all round (p)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.07</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>“Come on…”(g)</td>
<td>(lp) small hand gesture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.08</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>I GO BED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.09</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>“come on…”(g)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>PAUSE</td>
<td>hands to sides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>BUT</td>
<td>deliberate slow sign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>pulls another beer (p)</td>
<td>stands up straight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>SHE&gt;&gt;</td>
<td>index pointer both hands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIME</td>
<td>CLICKS</td>
<td>ENGLISH GLOSS</td>
<td>NON MANUAL FEATURES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.14</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>PAUSE</td>
<td>hands drop, head forward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>L/H VOMIT</td>
<td>head forward, puffed cheeks, lips pursed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.16</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>R/H VOMIT</td>
<td>puffed cheeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>NEXT, NEXT</td>
<td>puffed cheeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>L/H VOMIT</td>
<td>puffed cheeks, pursed lips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>R/H VOMIT</td>
<td>puffed cheeks, pursed lips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.20/21</td>
<td>10/10</td>
<td>NEXT/ NEXT</td>
<td>smile starting, moving toward audience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>NEXT VOMIT</td>
<td>cheeky grin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.23</td>
<td>40 PAUSE</td>
<td>'oh Dear’...</td>
<td>hands on chest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.24</td>
<td></td>
<td>“OH NO”(p)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.25</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>EMBARRASSED</td>
<td>pursed lips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>SHE/HERSELF</td>
<td>index finger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.27</td>
<td>10/10</td>
<td>GIVE x2</td>
<td>BEERS implied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIME</td>
<td>CLICKS</td>
<td>ENGLISH GLOSS</td>
<td>NON MANUAL FEATURES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.28</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>TOO MUCH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.29</td>
<td>30 – end of story</td>
<td></td>
<td>hands drop to sides, smile, turns to her</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>