CRITICALLY EVALUATING RECENT MODELS OF
DISABILITY WITH REFERENCE TO d/DEAF SIGNERS'
CONCERT EXPERIENCES.

By

AMY LOUISE SIMMONS

A thesis submitted to the University of Birmingham for the
Degree of MASTER OF PHILOSOPHY (B).

School of Languages, Cultures, Art History and Music.

College of Arts and Law.

University of Birmingham.

February, 2014.

UNIVERSITY OF BIRMINGHAM

University of Birmingham Research Archive

e-theses repository

Abstract

The aim of this study was to critically evaluate recent models of disability, such as the social and bio-psycho-social models of disability, with reference to d/Deaf Signers' experiences of access services in theatres and arenas and their experiences of attending live music events. I propose a cultural-linguistic-social-psycho-bio model of d/Deafness for analysing, understanding and (through future research) improving d/Deaf Signers' concert experiences. I based my model on Deaf Signers' self-identification as a culture and on their irrefutable claim that Signed languages are languages. In using 'd/Deafness' and 'social-psycho-bio' in my model, as opposed to 'Deafness' and 'cultural-linguistic' alone, I intend my model to encompass certain deaf Signers who do not self-identify as culturally Deaf. I will consider the barriers which d/Deaf Signers encounter when attempting to access live music events, whilst avoiding making assumptions that attending a concert is inherently preferable to not doing so or that every decision which a d/Deaf Signer makes not to attend a concert is connected to their d/Deafness. I interviewed (verbally or in written form) two d/Deaf Signers, six Sign interpreters (all but one was UK-based) and use responses from an impromptu telephone interview with a person who developed a theatre's access policies.

Acknowledgements

There are several individuals without the assistance and support of whom this project would not have been possible, at least not in its present form. I acknowledge the following persons in no particular order.

Dr Charlotte Ross, Dr Clare Barker, Dr Rachel Sutton-Spence and Dr Harriet Clarke, thank you all for your invaluable advice, as supervisors and as examiners. Thank you all for your patience!

Thank you to Steve Potter, my study facilitator for the support you have given me over the years and for ensuring the project was done to time and to standard.

Thank you to my parents Joan and Mike Simmons for proof-reading the thesis and for being so supportive.

I have been blessed to make so many new friends over the course of this project; you have all made the experience a special one!

Thank you to Joanne, Paul, Chris, Hayley, Rachel, Naomi, Michael, Judith and Stephanie for your valued insights and perspectives. Joanne inspired me to learn British Sign Language (BSL) and I am incredibly grateful for this. Thank you to Lesley for interpreting for Joanne; it is greatly appreciated.

I was inspired to conduct this study following a Signed concert tour by the Spice Girls which took place in 1998, and I would like to credit all those involved in this aspect of the concert.

Contents page

"The first question that interpreters get asked is, "But why would a deaf person go to a concert?" They think it's a silly question, but everyone asks it" (Hesse, 2011).

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

There are various models of disability, including the individual, social and bio-psycho-social models. The models are attempts to identify the source of disability; locating disability within the individual, within wider society (henceforth 'society'), and within the individual's body, psyche and society respectively; this latter model focuses on the multiple sources of disability. Each set of assumptions leads to distinct solutions to the problem of disabled individuals' social exclusion. Michael Oliver (1983) developed the individual model as a point of contrast for his social model. Oliver's individual model approaches disability from a purely physiological perspective; the implication of this is that a disabled individual's impairment alone prevents them from full social participation. From an individual model perspective, rehabilitative measures should be taken to incorporate disabled individuals into society. Although the individual model of disability is referred to by many as the medical model of disability, Oliver (1996) himself did not embrace this term, claiming "there is no such thing as the medical model of disability. There is instead, an individual model of disability of which medicalisation is one significant component" (p. 31). The social model, by contrast, which Oliver considers to be preferable to the individual model, locates disability within society; using this alternative approach, society is considered responsible for disabled individuals' social exclusion. In challenging prejudicial attitudes towards disabled individuals, Oliver felt, disabled individuals' social inclusion could be facilitated. The bio-psycho-social model of disability, as its title suggests,

frames disability as a physiological, psychological *and* social phenomenon. Only by addressing each aspect of disability can a disabled individual be fully included in society. The Back-Up Trust (2012), a UK-based organisation for individuals with a spinal cord injury, summarise the bio-psycho-social model in the following quote. The model:

> [S]ees disability as an interaction between a person's health condition and the environment they live in. It advocates that both the medical and social models are appropriate, but neither is sufficient on its own to explain the complex nature of one's health [...] This **bio-psychosocial** model shows the complex and dynamic relationship between a number of inter-related factors. In this model a person's ability to function is viewed as the outcome of the interactions between the medical factor [...] and contextual factors. The contextual factors include external environmental factors such as social attitude and buildings, and internal personal factors, which include coping styles, social background, education and other factors that influence how disability is experienced by the individual. (The Back-Up Trust, 2012, pp. 2-3).

The aims of my research were to critically evaluate the recent models of disability outlined above in order to establish the impact these models may have on our understanding of disability and d/Deaf individuals' experiences, specifically, the experience of attending concerts ('disability' is a controversial concept when discussing deafness and Deaf culture, see chapter 2). Having briefly introduced the various models of disability and aims of the project, I will now discuss my rationale for the study.

The epigraph to this chapter indicates that the widely held assumption is that d/Deaf individuals cannot access music as they are unable to hear it. Recent models of disability, such as the bio-psycho-social model, indicate that various factors may prevent d/Deaf Signers from accessing live music events, aside from their hearing impairments and some individuals' unwillingness to engage with hearing culture on

principle. In using d/Deaf Signers' concert experiences as a case study, I realised I could challenge either popular opinion or the recent models of disability which have called for greater attention to social factors in disability. This, I felt, outweighed the disadvantage of selecting an area of study which might apply to very few d/Deaf individuals, although I ensured I designed my research accordingly in anticipation of this (qualitative, rather than quantitative ethnographic research with d/Deaf Signers and Sign interpreters, using questionnaires and interviews). I gathered a sample and administered questionnaires and conducted interviews to discover more about the participants' relevant concert experiences. The rationale for undertaking this study is that, whilst there is an abundance of literature on models of disability, in particular, responses to the social model (Oliver, 1983) which Oliver based on the ideas of UPIAS (1976), there is an absence of literature critically evaluating recent models of disability with reference to d/Deaf Signers' concert experiences. The crux of my argument is that an understanding of d/Deaf Signers' concert experiences has the potential to improve recent models of disability and an understanding of recent models of disability has the potential to improve d/Deaf Signers' concert experiences. I developed the following research questions:

1. To what extent can existing models of disability improve d/Deaf Signers' concert experiences?
2. How can an understanding of d/Deaf Signers' concert experiences inform our understandings of models of disability?

It is within the scope of the study to address those research questions, but it is not within the scope of the study to directly inform access policies in theatres and arenas, or to redevelop existing models of disability. Through recommending future research and modifications to recent models of disability, it is my intention that the study will

have academic and practical value. Academically, I hope my thesis will result in an alternative model of disability, which depends less heavily on the physiological facets of disability (I propose instead a cultural-linguistic-socio-psycho-bio model of disability). On a practical level, it is my hope that my thesis will inspire guides to best practice, specifically as they relate to d/Deaf Signers at concerts, as I define the term. In the following section, I will outline the terms d/Deaf, Deaf culture and concerts.

Concepts

Throughout this thesis, I have applied the term d/Deaf, aside from references to specific individuals or issues specific to Deaf culture. The term d/Deaf is a controversial one; debate surrounds its continued application. Some feel it implies a division amongst individuals with substantially limited or no hearing, which they do not identify with. The separation between deaf and Deaf was proposed by James Woodward (1972); deaf refers to the physiological condition of being unable to hear, Deaf refers to those who have embraced Deaf culture and communicate using their national Signed language. Woodward specifically mentioned American Sign Language (ASL) in his definition; I consider this to be ethnocentric but not problematic, as it can easily be extended to individuals who use any other national Sign language as their native language. It is more usual for individuals using a Signed language to identify as Deaf but some may use, for argument's sake, British Sign Language (BSL), without identifying with Deaf culture *per se*. Both deaf and Deaf individuals may choose to attend concerts and to request Signed interpretations of the events.

Deaf culture can be divided into two broad categories of Deaf individuals; those in the immersion stage of Deafness, and those in the bi-cultural stage (Neil Glickman and Michael Harvey (1993). For individuals in the immersion stage, 'hearing culture' is

inferior to Deaf culture and they associate themselves exclusively with Deaf individuals. Bi-culturally Deaf individuals are comfortable within both the Deaf and hearing cultures, they associate with hearing individuals and participate in hearing culture, whilst remaining proud of their Deaf culture. For some individuals, being Deaf is a fundamental aspect of their identity. Deaf culture has its own idioms, jokes, performing arts and languages (the national Sign language). Those who identify with Deaf culture do live amongst hearing individuals; it is not a geographically segregated community. Attempts were made to establish a community of this nature in the United States of America (USA), but these attempts were ridiculed and abandoned rapidly, due to funding concerns and the implications for hearing children of Deaf parents.

Some hearing children of Deaf parents (who may refer to themselves as CODAs, children of Deaf adults) consider themselves to be Deaf, whilst recognising that they can hear. Jemina Napier (2002), physiologically hearing but having absorbed Deaf culture, considers herself hearing rather than Hearing; 'Hearing' refers to those who have absorbed Hearing culture, 'hearing' refers to those who have not. Likewise, some Deaf children born to hearing parents become culturally Deaf. Some culturally Deaf individuals (primarily those in the immersion stage) reject concerts and musical theatre, dismissing them as part of hearing culture from which, as I stated previously, they disassociate themselves. I appreciate their opinion but do not consider it problematic; any long-term outcomes of this project would benefit Deaf individuals who *do* wish to attend concerts or musical theatre and would not disadvantage Deaf individuals who do *not.*

I classified all performances of interest to me as a researcher as either musical theatre or concerts, but the term 'concerts' in particular was rather broadly defined as

the audio-visually recorded or live performance of music with lyrics. This meant music videos (e.g. Ed Sheeran's *You Need Me, I Don't Need You* and Sir Paul McCartney's *My Valentine)* and recordings of live performances of a single song (e.g. Geri Halliwell's promotional performances of *Lift Me Up)* qualified as concerts, in addition to performances featuring Signed music including the Spice Girls' *Girl Power Tour '98* and *Christmas in Spice World*, Boyzone's *Boyzone…Greatest Hits* tour and various performances by Rainbow Voices, Rainbow Chorus and the Manchester Lesbian and Gay Chorus. My primary concern was that lyrics were Sign interpreted and I defined 'concerts' loosely as I was unsure how many examples of Sign interpretation during live music events participants could provide. Fortunately, the participants were all able to discuss live music events such as concerts or musical theatre which they had either attended as a d/Deaf audience member or worked at as a Sign interpreter. None of the acts listed above, it should be noted, are d/Deaf or market themselves towards a specifically d/Deaf audience. However, there are various other acts which do market themselves towards specifically d/Deaf audiences and those with a degree of interest in their respective national Signed languages, such as Signing Hands choir, Fletch@, Signmark and Sean Forbes. I was, however, keen to research the experiences of d/Deaf Signers and interpreters who had attended or interpreted performances not specifically for d/Deaf individuals. Focussing on the experiences of attending or interpreting concerts of this nature, I felt, would facilitate an exploration of the primarily cultural-linguistic barriers to accessing live music which d/Deaf Signers encounter, as d/Deaf-specific events would be arranged with their linguistic differences in mind. Having briefly contextualised the study with reference to performers who incorporated (or continue to incorporate) Signed language into their acts, during the next section I will contextualise the study further by discussing the processes and policies governing d/Deaf Signers' access to live music events.

Current Policies and Practices

Within this section, I will outline the usual procedure for arranging Signed performances, including some of the companies who facilitate those performances by providing Sign interpreters. I will then discuss the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, which is particularly relevant to d/Deaf Signers' access to live music events.

It is not the theatre company or performers' responsibility to arrange Signed performances. In general, theatres have a mailing list and d/Deaf subscribers vote on which performances should be interpreted. The theatre then contacts companies such as BSL Tickets[1], who assign the most appropriate interpreter to each performance, based on their preferences, availability and interpreting style. Under the code of conduct for interpreters, it is inappropriate for an interpreter to work at an event where they do not feel able to remain neutral. In the Association of Sign Language Interpreters (ASLI's) code of professional conduct, for instance, it is stated that Sign interpreters must remain "impartial, maintain integrity and professionalism, keeping a professional distance, even in challenging situations" (ASLI, c. 2013). Alternatively, companies (for example, THEATRESIGN[2]) may receive requests from d/Deaf theatregoers directly and interpret the most popularly requested shows. Arenas provide information for customers with access requirements on their websites. Individuals with access requirements are instructed to telephone/text phone a specific ticket booking service, stating their requirements as they book tickets and providing evidence of disability. It is then the arena's responsibility to

---

[1] BSL Tickets is a company which assigns British Sign Language interpreters to events such as musical theatre, entertainment venues contact BSL Tickets to arrange this service for access nights or specific individuals who request the service.
[2] THEATRESIGN (which recommends BSL Tickets on their website) is, like BSL Tickets a company providing British Sign Language interpreters to events, more specifically, musical theatre.

contact companies, such as, again, BSL Tickets, to arrange the appropriate service. It is the role of Sign interpreters during concerts to interpret (in addition to dialogue and monologue) the lyrics from the original language of the lyrics performed to the Signed language which the client uses. Interpreters must convey music through musicality, altering their style to match the tone of the performance. It is not the role of the interpreter to project their opinion of the performance onto their interpretation (as stated previously), nor to censor the lyrics, whether they consider them suitable for a person of their client's age or not. Theatres and arenas develop their own access policies and they can opt in to a charter of best practice, such as the charter introduced by the company Attitude is Everything[3] (2011), but there is no standardised or legally binding policy.

There is, however, a United Nations convention, to which the UK is a signatory and which promotes d/Deaf individuals' rights to access entertainment. Its full title is the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (UNCRPD, 2006). Section 30 1 (b) of the convention demands that disabled individuals have the right to "enjoy access to television programmes, films, theatre and other cultural activities in accessible formats" (UNCRPD). Article 30 (4) of the Convention states: "persons with disabilities shall be entitled, on an equal basis with others, to recognition and support of their specific cultural and linguistic identity, including sign languages and deaf culture" (ibid.).

To date, this is the most relevant Act or Convention governing d/Deaf individuals' rights to access entertainment and the Act which, with its acknowledgement of Deaf culture and Signed languages, is the one which most closely corresponds to my

---

[3] Attitude is Everything is a company which, unlike BSL Tickets and THEATRESIGN is concerned with developing guides to best practice and recommendations for Deaf and disabled audiences at live music events. Essentially, BSL Tickets and THEATRESIGN are part of the policy implementation process and Attitude is Everything is part of the policy development process.

cultural-linguistic-social-psycho-bio model of d/Deafness which I propose later in this thesis. Access policies in theatres and arenas are relevant to my study because Signed or access performances are likely to take place at these venues and as Attitude is Everything (2014) suggest, issues remain in access services when a Deaf or disabled individual attempts to book tickets for an event.

In this introductory chapter, I have introduced the main models of disability and concepts relevant to my study, I stated my aims, objectives and my research questions and I have contextualised the study, giving the reader a brief indication of current policies and practices. In the next chapter, I present a literature review. The focus of that chapter is on models of disability and Deaf culture. From chapter three onwards, the focus of my dissertation turns to my research with d/Deaf concertgoers and Sign interpreters. Chapter three largely consists of a discussion of my research decisions; my recruitment procedure and my methods of data collection and analysis. Chapter four entails the discussion and analysis of the data I collected. The literature review in chapter two, combined with the data analysis in chapter four, enabled me to draw conclusions in chapter five. As is typical in research, the study produced more questions than answers and the scope of the study was too limited to address them, so I also suggest future research in this chapter. Chapter two, the literature review follows.

CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

During the literature review, my focus is on two models of disability I outlined in chapter one and Deaf culture. I will make only a passing reference to the individual model of disability, as the social and bio-psycho-social models are more relevant to my study. As this chapter includes a more in-depth discussion of the social and bio-psycho-social models, some of this information will be repeated from chapter one. The purposes of this chapter are to identify gaps in the literature, discuss the models and Deaf culture and to identify areas of contention within the literature. In so doing, I will contextualise my study within the wider corpus of work in this area. I will first discuss the models of disability, with particular emphasis on the bio-psycho-social model, before narrowing the focus to Deaf culture. My literature review consists of a discussion of concepts from two distinct disciplines. Models of disability such as the social model have been extensively discussed in the field of disability studies, but Deaf culture is more adequately addressed by Deaf studies scholars. It should be noted that I am discussing models of *disability* because my research indicates that the experience of being Deaf and accessing live music could (similar to disabled individuals' experiences) be approached from a cultural-linguistic-social-psycho-bio angle. I am not contradicting Deaf individuals' self-identification as culturally Deaf, rather than hearing-impaired; much of the next section is not directly relevant to d/Deaf individuals but serves to contextualise and critically evaluate the models. Although the bio-psycho-social model of disability predates the social model, it is the latter which has warranted the most academic attention.

Models of Disability

Michael Oliver (1983) developed his version of the social model in response to the commonly-held beliefs that disability was located within the body, that on becoming disabled, disabled individuals endured a process comparable to grief (grieving for the lost bodily function) and that it was the responsibility of the individual disabled person to become rehabilitated and adapt to society. Oliver termed this approach the individual model of disability. By contrast, he claimed disability was located within society (p. 27), each disabled individual responds to any loss of bodily function differently (p. 21) and it is the responsibility of society to adapt to disabled individuals (p. 23) and in so doing, minimise the extent to which impairment is a disadvantage. This view is shared by Nora Groce (1985). She studied Martha's Vineyard, an American island on which settlers with the deaf gene intermarried, resulting in a substantial d/Deaf population. On Martha's Vineyard, almost all inhabitants, d/Deaf and hearing, were fluent in Martha's Vineyard Sign Language and deafness was not a disadvantage:

> [T]he fact that a society could adjust to disabled individuals, rather than requiring them to do all the adjusting […] raises important questions about the rights of the disabled and the responsibilities of those who are not. The Martha's Vineyard experience suggests strongly that the concept of a handicap is an arbitrary social category. And if it is a question of definition, rather than a universal given, perhaps it can be redefined, and many of the cultural preconceptions summarised in the term "handicapped," as it is now used, eliminated. (Groce, 1985, p. 108).

Oliver attracted criticism from fellow scholars for allegedly disregarding the physiological and psychological aspects of disability in his social model.

For example, Jenny Morris (1991), stated:

> While environmental barriers and social attitudes are a crucial part of our experiences of
> disability – and do indeed disable us – to suggest that this is all there is to it is to deny the
> personal experience of physical or intellectual restrictions, of illness, of the fear of dying
> (Morris, 1991, p. 10).

Therefore, in Morris's opinion, regardless of the accommodations society may make for disabled individuals and irrespective of the attitudes non-disabled individuals have towards disabled persons, impairments can shorten a person's life-span, cause anxiety and/or leave them in pain, whether that pain is physical, emotional or both. Sally French (1993) contributed a similar argument to the discourse; she is a partially-sighted academic, who believes that no adaptations or attitude shifts amongst the general population can enable her to read non-verbal cues from conversation partners. Oliver (1996) responded to her statements by explaining, "[T]he social model is not an attempt to deal with the personal restrictions of impairment but the social barriers of disability." (Oliver, 1996, p. 38).

I interpret this to mean that Oliver appreciates French's point, but did not intend for his model to be holistic. His model draws attention to the social facets of what he recognises to be a multi-faceted experience (disability), previously side-lined as an after-thought in the bio-psycho-social model of disability.

The bio-psycho-social model of disability was introduced in 1964 by Roy Grinker, a psychologist and neurologist, who was not optimistic about its uses in psychiatry. The model's first key advocate was a clinician, George Engel (1977), who heralded it as a potential solution to the crisis he felt medicine and (he assumed) psychiatry were encountering at the time:

Psychiatry's crisis revolves around the question of whether the categories of human distress with which it is concerned are properly considered "disease" as currently conceptualized and whether exercise of the traditional authority of the physician is appropriate for their helping functions. Medicine's crisis stems from the logical inference that since "disease" is defined in terms of somatic parameters, physicians need not be concerned with psychosocial issues which lie outside medicine's responsibility and authority (Engel, 1977, p. 129).

Essentially, Engel felt it necessary for clinicians and psychiatrists to consider physiological, psychological and social factors of illness when assessing patients and prescribing the appropriate treatment. This appealed to clinicians who had become disillusioned with the practice of maintaining a professional distance from patients. Current opinion on this model appears to be divided along occupational lines; those in the clinical profession have shown more support for the model than mental health professionals. It is primarily from these two angles that the bio-psycho-social model has been addressed, rather than from a cultural studies perspective, such as my own study. In this respect, my research addresses a gap in the literature, exploring a model which is usually discussed in medical spheres of academic study. What follows is a discussion of support and criticism for the model.

Support and Criticism for the Bio-Psycho-Social Model of Disability

The World Health Organisation (WHO, 2011) framed the bio-psycho-social model as:

a workable compromise between medical and social models. Disability is the umbrella term for impairments, activity limitations and participation restrictions, referring to the negative aspects of the interaction between an individual (with a health condition) and that individual's contextual factors (environmental and personal factors) (WHO, 2011, p. 4).

A longer introduction to the bio-psycho-social model of disability can be found in the same document (pp. 1-6). What can be established from the above quote, however,

is that for the WHO, the model is 'a workable compromise' and it is relevant to the multi-faceted experience of disability.

From the outset, the bio-psycho-social model attracted support for its destruction of unnecessary barriers between clinicians and patients. Further support for the model on these grounds can be found in the writings of, for example, Robert Smith (2002) and Francesc Borrell-Carrió, Anthony Suchman and Ronald Epstein (2004), who agree that the bio-psycho-social model is conducive to more productive relationships between patient and doctor. Smith suggested that where physicians apply the model to their everyday practice, patients are more successfully treated, as the physician must consider the individual's psyche, such as the willingness to co-operate and their cultural norms, if they are to make an informed decision about how best to treat the patient. He felt the model was more scientific than the bio-medical approach to illness and disability alone. Nassir Ghaemi's (2009) opinion is diametrically opposed to Smith's.

Ghaemi, a psychiatrist, dismissed the bio-psycho-social model as eclecticism. Unlike Smith, he felt the model was unscientific, as he explained; "The basic idea [of the bio-psycho-social model] is that 'more is better': truth is achieved by adding more and more perspective, getting closer and closer to a highly complex reality. This is common sense, perhaps, but not scientific sense." (Ghaemi, 2009, p. 4). I fully appreciate his perspective and his concerns that eclecticism is not the most appropriate approach to each patient. However, science tends to over-simplify issues such as disability:

> While science objectifies the disabled and understands disability through the categories of abnormality, deviancy, and deficits to be cured, the informed researcher also realizes that the various ways in which science has defined and constructed disability are important

constituents of what disability signifies at a particular cultural moment. (Jay Dolmage and Cynthia Lewiecki-Wilson in Eileen E. Schell and K. J. Rawson, 2010, p. 31).[4]

In addition to this, seemingly scientific research can be misleading, as Christopher Langley (2012) explained in his critique of the bio-psycho-social model and its application to insurance and benefits policies. Langley criticised research supporting injured or disabled individuals' return to work which appears scientifically grounded and objective but which has, for example, been developed as part of a wider government agenda to reduce benefit costs.

Like Langley, Colin Barnes and Geoff Mercer (2010) have challenged the bio-psycho-social model of disability on several key grounds, particularly in their discussion of the WHO's International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health (WHO, 2001). One of the many issues which they observed with the model is that "it ignores the extent to which identifying and labelling deviations as illness or impairment are social processes, liable to vary between social groups and societies and over time," (Barnes and Mercer, 2010, p. 38). Deafness is one such example of a fluid category, as is the concept of 'normalcy'.

Lennard J. Davis (1997) wrote a critique of the term 'normalcy', claiming "the very term that permeates our contemporary social life – the normal – is a configuration that arises in a particular historical moment," (Davis, 1997, in Davis, p. 17). In his exploration of portrayals of disability in literature, Davis traces the notion of normalcy back to as relatively recently as the mid-19th century, revealing its connection to eugenics. 'Normal' is by no means an objective term and, he contends, must be challenged if disabled equality is to be achieved. "One of the tasks for a developing consciousness of disability issues is the attempt […] to reverse the hegemony of the normal and to institute alternative ways of thinking about the abnormal" (ibid.) A

---

[4] K. J. Rawson is the author's legal name.

comparison can be drawn between the 'hegemony of the normal' and a concept developed by Tobin Siebers (2008), the 'ideology of ability'.

Theoretical Approaches to Disability and Deafness

Siebers (2008) developed a theoretically-grounded critique of the social model, complex embodiment theory. Complex embodiment is the theory that where physical pain or prostheses are framed as advantages, disability becomes ability, which contributes to the 'ideology of ability'. Complex embodiment combines elements of social constructionism with corporeal accounts of the body. Siebers stated:

> I am claiming that the body has its own forces and that we need to recognize them if we are to get a less one-sided picture of how bodies and their representations affect each other for good and for bad. The body is, first and foremost, a biological agent teeming with vital and often chaotic forces. It is not inert matter subject to easy manipulation by social representations. The body is alive, which means that it is as capable of influencing and transforming social languages as they are capable of influencing and transforming it. (Siebers, 2008, p. 749).

Siebers felt that the physiological aspects of disability must be accounted for in body theory, if the theory is to unite disabled individuals and further their rights. It must be relevant to individuals with impairments and their daily experiences; for instance, it must incorporate the experience of pain. He suggested solutions to the problem of disability must be developed in the knowledge that the political system is largely inaccessible to disabled individuals. He acknowledged that communities tend to form around a common characteristic such as gender, ethnic origin or family, whereas disabled communities form around, for instance, the shared experience of the clinical condition in question, information sharing or treatment plans. Therefore, the physiological experiences of disabled individuals enable communities to form and

this is also applicable to the Deaf community (I discuss the Deaf community at length in the next section of this chapter).

Theresa Man Ling Lee (2011) was critical of extending the label of 'culture' to the Deaf community, on the grounds that this reduces the community to a lower status culture, in comparison to ethnic-based cultural groups. She claimed:

> The goal of integration of differences is indeed crucial to creating "a more tolerant and inclusive society." However this does not entail labelling all differences as cultural differences and then somehow making the ethnic-based cultural groups more properly "cultural" and therefore deserving of the policy of multiculturalism. The disabled are not a cultural group, second class or otherwise. (Man Ling Lee in Dianne Pothier and Richard Devlin, 2011, p. 102)

In her opinion, therefore, collective self-identification as a culture marginalises, as opposed to empowers, the Deaf community and disabled individuals.

My attention now turns to Deaf Studies literature, specifically, discussions of Deaf culture; many Deaf individuals do not identify with the concept of 'disability', whether one approaches it from a social, individual or bio-psycho-social perspective. Not all Deaf individuals believe music is an appropriate form of entertainment for a Deaf individual, due to its associations with Hearing culture. Although this research exclusively concerns individuals who *do* attend concerts, it is also worth acknowledging the perspectives of those who *do not*.

Deaf Culture

Before I continue this section, I will define 'culture' as it relates to Deafness. The following is a quote from Alexis C. Hamill and Catherine H. Stein (2011); I acknowledge the ethnocentricity of the statement as American Sign Language is the medium for Deaf individuals in the USA only:

Culture is defined as a system of shared values, beliefs, behaviours and artefacts passed

down through generations to function in that group's world and interact with other members

(Bates & Plog, 1990). Deaf culture has its own social norms, views, values, historical figures,

art (Lane, 2005; Padden & Humphries, 1988), and unique forces acting on identity formation

(Cornell & Lyness, 2004; Skelton and Valentine, 2003). The medium for Deaf culture is

American Sign Language (ASL) (Sacks, 1989). (Hamill and Stein, 2011, p. 390).

In this section, I will outline the literature pertaining to Deaf culture. One of the key

works on this subject, albeit Deaf culture in the USA, was written by Carol Padden

and Tom Humphries (1996). Padden and Humphries detailed aspects of Deaf

culture, including its varied art forms, which usually centre on the experience of

Deafness, differences between the Deaf and the hearing world (such as the

terminology we use[5]) and the ways in which hearing individuals disadvantage Deaf

individuals. Like many other Deaf individuals, Padden and Humphries reject the term

'disabled'; they consider its application to Deaf individuals necessary but

inappropriate:

> "Disabled" is a label that historically has not belonged to Deaf people. It suggests political self-
> representations and goals unfamiliar to the group. When Deaf people discuss their deafness,
> they use terms deeply related to their language, their past, and their community. Their
> enduring concerns have been the preservation of their language, policies for educating deaf
> children, and maintenance of their social and political organizations. The modern language of,
> "access" and "civil rights," as unfamiliar as it is to Deaf people, has been used by Deaf
> Leaders because the public understands these concerns more readily than ones specific to
> the Deaf community. Knowing well the special benefits, economic and otherwise, of calling
> themselves disabled, Deaf people have a history, albeit an uneasy one, of alignment with
> other disabled groups. (Padden and Humphries, 1996, p. 44).

---

[5] For example, 'very hard of hearing' in the hearing world implies that a person can hear only slightly,
but that same person, in Deaf culture, would be 'slightly hard of hearing'.

The above quote criticises the term 'access', which is a word I use throughout my dissertation as d/Deaf Signers request Sign interpreters via *access* services. Paddy Ladd (2003), who is also Deaf, contests the attempts to frame the experience of Deafness in social model terms on similar grounds:

> Many [Deaf individuals] are uncomfortable with their inclusion in the disability social model because, however it might try to construct itself to assimilate them, the criterion used for including Deaf communities in their ranks is that of physical deafness – in other words, the medical concept. (Ladd, 2003, p. 15).

Ladd also co-wrote an article in which the authors claimed:

> [E]ven the social model of disability offers only a partial explanation of the SLPs' situation. By insisting on biological primacy for the construction of the category of persons with disabilities, issues such as culturolinguistic dynamics and rights are ignored in favour of an individual rights approach to social policy. (Sarah Batterbury, Paddy Ladd and Mike Gulliver, 2007, p. 2899).

I accept the view that a variety of factors, including physiological and cultural factors, may influence a d/Deaf individual's decision to attend or not attend a concert. My argument is that models of disability can *also* be relevant to Deaf individuals, in *addition* to disabled individuals and that there are lessons which culturally Deaf persons may learn from models of disability. As I have previously stated, it is not my intention to imply that being Deaf is a physiological impairment.

In general, discovering Deaf culture, as Padden and Humphries explain, is a relief for those who enter it after years of isolation from hearing relatives and peers, but this is not the case for all culturally Deaf individuals. Tom Bertling (1995), for instance, wrote a more critical review of Deaf culture from within the community; he transferred to a school for the Deaf having begun his education in a mainstream school, where he functioned well and felt comfortable. In his experience, Deaf culture is not ideal

and does not present an honest representation of itself to deaf individuals or society at large:

> The deaf community should be more truthful to what they truly offer to parents of deaf children. Sacrificing deaf children to preserve the interests of a select few is asking too much. In reality, the deaf "culture" option is nothing more than another choice, for a selection, having to be made by parents based upon "which is the lessor evil?" [Sic.] (Bertling, 1995, p. 101).

Those who Padden and Humphries were referring to tended to be individuals who had struggled during their earlier education in mainstream school and amongst hearing relatives, who often did not realise their child was deaf until later in the child's life. Bertling wore hearing aids and did not self-identify as Deaf until he transferred to the Deaf school. Of particular relevance to my study, Bertling specifically referred to the apathy towards music which he observed amongst his Deaf peers at the school in question:

> I remembered feeling a kind of loss for the students at the school […] They would never experience music the way I could. All the childhood songs they never knew, the Christmas carols that made the Christmas experience, and the contemporary music that would be left behind. I later came to realize that this lost culture was insignificant to them […]. (Bertling, 1995, p. 28).

Ladd (2003) confirmed this:

> In the late 1970s, a number of Deaf individuals began to develop their own interpretations of pop songs (in the USA, several groups formed and toured), but it is only in the 1990s that they have adapted the lyrics of hearing songs to fit the Deaf situation or composed their own material (Ladd, 1991) around these themes. This artform is a controversial one since, in many cases, only those Deaf with some hearing can gain a full appreciation of the work, leading those with no hearing to feel alienated from it. (Ladd, 2003, p. 51).

In Deaf culture, therefore, not only is it regarded as preferable to produce original material pertaining to Deafness, music is also a controversial matter; some culturally

Deaf individuals reject music and criticise Deaf individuals who engage with it. Ladd seems to be referring to an opinion other than his own, because he:

> "[C]reated the world's first sign language pop video […] signed songs at Bob Dylan and Grateful Dead concerts in the US, learning the words by heart and being cued when each line started.

> "It was wonderful the number of hearing people that moved seats just so they could watch the signing," Ladd recalls. "I can't describe the feeling of respect and acceptance deaf people get at these concerts."" (Raekha Prasad, The Guardian, 2003).

I believe my study would attract criticism from those who feel it is inappropriate for Deaf individuals to engage with music. I respect their opinion; however, as stated previously, there are other Deaf individuals who do not share their view and do attend concerts; therefore I do not consider it problematic to use d/Deaf Signers' concert experiences as a point of reference for exploring models of disability. Padden and Humphries seem to share Ladd's view that music in a visual form is an appropriate means of entertainment for Deaf individuals, claiming:

> As signified by the many film and television portrayals of Deaf people longing to hear the sound of a guitar or piano, many hearing people assume that because Deaf people cannot hear music they cannot appreciate such concepts. Thinking of Deaf people as silent makes it impossible to recognize that, in certain aspects of their lives, they find ways to represent such concepts. (Padden and Humphries, 1996, p. 104).

Ways to represent music for d/Deaf individuals include art and Signed performances, although Signed performances can prove controversial, if they are not original works. Padden and Humphries agreed with Ladd, that Deaf performers should produce original works in their national Sign language, as opposed to developing interpretations of previous performances. When the National Theatre of the Deaf, 1971, staged 'My Third Eye', a specifically Deaf play, Padden and Humphries

regarded this as a positive, revolutionary decision. Their position on hearing performers and Signed performances is unclear, but what has become apparent from perusing the literature is that Deaf culture has its own performing arts, artistes and works, which some Deaf individuals prefer to mainstream (not Deaf-specific) performances.

Harlan Lane (1995) may also criticise the notion of interpreted concerts and he might criticise hearing researchers such as myself. He claimed:

> The professional services fueled by the disability construction of deafness are provided by some administrators of schools and training programs, experts in counseling and rehabilitation, teachers, *interpreters*, audiologists, speech therapists, otologists, psychologists, psychiatrists, librarians, *researchers*, social workers, and hearing aid specialists. All of these people and the facilities they command […] owe their livelihood or existence to deafness problems (Lane, 1995, p. 174, emphasis added).

From Lane's perspective, therefore, it seems interpreters are not universally welcomed amongst Sign language peoples.

Elizabeth dePoy and Stephen French Gilson (2011) make a similar statement to Lane, in relation to the disabled community, claiming, "Synthesized with systems theory, disability can be explained as the work that drives the disability industry. By virtue of receiving specialized services, disability is exploited and reified, providing ongoing economic benefit to those who perpetuate the category." (dePoy and French Gilson, 2011, p. 101).

Although these opinions do not inform my own, I nonetheless respectfully acknowledge them and appreciate that the study may not be welcome amongst certain culturally Deaf individuals. Whilst I do not question the possibility that professional Sign interpreters could profit due to the lack of individuals who are fluent

in their national Signed language, I personally have not encountered any Sign interpreters who have discouraged me from learning BSL. Likewise, although, as a researcher, I am benefitting from the inadequate access policies of certain theatres and arenas (as they give me a point of reference), I am in no way advocating this state of affairs or supporting the 'disability construction of deafness'. In this respect, therefore, Lane's statement may be a product of its time. In addition to this, specialised services (Sign interpretation and access services) seem to be the most feasible option for Deaf concertgoers at the time of writing.

Having reviewed the literature, acknowledging the critiques of the bio-psycho-social model of disability, I propose a cultural-linguistic-socio-psycho-bio model of d/Deafness. The bio-psycho-social model is the most holistic model to date, but prioritises physiological and psychological aspects of disability. In certain spheres, this approach can disadvantage disabled individuals, for example, by privileging the psychological aspects of disability, policy makers have restricted access to disability benefits. Some claimants had their benefit applications rejected on the grounds that they were perpetuating their own unemployment by falsely believing they were unfit to work. A cultural-linguistic-socio-psycho-bio approach is more relevant to the Deaf community in particular, as a culture, because to privilege the physiological aspects of d/Deafness would be to disregard a fundamental feature of a community which believes Deafness is, primarily, a cultural-linguistic phenomenon. I will return to this in chapter four. Opinions on live music events differ between culturally Deaf individuals, some actively dislike the idea of live music events, dismissing them as part of hearing culture, others are apathetic towards music, but there are Deaf individuals who *do* attend live music events. The remainder of this thesis, which continues now with a chapter entitled 'Research Methods', is concerned with those who *do* attend concerts.

CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHODS

In the previous chapter, I situated my study in the wider academic context. In this chapter, the focus will narrow to the specific details of my own research, which will enable me to contextualise the participants' responses and my analysis of those responses during the following chapter. I will outline the complexities of research with d/Deaf Signers and position myself as a researcher, before briefly discussing my analytical decisions and justifying my research decisions, such as the methods and recruitment procedures I used and my modifications to those research decisions. I will now identify my sample as my interactions with the participants impacted upon my research methods.

In total, there were nine participants in my study, including a telephone correspondent; Joanne Potter, Dr Paul Whittaker OBE (both d/Deaf) and Chris Ginsburg preferred to be interviewed in person, Sign interpreters Rachel Xerri-Brooks, Hayley Baker, Naomi Bearne, Michael Chase and Judith Renshaw opted to complete Survey Monkey questionnaires (Survey Monkey limits the number of questions users can include on any one survey; the implication for me as a researcher was that it was necessary to produce two questionnaires). Hayley and Michael's responses do not form part of the analysis, but they are referred to in appendix 6. I conducted an unscheduled telephone interview with Stephanie Michaels, who has developed access policies in a theatre. Chris, Rachel, Hayley, Naomi and Judith are BSL interpreters and are UK-based, Stephanie is also UK-based; Michael is an American Sign Language (ASL) interpreter and is based in the USA. 'Joanne Potter', 'Chris Ginsburg', 'Hayley Baker' and 'Stephanie Michaels' are pseudonyms. Joanne gave honest responses to my interview questions with a

proviso that her anonymity would be preserved, Chris was not concerned to protect his anonymity but when I asked if he would prefer a pseudonym, he replied, "yeah, why not?" Hayley did not give a reason for wanting anonymity. Stephanie seemed keen to protect her anonymity; I initially described her in a way which she felt could have revealed her identity and she asked me to omit the identifying information. The chapter continues now with a discussion of the complexities of conducting research with d/Deaf Signers, particularly when the researcher is using a Sign interpreter.

Complexities of Research with d/Deaf Signers

Firstly, it is appropriate to acknowledge here the invaluable role interpreters played in my research and in other research with d/Deaf Signers when the researcher is a non-Signer. When conducting a study across languages and cultures:

> Cross-cultural qualitative research […] requires a significant dependence on interpreters/translators and field assistants familiar with both the language *and* culture of the study population. These language assistants are often referred to as "cultural brokers" who convey the underlying cultural meaning of participants' words and expressions to the researchers (Denzin and Lincoln 2008; Dunkley et al. 2003; Temple and Edwards 2002; Simon 1996). The contribution of language assistants in cross-cultural research is vital in the creation of knowledge and its cultural interpretation, both of which are the bedrock of qualitative research (Monique Hennink in Pranee Liamputtong, 2008, p. 25).

However, researching with d/Deaf Signers can pose a specific set of issues for individuals conducting the studies, which should be borne in mind from the outset if their projects are to be ethically sound. Michele Moore and Sarah Beazley (1995), for instance, conducted research on d/Deaf individuals' reflections on their educational experiences. As they explained:

> "Hearing impaired people were increasingly expressing anger about the violation of their experiences by hearing researchers (Pullen and Jones 1992) and we knew from the outset

that we had to be vigilant about whose priorities our research activities would actually be promoting" (Moore, Beazley and June Maelzer, 1998, p. 38).

From this statement, and Paddy Ladd's (2003) claims that "majority cultural dominance ensures that is *they* who investigate and analyse the 'Other', who file the reports which collectively constitute what the West defines as 'knowledge'" (Ladd, 2003, p. 21), there appears to be some degree of controversy surrounding hearing researchers conducting studies within the Deaf community. In his analogy, Ladd was comparing 'the West' to hearing researchers and 'the Other' to the Deaf community. Even well-intentioned hearing researchers can unwittingly, to paraphrase Moore et al. 'violate [d/Deaf Signers'] experiences'.

Positioning Myself as a Researcher

I self-identified as a quasi-outsider researcher. I do not belong to Deaf culture and my experience of hearing loss does not extend beyond occasional, partial, temporary tinnitus. Whilst several relatives had or have hearing impairments, I have no Deaf relatives (three relatives have grommets and four relatives wore or wear hearing aids). I have no Deaf friends with whom I communicate using British Sign Language (BSL) and I do not have a career which involves Deaf individuals; I have no personal link to the Deaf community. When I was conducting the research, I knew no BSL; I have since gained my BSL level 1 qualification and I am currently working towards BSL level 2. Physiologically and cultural-linguistically, therefore, I was an outsider researcher.

On a social level, however, I was an insider researcher; I have experienced, for instance, being addressed through an assistant, where the individual addressing me had not thought to make eye contact with me. As an autistic individual, a study facilitator was assigned to support me throughout my further and now higher

education. On various occasions, both academic and non-academic members of staff have addressed the study facilitator in my presence when it would have been more appropriate to address me directly. Ladd's (2003) discussion of the dynamics in a Deaf club (Ladd, 2003, p. 376-9) almost exactly matched my experience of belonging to an autistic community project. Due to limitations of space and as it is not directly relevant to my research topic, I am, regrettably, not in a position to discuss this further. Thus, whilst I was primarily an outsider researcher, I also positioned myself as a partly insider researcher. Both outsider and insider researchers have a role to play in research with d/Deaf Signers.

Both Ladd and Moore et al recognise that given the right circumstances, outsider researchers can make useful contributions to the target population. I am in a privileged position to conduct research, Ladd claimed:

> Although all of us, Deaf or hearing, have a role to play in achieving change, it can be argued that those in positions carrying some degree of power or influence have more cultural capital to wield. This is especially true in academic domains (Ladd, 2003, p. 453).

Whilst a student at my level is not in a position of power, *per se*, I understand him to mean 'individuals in academia in general', when he refers to "those in positions carrying some degree of power or influence" (ibid.).

Moore, Beazley and Maelzer advocate collaborative efforts between disabled and non-disabled researchers; two non-disabled researchers, Moore and Beazley, co-authored their book with a disabled co-researcher, Maelzer. Whilst discussing this collaboration, Moore and Beazley argue that "Most importantly, we believe it is essential to place disabled people firmly at the forefront of" (Moore, Beazley and Maelzer, 1998, p. 97) dialogues between disabled individuals and non-disabled researchers to establish research questions which disabled individuals would find

beneficial and relevant. Although this project could not be a collaborative effort as it is a Masters project, I consulted d/Deaf individuals and ensured they had the opportunity to correct me if they felt I had misrepresented their views, as I explain in due course. My attention now turns to the research methods.

The Research Methods

I intended to conduct qualitative interviews and questionnaires with thirty participants; ten hearing individuals, ten d/Deaf persons and ten Sign interpreters which, initially, I felt was a realistic target sample size. I decided that qualitative, more than quantitative data was most appropriate for my particular study, since I was researching individuals' experiences and opinions and I anticipated a small sample size. As Norman Denzin and Yvonna Lincoln (2005) stated, "Through observation, enumeration, and talk, the researcher can personally come to perceive the nature of the case" (Denzin and Lincoln, 2005, p. 455). A further justification for conducting qualitative research is that if I had conducted quantitative research, I would be restricting the participants to a series of pre-set responses; I was unwilling to assume I could predict all possible responses for all questions, particularly as an outsider researcher.

I hypothesised that language choice may influence a person's decision to respond in English or BSL and whether to participate online or in person, so I offered respondents the opportunity to choose how they participated. I expected Signers to prefer to communicate with me directly, rather than via interpreters, who I anticipated would charge participants for their services. Participants could be interviewed in person, on the telephone or via webcam, or could respond to open-ended, qualitative questions via instant messaging services, Survey Monkey, email or post. I used closed, quantitative questions, but only to put the participants' responses to the

survey questions into context. Although questionnaires can be written in BSL syntax and exclusively using terms which can be directly translated into BSL, I lacked sufficient expertise to develop a questionnaire of this nature. All participants either responded via Survey Monkey or participated in an interview. The majority of participants used Survey Monkey to complete online questionnaires.

The key benefit of using questionnaires, in my experience, was their capacity to enable more individuals to participate in the study than may otherwise have been possible, for instance an individual from abroad and a person who travelled daily, whose schedule meant they struggled to attend an interview. Essentially, questionnaires and interviews have advantages and disadvantages over each other, but the participants selected the method they felt was most appropriate for their individual circumstances.

Judith worked as a freelance interpreter and due to her work commitments, found it generally impossible to set aside a specific time for an interview and she decided to complete a questionnaire. Questionnaires are, to an extent, not always fail-safe. Hayley did not complete the second questionnaire, leaving me unable to use her responses in my analysis, but she may have also chosen not to complete an interview. Since ethical codes of conduct protect a participant's right to withdraw from a study without justification or consequence, if a participant can exercise that right more easily whilst completing a questionnaire, then this must be regarded as an advantage. However, it may have been an oversight on Hayley's part, which would not have occurred if I had interviewed her. Whilst there are limitations of space on a questionnaire, so in theory, participants may have felt pressured into providing concise responses, as no one's responses came *close* to reaching the allocated limit, I do not believe this was an issue.

Having designed research appropriate to the linguistic differences and personal circumstances of the participants, the next stage of my research (which I found the most challenging stage in the research process) was *recruiting* participants. I was unable to recruit thirty participants. However, I *did* successfully recruit nine individuals; I will discuss *how* I did so in due course, once I have briefly justified my method of analysis.

Analytical Decisions

Qualitative data such as that generated by my study is recognised to be more challenging to analyse than quantitative data, but nonetheless, I *did* analyse the data. I used the analytical approach outlined by Joseph Maxwell (2005): [One] form of categorizing analysis involves organizing the data into broader themes and issues" (Maxwell, 2005, p. 96). This is the form of categorising analysis I conduct. Specifically, I used theoretical categories.

> "Theoretical categories […] place the coded data into a more general or abstract framework. These categories may be derived either from prior theory or from an inductively developed theory (in which case the concepts and the theory are usually developed concurrently). They usually represent the *researcher's* concepts (what are called "etic" categories), rather than denoting participants' own concepts (Maxwell, 2005, pp. 97-8).

My own analysis, presented in the following chapter, consists of categories which were initially developed from an existing theory (which could be more accurately described as a model). Through analysing the qualitative data within the categories, it is possible to adapt and strengthen the original theory.

I decided to analyse the data using thematic analysis. This has advantages and disadvantages, as outlined below, but I considered this to be the most appropriate means of analysing the collected data. Emily Namey, Greg Guest, Lucy Thairu and

Laura Johnson (2008) discussed the contrast between content analysis and thematic analysis:

> Thematic analysis, in contrast [to content analysis], is more involved and nuanced. Thematic analysis moves beyond counting explicit words or phrases and focuses on identifying and describing both implicit and explicit ideas. Codes developed for ideas or themes are then applied or linked to raw data as summary markers for later analysis […] (Namey et al in Guest and Kathleen M. MacQueen, 2008, p.138).

Namey et al continue by discussing a key disadvantage of thematic analysis, claiming, "Reliability is of greater concern with thematic analysis than content analysis because research analysts must interpret raw text data in order to apply codes, and because interpretations may vary across analysts." (ibid.)

The penultimate section of this chapter is concerned with how I recruited participants and it will be followed by a discussion of how my interactions with those participants inspired me to modify my research approach.

Recruitment

David Fetterman (1998) refers to the big-net approach to ethnographic research (Fetterman, 1998, p. 32). Attempting to recruit from as wide a range of individuals within the target culture as possible is a research technique which is commonly used amongst ethnographic researchers. I attempted to recruit via Facebook (a social networking website), Twitter (a micro-blogging website) and mailing lists via email, in addition to attending an event in Birmingham which was partially interpreted. I recruited only three participants using those resources (Joanne, Michael and Judith). Since the sample size was so small, I decided that all participants would be included in the final report. To the extent that it was possible, given the sample size, I applied the principle of judgemental sampling to the project, as described by Fetterman:

Ethnographers typically use an informal strategy to begin fieldwork, such as starting wherever they can slip a foot in the door. The most common technique is judgemental sampling – that is, ethnographers rely on their judgment to select the most appropriate members of the subculture or unit based on the research question. This approach is quite natural, requiring the ethnographer to ask very simple, direct questions about what people do. Natural opportunities, convenience, and luck also play a part in the process if the ethnographer is savvy enough to make good use of them. (Fetterman, 1998, p. 33).

I was able to 'slip a foot in the door' (ibid.) thanks largely to co-operative gatekeepers. A gatekeeper is "[t]he person who controls research access, for example […] the person within a group or community who makes the final decision as to whether to allow the researcher access to undertake the research" (Mark Saunders in Victor Jupp, 2006, p. 126). I was fortunate to have Chris Ginsburg as my main gatekeeper: he is fully Deaf aware, therefore he was able to recognise potentially problematic recruitment techniques (discussed in due course) and he did not exclude d/Deaf Signers from those he recommended I contact. This is in stark contrast to the gatekeepers for Moore and Beazley's (1995) afore-mentioned study. The gatekeepers in that particular study (who selected participants strategically, as part of a hidden agenda) were far from ideal, largely recruiting only oral d/Deaf individuals who they felt could communicate most effectively during a primarily oral interview, despite the availability of BSL interpreters.

Gatekeepers can include or exclude outsider researchers. One organisation rejected my request to advertise my study on their mailing list because of my status as an outsider researcher. The person who dealt with my enquiry asked whether I was d/Deaf, attended Signed performances regularly, was fluent in BSL or had d/Deaf relatives, the answer to all of which was no. Although this disadvantaged me as a researcher, I am sympathetic to those who prevented me from accessing d/Deaf clients, considering the outsider researchers of yesteryear who exploited d/Deaf

Signers. The deliberations of hearing educators of the d/Deaf at the second International Congress on the Education of the Deaf in 1880 led to the banning of Signed languages in the vast majority of educational establishments (Melvia M. Nomeland and Ronald E. Nomeland, 2012, p. 50). It is therefore understandable that some d/Deaf Signers distrust hearing researchers, particularly those with no personal connection to the Deaf community. There was one key difference between me and the hearing researchers who abused their position of relative power: I acknowledged my position as an outsider researcher from the outset, allowing respondents, as the experts, to guide my understanding of Deaf culture and their experiences of Signed performances. The oftentimes uneasy relationship between d/Deaf individuals and hearing researchers in the recent past, I suspect, may have contributed to the small sample size.

Due to the qualitative nature of the investigation, this small sample size was less problematic than it may have been, however, a month before the original project deadline (September 2011), only Joanne and Rachel had offered their insights. I gained access to Rachel's views via my original gatekeeper, an academic member of staff at the University of Birmingham and a personal friend of Rachel's, who contacted Rachel to recruit her on my behalf. An online search for Rainbow Voices (the choir for which Rachel had previously interpreted) led me to a website detailing an event in Birmingham, where the choir would be performing. I perused the website and discovered that Joanne, under her stage name, would also be contributing to the event; having contacted Joanne via Facebook, I approached her after her appearance and arranged an interview with her, with her interpreter Lesley interpreting. Although Joanne and Rachel had valuable insights, the views of one Deaf individual and one BSL interpreter were not sufficient to inform even a qualitative study.

I decided to broaden the research population to include individuals who attend or interpret for Signed musical theatre; I contacted a company specialising in assigning BSL interpreters to theatrical performances. I initially made contact via their website and Chris replied. He agreed to be interviewed; coincidentally, he was evaluating Paul Whittaker's interpretation of *Evita* at a Birmingham theatre, local to the university I attend, shortly after I began our email conversation, so we agreed to conduct the interview before the performance. During our interview, he mentioned Hayley Baker, a then-recently qualified interpreter and his colleague Paul, offering contact details for both; I later contacted them by email. Therefore, the main recruitment technique was the big-net approach, but I recruited Hayley and Paul through a sampling method *similar* to the snowball sampling technique. According to Earl Babbie (2011), snowball sampling is used when researchers initially only have access to a small number of participants. Researchers ask all participants to recommend others who may take part in the study; the initially small sample size increases like a snowball would as it gathers more snow.

The two key differences between snowball sampling and Chris's decision to provide contact details for Hayley and Paul were, firstly, Chris gave contact details for Hayley and Paul unprompted, therefore this was opportunistic snowball sampling, rather than a research decision. Secondly, I did not ask Hayley or Paul for contact details of BSL interpreters or d/Deaf concertgoers they knew, therefore responses were not accumulative as such. In my experience of conducting this research, snowball sampling seems to be the most appropriate recruitment technique for an outsider researcher. If I repeated the study, I would apply this method more frequently until I had a sufficient number of participants.

I used mailing lists for Sign interpreters to recruit further participants; in so doing, I recruited one participant, Judith, who did not specify which mailing list or lists had notified her of the study. In opening my study to individuals involved in interpreting musical theatre, I had attracted a further four participants. However, the data was skewed at this point; Chris, Judith and Paul were all primarily involved in musical theatre (although Paul does also attend concerts). Of the six participants, only Joanne and Rachel had experience of interpreting at, attending or performing during concerts (Joanne has worked for a commercially successful mainstream act on stage). I hypothesised that theatres may be more willing than arenas to accommodate d/Deaf Signers, due to the substantial amount of spoken dialogue involved in musical theatre, compared to concerts. In general, concert tours do not have interpreted performances; long-running musicals are more likely than concerts to be interpreted at some point during their residency.

I decided to cast my hypothetical 'big-net' even more widely; the USA and the UK are both signatories to the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, which Chris informed me had great relevance for d/Deaf concertgoers and theatregoers, hence my decision recruit participants from outside the UK. An online search led me to Michael Chase's[6] website and I contacted him on Twitter, our conversation continued over email and he responded to my questionnaire via Survey Monkey. I will now discuss the modifications to my research approach which I made throughout the study.

---

[6] Coincidentally, he has interpreted for Lady Gaga, who has expressed an interest in interpreting her performances into ASL (National Deaf Children's Society, 2011), although she is yet to do so. Although she attracted criticism for this decision, the criticism was generally based on the critics' pre-existing negative bias towards her.

Modifications to my Research Approach

I provided the participant Joanne, for whom English is a second language, with a copy of all references to her in the thesis in terms which I felt she was likely to understand. As an outsider researcher, with limited knowledge of BSL and no access to anyone who *did* have a sufficient BSL vocabulary, I had to resort to using simple English that I would use for anyone with English as a second language. Joanne's first language is BSL and, unlike Paul, who received information in BSL and replied in English, Joanne responded in BSL. It was therefore impossible for me to establish whether Lesley, her interpreter, had accurately relayed information to and from Joanne (Joanne's responses were appropriate to the questions, however I had to trust they were Joanne's words, not Lesley's). Theoretically[7], this may have caused an ethical issue, as Harlan Lane, Robert Hoffmeister and Ben Bahan (1996) explain. Summarising interpreter-educator and linguist Charlotte Baker-Shenk's view, they claim:

> The interpreter has power as a hearing person and has the means for the Deaf person to secure what he seeks. Moreover, the interpreter can make the Deaf person appear smart or dumb depending on her skill, choice of vocabulary, and the way she voices the Deaf person's message (Lane, Hoffmeister and Bahan, 1996, p. 358).

Outsider researchers, in sum, must exercise caution when researching across languages and cultures to avoid causing unnecessary offence to the participant and to ensure the accurate representation of participants.

It should be noted that Joanne participated in an interview because she found the questionnaire inaccessible to an individual with BSL as their first language. Questionnaires alone are inadvisable, therefore, if a researcher wishes to conduct

---

[7] My choice of the term 'theoretically' reflects the fact this is a general comment and is by no means a comment concerning Lesley specifically.

inter-lingual research. If a person is d/Deaf and fluent in English, however, a questionnaire may offer more privacy than an interview, where an interpreter is required. For instance, hypothetically, participant Chris Ginsburg may have interpreted a performance for Paul, and Paul may have wished to cite this as an example of a poor quality interpretation. However, in Chris's presence, and working with him regularly, it is unlikely that he would be honest, whereas on a questionnaire, would be more likely to provide an honest response.

Chris, as I stated previously, the primary gatekeeper for the study, discouraged me from attending a Signed performance to distribute questionnaires. Stephanie Michaels, the access officer at the theatre staging the performance I intended to attend and a personal friend of Chris's, had expressed her concerns to him that I intended to recruit research participants during a performance; Chris explained her reasoning. To attempt to recruit theatregoers during a performance may be considered exploitative, framing them as potential participants, rather than theatre-goers. I immediately saw the sense in their concern and agreed not to continue with my plan to recruit at the theatre.

In this chapter, I discussed my research methods, I briefly introduced the participants and the ways in which my interactions with them shaped my methods and overall approach to the research, including my analytical approach. In the next chapter, I will present my thematic analysis of the participants' responses.

CHAPTER FOUR: DISCUSSION

During this chapter, I will, firstly, introduce the research participants in greater depth, for instance, providing information about their work experience and the issues they raised during their interviews or expressed on the questionnaire which seemed to hold most significance for them (without compromising their anonymity if anonymity was requested). The purpose of this is to provide more detail on the participants, it is not meant to be a presentation of my findings. Not all of the issues which were most relevant to them will be referred to in the analysis, but in mentioning those matters briefly while I introduce the participants, I intend to foster a greater appreciation in the reader for who they are and what matters to them. Secondly, I will explain and justify my decision to categorise responses to the field questions into three key themes, all of which will enable me to address my research questions. Thirdly, I will conduct a thematic analysis of the responses given, by summarising the participants' answers to key field questions pertaining to each category and analysing them, with reference to the research questions. I will then be in a position to draw conclusions, which will be presented in the final chapter. Before I continue, I would like to acknowledge that my field questions were not developed to address my current research questions. As I stated during the previous chapter, my interactions with the participants strongly influenced my research methods. Following my interactions with the participants, I also felt it was necessary to reconsider my research questions. Initially, my research questions were:

1. To what extent can the social model of disability explain d/Deaf Signers' concert experiences

2. How effective was the Disability Discrimination Act (DDA, 2005) in enabling d/Deaf Signers to access live music events and

3. Who should pay for the Sign interpretation?

My field questions were developed to address those research questions, as opposed to my current research questions. To reiterate, my current research questions are; to what extent can existing models of disability improve our understanding of d/Deaf Signers' concert experiences and how can an understanding of d/Deaf Signers' concert experiences inform our understandings of models of disability. However, despite redeveloping the research questions so substantially, the categories I have chosen for my thematic analysis have enabled me to frame the participants' responses in cultural-linguistic-bio-psycho-social terms. For instance, I was able to identify linguistic, psychological and social barriers to attending and accessing live music events from the participants' responses. The chapter continues with brief background information on each participant.

The Participants

During this section, I will introduce eight participants and one telephone correspondent[8]. This section will illustrate the variety of identities and work experiences represented in my small sample. For each participant, I will also mention the issues which seemed to be most resonant for them, based largely on recurring themes in their responses. The first three participants I introduce were interviewees; all other respondents replied using Survey Monkey, with the exception of the telephone correspondent.

---

[8] Some of these participants declined to use their real name. Names in inverted commas signify that a pseudonym is being used.

Self-employed 'Joanne Potter' is bi-culturally Deaf and her first language, British Sign Language (BSL) is an invaluable asset in both of her chosen careers; she is a highly successful BSL tutor and interprets the lyrics of popular music into BSL, performing them at a variety of high-profile events. Joanne was keen to impress upon me that she did not consider herself disabled[9] and she found the quality of interpretation was key to her enjoyment or otherwise of a performance.

Dr Paul Whittaker OBE (Paul), the founder and artistic director of Music and the Deaf (a charity which encourages d/Deaf individuals to engage with music) became deaf at an early age. He obtained a degree in music from Oxford University and earned a postgraduate diploma at the Royal Northern College of Music. Paul also interprets during works of musical theatre. Balance and compromise seemed to be the main theme in Paul's interview, for instance, the balance between presenting his organisation as a charity without attracting unwanted pity from the general public.

'Chris Ginsburg' was the language director at a company which allocates BSL interpreters to musical performances; he also owned their parent company (neither company shall be specified, to protect his anonymity). He has interpreted during various works of musical theatre. Similar to Joanne, he was eager to advise me that Deaf individuals did not identify themselves with terms such as 'disability' and 'impairment'. Significant issues for Chris were the suitability of an interpreter for a given performance and ensuring I, as an outsider researcher, conducted ethically sound research.

Rachel Xerri-Brooks manages volunteers for the National Deaf Children's Society and is qualified to BSL level three. She has had experience in interpreting for the Birmingham-based Rainbow Voices choir (which recruits members from the lesbian,

---

[9] I am very grateful to Joanne for her patience and willingness to explain her position on the term 'disabled' to me, as I am now aware of how offensive this may otherwise have been.

gay, bisexual, transgender, questioning community and their allies). Rachel's responses primarily focussed on factors which improved or worsened d/Deaf Signers' experiences of concert attendance.

Judith Renshaw is a free-lance BSL interpreter; she has experience of interpreting for pantomimes and comedies. Judith seemed to feel strongly that government acts, such as the DDA (2005) could only be marginally effective; legislation could coerce theatres and arenas into providing access services, but could do little to improve the *willingness* to provide them or foster an understanding of *why* a Deaf individual may choose to attend a concert. This was a view which Paul also expressed.

Naomi Bearne is an in-house BSL interpreter at Bristol University (Centre for Deaf Studies) and has had experience of interpreting for music festivals (e.g. Glastonbury). Naomi's main concern was context-specificity, for instance, the interpreter must be mindful of the context in which they are interpreting and the audience they are interpreting for.

One other individual, 'Stephanie Michaels', was not a participant but I will refer to her input alongside that of the participants where appropriate. I had an impromptu telephone interview with Stephanie who works at a theatre in their access service. Stephanie is experienced in developing access policies, some of which directly benefit d/Deaf theatregoers. Stephanie discussed various topics in depth and none seemed to be of greater concern to her than others.

Having introduced the participants, I will now present the discussion and analysis of the responses they gave to the field questions. As I have stated previously, I have decided to analyse the data thematically. My three themes, which I will discuss in greater depth in due course, are:

1. Self-identification as deaf or Deaf and the trends I have observed in d/Deaf individuals' relationship to music;

2. The participants' experiences of current social barriers to accessing live music events and;

3. How the participants' experiences enable me to critically evaluate recent models of disability.

After a close-reading of the text (I am classifying the verbal interviews as text for the purpose of analysis), I selected these themes on the basis of my thematic analysis of the interview and questionnaire responses. The first theme surrounds issues of self-identification (as deaf or Deaf) and the propensity to attend concerts. It is my intention to approach live music events from various perspectives within Deaf culture and amongst deaf individuals. In considering issues of self-identification, I will be able to establish whether the bio-psycho social model of disability seems to have greater resonance for deaf or Deaf individuals, depending on whether they self-identify as deaf or Deaf. Further, this category serves as an ideal opportunity to discuss the psychological aspects of d/Deafness. Given the small sample size and the subjective, individual nature of responses to music, I will make no attempt to attribute a particular opinion of live music events to specific factions of the d/Deaf community.

The second category will be phenomenological in nature; I will outline and analyse pertinent experiences reported by the participants. The purpose of this category is to contextualise the participants' responses; in the introductory chapter, I contextualised the study with reference to current policies and practices, but this category concerns d/Deaf individuals' and Sign interpreters' *experiences* of those policies and practices. It also serves to illustrate the multitude of social factors which can influence d/Deaf Signers' experiences of attending live music events.

In the final category, I will discuss participants' responses in relation to recent models of disability, in order to critically evaluate those models with reference to d/Deaf Signers' concert experiences (the aim of the thesis). A discussion of self-identification as deaf or Deaf and the relationships d/Deaf individuals have to music now follows.

Issues of Self-Identification

In this section, I will discuss responses which indicate, or do not indicate, a correlation between self-identification as either deaf or Deaf (and the strength of that identity) and the propensity to attend concerts.

Judith Renshaw suggested that the majority of audience members she interprets for would self-identify as disabled:

> [T]he vast majority [of deaf individuals I interpret for] will identify themselves as disabled. There are on occasion some that do not. Deaf people are capable of anything that a hearing person is however they still need to use interpreters to access services for this reason I would say that deaf people are disabled.

From her use of a lower-case 'd' when using the term 'deaf' and her clients' self-identification as disabled, I can infer that deaf individuals do attend concerts. Stephanie Michaels also commented that it was "the little d deaf who go to the theatre, the big D Deaf don't want anything to do with things like live music; they see it as part of Hearing culture!" This is consistent with Ladd's (2003) view that some Deaf individuals tend to reject live music events and Hearing culture generally. By contrast, culturally Deaf Joanne Potter's career revolves around music and she regularly attends concerts. She claimed "deaf people don't tend to get really angry about music, maybe it's because they can't hear it". In Joanne's experience, therefore, an individual's focus on the physiological aspects of their deafness can

lead to an apathetic attitude towards music (as per Bertling's (1995) observations).[10]

It is evident from the statements Judith, Stephanie and Joanne gave during the study that self-identity as either deaf or Deaf does not determine these individuals' relationship to music in a uniform way; certain deaf and Deaf individuals are apathetic or against live music events, other deaf and Deaf individuals embrace live music. In light of the small sample size, I cannot generalise from my findings and I am not in a position to comment about the extent to which there is a consensus amongst deaf individuals and amongst the Deaf community about live music events.

The *extent* to which an individual self-identifies as either deaf or Deaf may be influential in terms of their propensity to attend live music events. Joanne, for example, is highly politicised, rejecting the term 'disabled' and 'hearing impaired' in favour of 'Deaf' and explaining, "As long as [the interpreter is] good, being Deaf isn't a disadvantage [at a concert]". Her careers are, as stated previously, based on her Deafness and her language. Joanne has rejected neither Deaf culture nor hearing culture, taking pride in her Deafness while associating closely with hearing individuals. Neither physiological nor cultural factors have prevented her from attending concerts (I will return to this later in the chapter). Similarly, Paul self-identifies as deaf (from his descriptions of himself available online) but nonetheless, his outlook is similar to Joanne's, for example, he commented to me, "I can speak and I can Sign, you can only speak, so in this situation, who is the more disabled?" This was not to imply, of course, that non-verbal d/Deaf individuals, or d/Deaf individuals who do not Sign are disabled, but merely to encourage me to recognise that he is able to communicate using two methods in a face-to-face conversation, whereas I was only able to communicate using *one* method. As stated previously, I

---

[10] I used the lower-case 'd' in Joanne's quote above only because she was referring to individuals who were deterred from attending concerts because they were unable to hear the music.

was not sufficiently proficient in BSL to conduct an interview at this level. Chris Ginsburg also adopted a cultural view of Deafness, likening Deaf individuals, for whom he interprets during live music events, to French-speaking tourists:

> Imagine a London tour bus. Upstairs, on one side of the bus, you've got some Deaf tourists and on the other side of the bus, you've got some French tourists. The French tourists have got an interpreter so they're happy and the Deaf tourists have got their Sign interpreter so they're happy. So who's disabled in that scenario?" This was a rhetorical question, neither the Deaf tourists nor the French tourists were disabled, "as long as there's an interpreter, no one's at a disadvantage!

Strongly identifying either with Deaf culture or as a physiologically deaf individual may be a factor in preventing a person from attending a concert. This observation is based on my interviews with six BSL interpreters, an individual who works in a theatre's access service, one deaf individual and one Deaf individual; I did not ask the participants how strongly they identified as either deaf or Deaf, since the issue of self-identification was irrelevant to my original research questions. I cannot claim that my observation applies universally, but it does indicate a potential avenue for future research. The following section concerns the concert experiences of d/Deaf individuals who *do* decide to attend concerts and those who interpret during them, with a particular focus on social barriers to accessing live music events.

Current Social Barriers Preventing d/Deaf Signers from Accessing Live Music Events

During this section, I will take a phenomenological approach to current access policies and practices in theatres and arenas, by analysing them from the perspectives of service users (d/Deaf Signers) and providers (Sign interpreters). As I stated previously, I did discuss current policies and practices within theatres and arenas during the introduction, but relying on official policy statements; I made no

reference to the perspectives and experiences of the service users and providers. In general, the participants recalled negative experiences, but as the sample size is so small, I am by no means in a position to criticise theatres' and arenas' access policies; I can only detail the barriers which specific d/Deaf concertgoers have encountered when accessing particular live music events. I will first discuss the access policies which Stephanie Michaels developed in conjunction with d/Deaf Signers; this should be taken as an example of the standard of service which d/Deaf concertgoers and theatregoers could receive, given ideal circumstances.

The access policies which Stephanie Michaels developed indicate that d/Deaf individuals are involved in access policy development at certain venues (to protect Michaels' anonymity, I am not able to name the venue where she works). She informed me that d/Deaf individuals were invited to sit in each seating area in the auditorium to establish which areas would offer the greatest visibility of the interpreter and the performers. The d/Deaf patrons of the theatre subscribe to a newsletter and are entitled to vote for which performances they would like to see interpreted; the performances attracting the most votes are then interpreted. An individual trained in BSL will often be present in the audience for quality assurance purposes; during the interval, this individual will subtly watch the conversations occurring in the audience in BSL, to establish the level of customer satisfaction with the interpreter for that performance. When customer satisfaction levels are deemed to be low, this will be reported to the company who provided the interpreter. As there is no standardised policy governing access policies in theatres and arenas, considerable variation has been observed between theatres. Whilst the establishment employing Stephanie offers a high standard of service to d/Deaf Signers and other patrons, theatregoers elsewhere in the UK are less fortunate.

Some venues have failed to consider d/Deaf Signers' communication requirements when developing their access policies. To quote Naomi, "a profoundly Deaf friend was told they could sit in the lipreading section of the theatre to watch Derren Brown (how ridiculous!)" It can be inferred from this statement that this friend communicates in Signed language (presumably in BSL, as Naomi is based in England) in preference to lip reading. Therefore, the access officers at the theatre in question *did* recognise that Deaf individuals may wish to attend performances and developed *some* access policies, but had not considered all methods of communication (in this instance, BSL). This may have been an oversight, but it does illustrate a lack of Deaf awareness on the part of the theatre, which in this case may have ruined the Deaf theatregoer's enjoyment of the performance. I hypothesised that d/Deaf Signers would experience greater difficulty in accessing live music events as opposed to non-musical performances and that theatres would be more likely to provide interpreters, due to the extent of dialogue in a play or musical. However, in this instance, the theatre was ill-prepared for the Deaf patron's request; further, Brown is an illusionist and a perusal of his official website indicates that music is not a strong element of his performances. I will return to this point in greater depth shortly. A lack of foresight on the part of those responsible for arranging services such as BSL interpretation is not the only barrier d/Deaf Signers may experience when seeking to access live music events. Smaller organisations, such as choirs, may lack resources to be selective about the BSL interpreters they employ, depending instead upon volunteers who, while well-meaning and otherwise highly qualified in BSL, display limited musicality.

Paul, Joanne and Rachel all reported an especially poor quality interpretation from the same BSL interpreter, working for a choir. "His language was too high," Joanne explained; I understood her to mean that the language was too formal and complex

for the lyrics being performed by the choir. Rachel's comment on this same interpreter indicated that Joanne's opinion was widely shared:

> Several of my deaf friends have complained to me about one of the interpreters that [the choir] use saying they cannot understand him as his level of BSL is too high and is not enough in the format of a song.

Again, by 'level of BSL', Rachel is referring to his unnecessarily formal presentation of the lyrics, rather than implying that more highly qualified interpreters are less able to interpret those lyrics than those with fewer BSL qualifications.[11] Whilst the poor quality interpreter who cannot be easily understood reduces the level of access d/Deaf concertgoers have to the choir's live music events, individuals and entertainment venues with a greater budget can be far less accessible. My interview and later conversation with Chris Ginsburg revealed that a musical theatre actress and the access services serving a particular arena have actively prevented Sign interpreted performances taking place.

During my interview with Chris, he made reference to a high-profile musical theatre actress, who will remain anonymous. Chris's company had received a request for a BSL interpreter for a musical she was performing in, however the actress was unwilling to cooperate. She refused in advance of the show to perform if anyone interpreted the event, claiming she found interpreters distracting. With such an ultimatum, Chris's company had no option but to refuse their services for that particular musical. Following my interview with Paul, which Chris interpreted, Chris also reported an arena's refusal to provide an interpreter for a specific concert. "We're having major problems with [the arena] at the moment! Someone wanted to go and see Steps […] and they won't let them have a Sign interpreter for their

---

[11] The BSL qualification system is based on levels; I am currently a level 2 student, Rachel, as I have stated previously, has a level 3 qualification and so forth.

comeback tour!" To clarify 'they' refers to the anonymous arena, not the performers.

Judith is another individual who has encountered negative attitudes towards BSL interpreters, although it is unclear whether this had an impact on future access provision at the theatre in question, but hypothetically it may have precluded further Signed performances from taking place. Judith had attracted criticism having interpreted a performance at a theatre and gave the following details:

> I have been approached by hearing audience members who have complained that they find an interpreter distracting. I am also aware that the same complaint was made to the theatre. The performance had been advised [advertised] that it would be a signed performance.

As the theatre's access staff are likely to have realised that the individuals who registered a complaint had failed to notice that the performance would be interpreted (they were not at fault but they are likely to have attended the performance in error), it is probable that it would not have had an impact on the theatre's access policies. However, fear of deterring hearing customers may *theoretically* have caused the theatre to reconsider their policies.

To conclude this section, I would suggest that there are various factors which can negatively impact upon the development or implementation of access policies in theatres and arenas; policies which would otherwise improve d/Deaf Signers' access to live music events. These are generally social factors (attitudinal barriers to access, for example), but as I discuss during the final category, there are other influential factors. Having outlined the factors preventing d/Deaf Signers from accessing live music events, I will now present my final section, framing the participants' experiences and opinions in terms of recent models of disability, which will enable me to critically evaluate those models.

Critically Evaluating Recent Models of Disability with Reference to the Participants' Experiences

During this section, I will firstly critically evaluate the social model of disability; this discussion will be followed by a critical evaluation of the bio-psycho-social model of disability. I will use the participants' responses to my field questions as a framework by which to evaluate these two respective models of disability. Much of the evidence presented in this section has been detailed previously; to avoid unnecessary repetition, the only evidence I will discuss in depth within this section are the relevant comments that I have not mentioned elsewhere in this chapter. Before I continue with this section, it is necessary for me to reiterate that my field questions were developed before I became aware of the bio-psycho-social model of disability. Therefore, very little can be established from the participants' responses about the psychological facets of a d/Deaf Signers' decision to attend live music events or not, particularly because I did not interview any d/Deaf individuals who decided not to attend live music events.

To a degree, the social model of disability is able to provide an insight into the experiences of d/Deaf Signers who decide to attend live music events. Firstly, the respondents reported primarily social barriers to accessing live music events, which I have discussed in depth previously in this chapter. Examples of this include the information provided by Chris concerning the musical theatre actress, who refused to perform unless the BSL interpretation service which had been requested was not provided and the arena who refused a d/Deaf Signer access to an interpreter for a Steps concert. Likewise, Naomi's afore-mentioned Deaf friend who requested access to a BSL interpreter for a performance by Derren Brown and was offered seating in the theatre's lip-reading area of their auditorium also encountered a potential social

barrier to accessing a live performance (albeit not a live music event). I use the term

'potential' because it is unclear whether the individual who requested an interpreter

for the Steps concert or the individual who requested a BSL interpreter for the Derren

Brown performance were eventually provided with a BSL interpreter. I find the variety

of performances in these three examples of discrimination are worthy of note. I had

initially hypothesised that dialogue-based performances would be more likely to be

accessible to d/Deaf Signers than musical performances. Sign interpreters regularly

facilitate dialogue between Signers and non-Signers, the comparison between daily

conversation and scripted conversation is self-evident. Music is considered to appeal

primarily to one's sense of hearing and is not, therefore, expected to appeal to

individuals without their sense of hearing. However, as the evidence I gathered

during the participant research illustrates, there were three types of performance (a

concert, musical theatre and an illusionist; Steps, the performance involving the

uncooperative actress[12] and Derren Brown respectively) for which d/Deaf Signers

were denied access to a BSL interpreter. This indicates that widespread assumptions

about d/Deaf individuals' capacity to appreciate *music* are not the only social barriers

d/Deaf Signers encounter when attempting to access live music events. Regardless

of the format of the performance for which a d/Deaf Signer has requested a Sign

interpreter, concerns remain about BSL interpreters during performances; it is only

possible at this stage to state that the musical theatre actress was concerned the

interpreter would distract her from her performance. The theatre and arena did not

give a reason for potentially refusing access to a BSL interpreter, to my knowledge.

These are the more blatant social barriers to accessing live music events;

---

[12] Steps and Derren Brown were not involved in the decision to deny access to a BSL interpreter, which is why they are named and the musical theatre actress and the production she was involved in are anonymous.

additionally, there are barriers which initially seem psychological or even physiological but may, or may not have social roots.

It is possible, in my judgement, that d/Deaf Signers who decide not to attend concerts may have been influenced in their decision by social norms and expectations. If they have been socialised by individuals (either d/Deaf or hearing) who believe music is an unsuitable form of entertainment for d/Deaf individuals, they may also hold that opinion. Joanne's afore-mentioned suggestion that d/Deaf individuals' observed apathy towards music may stem from their inability to hear it, seems to be a reference to the physiological fact of deafness, or an individual's psychological response to d/Deafness. Joanne is able to hear *slightly* with hearing aids so I cannot discount the possibility that, if she was entirely unable to hear, she might not engage with music with such passion. Likewise, Paul lost his hearing during childhood, by which point his enthusiasm for music had already developed. Therefore, physiological factors may be influential in d/Deaf Signers' experiences of live music events, but other factors may be more prominent. Artists such as Jayne Fletcher market themselves towards d/Deaf and hearing individuals alike; to quote Fletcher, who is Deaf, in translating the lyrics of a widely recognised song into BSL, she is able to give "Deaf people access to music," (Fletcher, c. 2011). Fletcher also plays the song she is interpreting during her performances, but it is the act of interpreting, rather than *playing* the song which gives Deaf individuals access to music. Linguistic accessibility in this instance overrides the physiological impact of deafness.

Unfortunately for interpreters *and* service users, linguistic barriers, in addition to social, psychological and physiological factors, can be present in the context of a live music event. The interpreter may not be at fault, for instance when Paul attracted criticism for his translation of a musical theatre standard, 'Send in the Clowns' (the

title is an English idiom, meaning to make light of, and continue despite, a dire situation; I will discuss English idioms and BSL shortly). He interpreted the song for 'Sondheim at 80' (BBC, 2010). Aware of the context in which the song is performed, Paul interpreted the lyrics according to their original, metaphorical meaning. By 'original, metaphorical meaning', I am referring to the lyricist's intent, the meaning which they wanted the character to give to those lyrics at that point in the performance. Paul exclaimed, "people were coming up to me afterwards saying 'you Signed 'clowns' wrong!'"[13] This was a linguistic decision on his part, rather than an error; interpreting 'clowns' literally would have altered the meaning of the lyrics to the song *entirely*. As BSL and English are two separate languages, this is to be expected on occasion, in particular when metaphorical language is involved. As Rachel Sutton-Spence and Bencie Woll (1998) explain, many English idioms:

> [D]o not find a ready equivalent in BSL with a similar meaning, e.g. *come hell or high water* or *once in a blue moon.* A signer could sign COME HELL -o-r- HIGH WATER or ONCE IN -a- BLUE MOON but these would be sign-for-word translations and would have no established meaning in BSL of 'determination' or 'rarity' respectively (Sutton-Spence and Woll, 1998, p. 188).

Chris also referred to the issue of interpreting lyrics literally; his example was 'Any Dream Will Do', another musical theatre standard. He interpreted a few lines of the song into BSL during our interview, to illustrate how nonsensical certain songs are when inappropriate linguistic decisions are made and how impractical it can be to Sign them literally. If Chris decides to interpret literally that particular metaphorical piece literally, he has no option but to Sign the song with his eyes closed; quoting Chris, "to see for certain, what I thought I knew, but I've still got my eyes closed!" Chris was referring to the fact that "I closed my eyes" is the opening line of the song,

---

[13] As he was not attempting to Sign the word 'clowns', this accusation from the audience member in question is invalid.

with no reference later in the piece to the character re-opening his eyes. Although this was a humorous example and he does not use this particular translation with clients, it illustrates that linguistic issues can, if an interpreter with less skill in interpreting lyrics is translating a song, reduce the standard of service d/Deaf Signers receive when they attend live music events. This was the experience of the individuals who reported watching the interpreter for a specific choir whose language was considered too formal for the piece being interpreted, discussed at length previously. It should be acknowledged at this stage that hearing individuals who are inclined to take lyrics literally may also misunderstand the lyrics. I do not claim that this situation is particular to d/Deaf Signers; rather, I am suggesting that, from the participant research, linguistic differences can impede some d/Deaf Signers' understanding of metaphorical lyrics.

Like linguistic factors, cultural 'barriers' have also been noted, for instance, the unwillingness to contravene the norms of Deaf culture by attending a live music event, which is what Stephanie Michaels observed when she referred to the lack of Deaf individuals who attend live music events at her theatre. I do not consider an individual's refusal to attend a live music event on principle to be a barrier; I see this as a matter of personal preference. To suggest that attending a live music event is preferable to *not* attending one is culture-centric, making a value judgement on Deaf culture based on the norms of Hearing culture. However, if a Deaf individual wishes to attend a live music event but is deterred by the prospect of repercussions from within their community, I would argue that this is a barrier.

Cultural factors cannot be considered linguistic, social, psychological or physiological barriers to access and should therefore constitute a separate category. This would give rise to the cultural-linguistic-socio-psycho-bio model of d/Deafness (I use

d/Deafness in preference to disability because some of these factors are only applicable to Deaf individuals and deaf Signers; namely cultural and linguistic aspects of accessing and experiencing live music events or not). From this perspective, it is possible to critically evaluate both the social model of disability and the bio-psycho-social model of disability on the same grounds; linguistic and cultural factors are influential for d/Deaf Signers (some of whom, in Judith's experience, consider themselves to be disabled). In addition to this, many d/Deaf Signers may choose to prioritise social factors above psychological factors; physiological aspects of d/Deafness may be considered by some d/Deaf Signers to have limited, if any, relevance for their decision to attend, or not attend, live music events and their experiences of any events they *do* choose to attend.

In most cases, participants did not associate their experiences, or the experiences of their clients, with models of disability. This is not to discredit the models of disability, but, for Deaf individuals and deaf persons who Sign, a separate, more holistic model is preferable to the bio-psycho-social model of disability. Not only are social, psychological and physiological factors involved in determining a d/Deaf Signer's experience of a live music event, cultural and linguistic factors also seem, from the literature review and participant research, to have a substantial role in this regard. Some may suggest that linguistic and cultural factors could be incorporated into the 'social' tenet of the bio-psycho-social model of disability, but to apply even a purely social model of disability to d/Deaf individuals is to frame their community in physiological terms. As Ladd (2003) argued, whilst social model accommodations such as visual cues (e.g. flashing or vibrating fire alarms) are useful for d/Deaf individuals, they have nonetheless been developed with a medical view of d/Deafness. Providing Sign interpreters for live music events, by contrast, is a way of accommodating a *linguistic* rather than physiological difference, thus providing

access to live music events in a manner consistent with Deaf Signers' view of themselves as a linguistic and cultural group. My more holistic model, to summarise, takes into consideration factors which are unique to Deaf culture and Signed languages, appreciates Deaf individuals' self-identification as part of a culture, and recognises that the physiological aspects of d/Deafness are, in the context of a live music event, secondary to social and psychological factors. This project has been based on the opinions and experiences of Sign language interpreters and d/Deaf Signers; I am only in a position to make recommendations for improving the bio-psycho-social model based on the experiences and opinions of *some* d/Deaf Signers and interpreters. One model does not fit all; d/Deaf Signers may choose to see their decision to attend or not attend live music events from any number of perspectives, from the individual model of disability to the cultural-linguistic-social-psycho-bio model of d/Deafness and any combination of those factors. Models cannot and do not attempt to provide an all-encompassing account of a given phenomenon. However, what I am able to conclude, is that my cultural-linguistic-social-psycho-bio model of d/Deafness is the most appropriate means of understanding *certain* d/Deaf Signers' concert experiences.

In my opinion, based on my research, no current models of disability are able to further improve d/Deaf Signers' concert experiences, because none have incorporated Deaf individuals' self-identification as a cultural and linguistic minority; models of disability all continue to frame d/Deaf Signers' experiences in physiological, rather than cultural-linguistic terms. Social accommodations are based on the premise that the individual making use of the accommodation is impaired in some way, e.g. assistive technology. Therefore, if access services apply any models of disability (social, individual or bio-psycho-social), to the d/Deaf community, it is likely that d/Deaf Signers will not notice an improvement in the services. Only when

Deaf culture is acknowledged as a culture, only when British Sign Language is acknowledged as a language, can an improvement be made. A focus on the physiological facets of d/Deafness has left certain arenas and theatres ill-prepared to meet the linguistic requirements of d/Deaf patrons who Sign, even if those service providers have accepted the *social* model of disability (for example, providing ramps and widened aisles for wheelchair users).

The following (final) chapter is the conclusion, during which I will reflect upon my experiences as a researcher, present recommendations for future research and draw conclusions.

CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSION

During this chapter, I will reflect on how my research has influenced me as a person and a researcher and offer recommendations for further research before drawing my final conclusions. Throughout this chapter, I have included advice for future researchers, based on my personal experiences of conducting this study. Like any researcher, particularly someone with little previous research experience, there were areas of my research which could have been improved and it is my hope that researchers in the future will learn from my mistakes. This is the final chapter of my thesis, which now continues with my reflections on how the research has influenced me, both inside and outside academia.

Reflections on How the Study has Influenced me as a Person and a Researcher

At the outset of the study, I hypothesised that the social model of disability could be critically evaluated with reference to d/Deaf Signers' experiences of live music events. I anticipated that my research would confirm my pre-existing belief that live music events could not be accessible to d/Deaf individuals, regardless of the presence or otherwise of a BSL interpreter. In this way, I initially felt, I would be in a position to critique models of disability with a strong emphasis on the social facets of disability; a BSL interpreter could not, I believed, enable a d/Deaf individual to engage with music. Attending a live music event in Birmingham, featuring Joanne Potter as a performer, caused me to re-evaluate my misconceived ideas about d/Deaf individuals and their relationship with music. Joanne has a considerable following of d/Deaf fans and it was evident from their response to her performance that not only *could* d/Deaf Signers engage with music, some actively sought to do so. I believe this was significant because it was at this point that I began to see d/Deaf

Signers not only as potential research participants or as individuals who were capable or incapable of engaging with music, but as concertgoers who attended live music events for their personal entertainment.

During my initial conversation with Joanne, I displayed a lack of awareness of how to interact with a Deaf individual. Using exaggerated lip-movements, I asked, "Do you lip-read?" During our conversation via her BSL interpreter, I failed to make eye contact, concentrating my attention on the interpreter as she was speaking English. I had prepared to meet Joanne beforehand by writing to her via Facebook (unknowingly, I had used inaccessible language, believing all English terms had a BSL equivalent); when I introduced myself, she commented, "You sent me a very long message on Facebook!" I did not consider this to be a criticism but she may have preferred a shorter message, particularly since English is her second language. The only BSL Sign I had learned in advance of meeting her was 'thank you'. I now realise that a single Sign is not sufficient; I recently completed level 1 in BSL and intend to learn as much of the language as possible, so I can hold a conversation in BSL.

By the time I interviewed Joanne, I was more prepared to interact appropriately. I maintained eye contact with her and used language suitable for an individual with English as a second language, however, I felt a lack of awareness still persisted on my part. I asked whether she preferred the term 'hearing impaired' or 'disabled'. These issues arose through a lack of understanding and minimal awareness of the Deaf community. I now use the term 'Deaf' as a separate category unless I am advised otherwise. I have used my interactions with Joanne as a point of reference as she was the first participant, indeed the first Deaf individual I had ever met. Each participant was informative, but meeting and interviewing Joanne was my greatest

learning curve in the process. On the subject of interviewing Joanne, as I have previously stated, Lesley may *theoretically* have misinterpreted Joanne but this did not seem to be the case. At one point, Lesley incorrectly interpreted her; the issue was easily resolved when Joanne noticed the mistake and corrected her, Lesley, in turn, corrected herself.

To summarise, through engaging in this research, I have learned to conduct more extensive research before meeting an individual from another culture, particularly if they use a different language. I have learned not to assume d/Deaf individuals are disabled and not to classify every activity a d/Deaf individual undertakes as an activity which they are capable or incapable of doing. I now know to make eye contact with d/Deaf Signers and that token gestures are *not* sufficient to display respect for another language. On a related note, I have begun to learn BSL (which I now study at level 2). Finally, the music band which I joined shortly before beginning the research have access and BSL policies; when we receive bookings, one of the first questions I ask the individual who has requested us is whether any audience member has any access requirements. The service has not yet been requested but our procedure, in the event of a request for a BSL interpreter, would be to send lyrics in advance and co-operate with the interpreter should they wish to attend rehearsals. This developed as a direct result of my studies. I take pride in how much of a learning curve this study has been for me, and the extent to which it has transformed my understanding of d/Deafness. It is my sincere hope that I can take this study further and that future researchers will follow suit.

Recommendations for Future Research and Practice

On the topic of future researchers, I will now recommend further research projects; as I established at the beginning of the study, the project had limited scope. The

spheres of d/Deafness, music and models of disability are too vast for one researcher alone to study. As is frequently the case (and as I have stated previously), the project has produced more questions than it has answered which, due to restricted time, I could not have explored in sufficient depth. During the course of the study, I realised that performers (choirs, bands and so forth) could be categorised as politicised mainstream acts, non-politicised mainstream acts, politicised non-mainstream acts and non-politicised non-mainstream acts. I believe further research should be conducted as to the access policies or practices of each respective type of act, to identify the barriers to providing access which these types of acts encounter.

On a similar note, I would be keen for future researchers to establish whether individuals who work in access services in theatres and arenas encounter any barriers to providing Sign interpreters to d/Deaf Signers who request them. In certain cases, access officers at entertainment venues have been *unwilling* to provide a Sign interpreter, but it may be that other access officers have been *unable* to do so. It would be over-simplifying the issue to suggest that attitudinal barriers alone are responsible for any access services failing to provide a Sign interpreter.

In my opinion, it is worth conducting research with d/Deaf Signers who decide not to attend concerts, as this study has been based solely on the opinions of those who *have* chosen to attend live music events. Potentially, the interview schedule could include a question on the extent to which the participant self-identifies as Deaf or deaf. This suggested research would be a significant step towards identifying any barriers to attending live music events which some d/Deaf Signers may wish to overcome; in turn, this could, potentially, lead to solutions being found. Researchers would be well-advised to bear in mind that not all d/Deaf individuals wish to attend concerts and they may not consider this to be problematic, this should reduce the

possibility of conducting culture-centric research. Similarly, there are various reasons why an individual may wish to attend a concert, but is unable to do so; not all barriers, researchers should remember, are connected to an individual's d/Deafness. It is my belief that if further research is conducted, solutions to the access issues which d/Deaf individuals encounter will be discovered.

My cultural-linguistic-social-psycho-bio model of d/Deafness should be critically evaluated in the future by conducting research with d/Deaf Signers (whether they attend concerts or not) to establish *their* opinion of the model. I developed the model after conducting the research; therefore there was no opportunity to ask the research participants' opinion on it, although I did base it on their responses. Throughout the previous chapter, I made reference on several occasions to the small sample size and how I could not generalise from the findings; it may be worth conducting research with a larger number of individuals although this depends on the research question.

Finally, the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (UNCRPD) should be critically evaluated by conducting a comparative analysis of access services in theatres and arenas before and after its introduction. This could be achieved by engaging with d/Deaf Signers who attend concerts and those who have done so before the UK became party to the UNCRPD, to establish whether a discernible difference has been made. Future researchers should also engage with individuals working in access services to determine whether they have noticed a difference in policies and practices. It should be borne in mind that this particular research population may wish to portray their theatre or arena in a positive light and not acknowledge any instances of inaccessibility and/or prejudice on their part.

My participant research has given rise to four recommendations for future practice. I am not in a position to discuss these in depth, for reasons of space, but the recommendations include a simplified and standardised ticket booking service, training opportunities for interpreters who wish to interpret during live music events and giving at least one access performance for each show if possible. For a more detailed discussion on these recommendations, please refer to appendix 6. The thesis continues now with the final part of this chapter; the conclusions.

Conclusions

Having reviewed literature from the respective academic fields of Deaf studies and disability studies and having interviewed d/Deaf Signers who attend live music events, Sign interpreters and others who have been involved in providing Sign interpretation services at those events, I am in a position to draw conclusions. It is my considered opinion that in some instances, the bio-psycho-social model of disability is not sufficient for understanding and improving d/Deaf Signers' experiences of access services and attending live music events. To this end, I have developed the cultural-linguistic-social-psycho-bio model of d/Deafness. It is not my intention to discredit the bio-psycho-social model of disability but my research suggests that for certain factions of the d/Deaf community, a more holistic model is necessary. A quote from Ladd (2003)[14] is illustrative here:

> The social model of disability also presents us with obstacles to research. It has failed to realise the extent to which it is still medically constructed. Even though it places a emphasis on the commonality of the experience of social oppression, all the groups within its aegis are undeniably those who are characterised by having a physical impairment. It is also conceived around the tenets of individualism – that is, the social and political barriers facing individual disabled people in their attempts to gain full access to society. Thus it has been unable to cope with the collectivist

---

[14] Ladd gave permission via email for me to quote this.

life experience that characterises Deaf communities (and those communities' consequent very different priorities). However, since disability constructions have been given political and economic primacy, the dissenting Deaf voice has been pushed aside and there is almost no discourse space in which to establish that dissenting view, with its insistence on the crucial nature of the Deaf cultural concept.

> We have seen that Deaf communities should instead be constructed around a culturo-linguistic model. Its patterns of experience and oppression are therefore similar to and should be classified with other linguistic minorities. However, these minorities are themselves caught up in the medical model and reluctant to admit sign language cultures to their domains and discourses. Moreover, there is almost no formal academic focus on linguistic minorities *per se*; thus bringing compelling Deaf linguistic and cultural evidence to their attention is extremely difficult. (Ladd, 2003, p. 268).

One single model cannot encompass the entire d/Deaf community as it is so diverse, but I believe for certain d/Deaf Signers, it is appropriate to consider their experiences of live music events in terms of the cultural-linguistic-social-psycho-bio model of d/Deafness. I will now discuss the three ways in which I have taken the bio-psycho-social model of disability and used it to develop my own model; the reversal of 'bio-psycho-social', the replacement of 'disability' with 'd/Deafness' and the addition of 'cultural-linguistic'.

Firstly, I decided to reverse the bio-psycho-social model of disability to prioritise the social aspects of some d/Deaf Signers' experiences of access services and live music events. From my interview with Joanne onwards, it became apparent that for certain factions of the Deaf community, physiological factors were of less importance to them (both in the context of a live music event and in daily life) than any other factors of disability. The bio-psycho-social model of disability, by contrast, has prioritised physiological factors of disability; for culturally Deaf individuals, this is not an appropriate means of framing, understanding and analysing their experiences of access services and live music events. This, in my considered opinion, justifies the

reversal of "bio-psycho-social" in certain cases. I have used the term 'disability' throughout but as I will now discuss, for this particular model, I felt it necessary to abandon the term 'disability' entirely.

The term 'disability' is a phrase which on several occasions proved controversial during my participant research. As I have developed the model based on the responses of those participants and the perspectives of Deaf academics, my particular model is a model of d/Deafness as opposed to disability. In my view, the bio-psycho-social model of disability is only of limited use when understanding, analysing and (in the future) improving some d/Deaf Signers' concert experiences (namely those d/Deaf Signers who do not self-identify as disabled). To refer to my model as the cultural-linguistic-social-psycho-bio model of disability is to disregard the perspective of many culturally Deaf individuals, framing Deaf individuals' experiences from a Hearing culture perspective.

For culturally Deaf individuals, 'cultural-linguistic' should be added to the model, in addition to 'social-psycho-bio' because, as mentioned previously in this chapter, Ladd claimed:

Deaf communities […], find that such an approach [as the social model of disability] does not address the true nature of their being-in-the-world, the issues which arise from this or the politics and policies needed to embrace it. Instead they see themselves as having much more in common with language minorities. (Ladd, 2003, p. 15-6).

Ladd is a strong advocate of a cultural-linguistic model and the social model is, for him and other Deaf individuals, insufficient for gaining an appreciation of their perspectives and experiences; cultural-linguistic factors cannot be classified as psychological or physiological factors either. From my participant research, it appears that deaf individuals also attend live music events, which is why I use 'd/Deafness'

rather than Deafness and why social, psychological and physiological factors are also covered in my model.

Through using the Deaf community as a point of reference, I have been able to gain a greater insight into the current models of disability. It has been possible to establish, for example, that models of disability (including the social model of disability) are based upon impairment and do not take account of the cultural and linguistic experiences of Deaf Signers. My cultural-linguistic-social-psycho-bio model of d/Deafness is grounded loosely in the bio-psycho-social model of disability but my alterations are such that the perspectives of culturally Deaf individuals are taken into consideration. Sign interpreters at concerts such as some of the performances I considered for my study are, as I previously stated, tasked with interpreting lyrics from one language to another (generally from English to either BSL or ASL), in a musical style suitable for the piece performed. Language does not feature in any model of disability which again indicates that the concert experiences of d/Deaf Signers would benefit from a more holistic model than any models of disability. Language occurs within society, so it may be assumed that any model which incorporates social facets of disability is fit for purpose. This assumption is erroneous; national Signed languages are, for Deaf individuals, the languages of their respective cultures, they are *not* accommodations.

Ultimately, the d/Deaf community is diverse, a model cannot and should not attempt to encompass the experiences and perspectives of each individual in an entire community. Whether cultural, linguistic, social, psychological or physiological factors (or a combination of some, or all of them) are to be considered barriers to d/Deaf Signers seeking to access live music events is for each individual d/Deaf Signer to decide, but to date, an holistic approach has not yet been taken and, as Ladd

claimed, scholars have failed to pay attention to the cultural-linguistic barriers which d/Deaf Signers may encounter. Some d/Deaf individuals do not wish to attend concerts, for any number of reasons, not all of which have any connection to their lack of hearing. This thesis has been concerned only with factors relating to d/Deafness, due to the research questions, but as previously stated, I do not wish to imply that these are the *only* factors preventing concert attendance or that attending a concert is intrinsically preferable to not attending one. In prioritising cultural and linguistic factors above physiological aspects of d/Deafness, access services in theatres and arenas should be more willing to provide a Sign interpreter for their d/Deaf patrons who Sign. If the individuals responsible for booking Sign interpreters realise that language is more relevant to a d/Deaf Signer than their hearing impairment, logically, they should also conclude that a lack of access to a Sign language interpreter (which they, the access officer, *can* control) is a greater barrier to d/Deaf Signers accessing live music events than that patron's hearing impairment, which the access officer *cannot* control. In my considered academic opinion therefore, the cultural-linguistic-social-psycho-bio model of d/Deafness should be used when understanding, analysing and improving d/Deaf Signers experiences of access services and live music events.

REFERENCES

1. Association of Sign Language Interpreters (c. 2013). [**Principles**]^{15} **of Professional Practice** [online]. Available from: http://www.asli.org.uk/prinicples-of-professional-practice-p77.aspx [Accessed 24 February 2014]

2. Attitude Is Everything (c. 2011). **The Attitude is Everything Charter of Best Practice** [online]**.** Available from: http://www.attitudeiseverything.org.uk/the-charter-of-best-practice [Accessed 30 January 2014]

3. Attitude Is Everything (2014). **State of Access Report 2014** [online]. Available from: http://www.attitudeiseverything.org.uk/uploads/general/State_of_Access_Report_2014_-_Web_PDF.pdf [Accessed 16 February 2014]

4. Babbie, E. (2011). **The Basics of Social Research.** California: Wadsworth.

5. Back-Up Trust (2012). **1. Understanding Inclusive Education: 1.3 Models of Disability, Adjustment, Inclusion and Circles of Support.** Wandsworth: Back-Up Trust.

6. Barnes, C. and Mercer, G. (2010). **Exploring Disability.** Cambridge: Polity.

7. Batterbury, S., Ladd, P., and Gulliver, M. (2007). Sign Language Peoples as Indigenous Peoples: Implications for Research and Policy. **Environment and Planning A.**, 39: (12): 2899-2915.

8. Bertling, T. (1994). **A Child Sacrificed to the Deaf Culture.** Oregon: Kodiak Media Group.

9. Borrell-Carrió, F., Suchman, A. and Epstein, R. (2004). The Biopsychosocial Model 25 Years Later: Principles, Practice, and Scientific Inquiry. **Annals of Family Medicine.** 2: (6): 576-582.

10. Davis, L. J. (2010). "Constructing Normalcy." In: Davis, L. J. (ed.) **The Disability Studies Reader.** New York: Routledge, pp. 3-19.

11. Denzin, N. and Lincoln, Y. (2005). **The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Research: Third Edition.** London: Sage Publications Ltd.

12. dePoy, E. and French Gilson, S. (2011). **Studying Disability: Multiple Theories and Responses.** California: Sage Publications.

13. Dolmage, J. and Lewiecki-Wilson, C. (2010). "Refiguring Rhetorica: Linking Feminist Rhetoric and Disability Studies." In: Schell, E. E. and Rawson, K. J. (eds.). **Rhetorica In Motion.** Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, pp. 23-38.

14. Engel, G. (1977). The Need for a New Medical Model: A Challenge for Biomedicine. **Science.** 196: (4286): 129-136.

15. Fetterman, D. (1998). **Ethnography: Step-By-Step.** California: Sage.

16. Fletcher, J. (c. 2011). **About Fletch@** [online]. Available from: http://signsong.org.uk/fletch%40/about_fletch%40.html [Accessed 20 December 2013]

---

^{15} The title of the source is 'Prinicples of Professional Practice' and I corrected it.

17. French, S. (1993). "Disability, Impairment or Something Inbetween." In: Swain, J., Finkelstein, V., French, S. et al. (eds.) **Disabling Barriers: Enabling Environments.** London: Sage, pp. 17-25.

18. Glickman, N. and Harvey, M. A. (1996). **Culturally Affirmative Psychotherapy with Deaf Persons.** New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc., Publishers.

19. Ghaemi, N. (2009). The Rise and Fall of the Biopsychosocial Model. **The British Journal of Psychiatry.** 195: (1): 3-4.

20. Grinker, R. (1964). A Struggle for Eclecticism. **American Journal of Psychiatry.** 121: 451-457.

21. Groce, N. (1985). **Everyone Here Spoke Sign Language: Hereditary Deafness on Martha's Vineyard.** Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

22. Hamill, A. C. and Stein, C. H. (2011). Culture and Empowerment in the Deaf Community: an Analysis of Internet Weblogs. **Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology.** 21: (5): 388-406.

23. Hesse, M. (2011). **What Sign-Language Interpreters Make of the Likes of Lady Gaga and Bon Jovi** [online]. Available from: http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2011/03/01/AR2011030106229.html [Accessed 30 January 2014].

24. Hennink, M. (2008). "Language and Communication in Cross-Cultural Qualitative Research." In Liamputtong, P. (ed.). **Doing Cross-Cultural Research: Ethical and Methodological Perspectives**. New York: Springer, pp. 21-33.

25. Ladd, P. (2003). **Understanding Deaf Culture: In Search of Deafhood.** Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

26. Lane, H. (1995). Constructions of Deafness. **Disability and Society.** 10: (2): 171-190.

27. Lane, H., Hoffmeister, R. and Bahan, B. (1996). **A Journey into the Deaf-World.** California: DawnSignPress.[16]

28. Langley, C. (2012). **The Tangled Web of the 'Biopsychosocial' Model of Disability** [online]. Available from: http://lostheskald.wordpress.com/2012/01/16/the-tangled-web-of-the-biopsychosocial-model-of-disability/ [Accessed 30 January 2014]

29. Man Ling Lee, T. (2011). "Multicultural Citizenship: The Case of the Disabled." In: Pottier, D. and Devlin, R. **Critical Disability Theory: Essays in Philosophy, Politics, Policy and Law.** Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, pp. 87-105.

30. Maxwell, J. (2005). **Qualitative Research Design: An Interactive Approach.** California: Sage Publications Inc.

31. Moore, M. and Beazley, S. (1995). **The Post-School Reflections of Young Deaf People. (**Unpublished) research report: Manchester Polytechnic.

32. Moore, M., Beazley, S. and Maelzer, J. (1998). **Researching Disability Issues.** Buckingham: Open University Press.

---

[16] DawnSignPress is grammatically incorrect but it is how the company refers to itself in its publications.

33. Morris, J. (1991). **Pride against Prejudice: Transforming Attitudes to Disability.** London: The Women's Press.

34. Namey, E., Guest, G., Thairu, L. and Johnson, L. (2008). "Data Reduction Techniques for Large Qualitative Data Sets." In: Guest, G. and Macqueen, K. M. (eds.). **Handbook for Team-Based Qualitative Research.** Maryland: Altamira Press, pp. 137-161.

35. Napier, J. (2002). The d/Deaf – h/Hearing Debate. **Sign Language Studies.** 2: (2): 141-149.

36. National Deaf Children's Society (2011). **Lady GaGa is Learning Sign Language** [online]**.** Date accessed, 10/01/14. Available from: http://www.ndcs.org.uk/news/other_news/lady_gaga_sign_lang.html [Accessed 10 January 2014]

37. Nomeland, M. M. and Nomeland, R. E. (2012). **The Deaf Community in America: History in the Making.** North Carolina: McFarland and Company, Inc.

38. Oliver, M. (1983). **Social Work with Disabled People.** Basingstoke: Macmillian.

39. Oliver, M. (1996). **Understanding Disability: From Theory to Practice.** London: Macmillan.

40. Prassad, R. (2003). **Sound and Fury** [online]**.** Date accessed: 06/02/14. Available from: http://www.theguardian.com/society/2003/mar/19/guardiansocietysupplement5 [Accessed 6 February 2014]

41. Saunders, M. (2006) "Gatekeeper". In Jupp, V. (ed.). **The SAGE Dictionary of Social Research Methods.** London: Sage, p. 126.

42. Siebers, T. (2008). **Disability Theory.** Michigan: The University of Michigan Press.

43. Smith, R. (2002). The Biopsychosocial Revolution: Interviewing and Provider-Patient Relationships Becoming Key Issues for Primary Care. **Journal of General Internal Medicine.** 17: (4): 309-310.

44. Sutton-Spence, R. and Woll, B. (1998). **The Linguistics of British Sign Language.** Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

45. Union of Physically Impaired Against Segregation (1976). **Fundamental Principles of Disability.** London: UPIAS.

46. United Nations (2006). **Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities** [online], 13 December, 2006, A/RES/61/106, Annex I. Available from: http://www.unhcr.org/refworld/docid/4680cd212.html [Accessed 13 May 2012]

47. Woodward, J. (1972). Implications for Sociolinguistic Research among the Deaf. **Sign Language Studies.** 1: 1-7.

48. World Health Organisation (2001). **International Classification of Functioning, Health, Disability and Health.** Geneva: WHO.

49. World Health Organisation (2011). **World Report on Disability.** Geneva: WHO.

Concerts

50. BBC (2010). **Sondheim at 80.** London, 31 July, 2010.
51. Boyzone (1999). **Boyzone…Greatest Hits Tour.** London, 10 December 1999.
52. Halliwell, G. (1999). **Lift Me Up.** GirlPowerForever (2009). **Geri Halliwell Lift Me Up @ TOTP** [online]**.** Available from: http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RNHb7YizPRM [Accessed 6 February 2014]
53. McCartney, P. (2012). **My Valentine.** PAULMCCARTNEY (2012). **Paul McCartney's 'My Valentine' Featuring Natalie Portman and Johnny Depp** [online]. Available from: http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ZXvzzTICvJs [Accessed 6 February 2014]
54. Sheeran, E. (2011). **You Need Me, I Don't Need You.** Ed Sheeran (2011). **Ed Sheeran – You Need Me, I Don't Need You [Official Video]** [online]. Accessed 06/02/14. Available from: http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ZXvzzTICvJs [Accessed 6 February 2014]
55. Spice Girls (1998). **Girl Power Tour '98.** Birmingham, 6 May 1998.
56. Spice Girls (1999). **Christmas in Spice World.** London, 15 December 1999.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1: MY EXPERIENCE OF GIVING AN ACCESSIBLE PERFORMANCE

In November, 2013, I received an email informing me that I had been selected for the final of a competition for disabled contestants. After careful consideration, I decided that I would accept their invitation to compete. It was self-evident that I should be Deaf accessible; at this point, I was unaware that any Deaf individuals would be in the audience.

I realised that, as I was only one performer in a show featuring several other acts, I would be under direction, so I decided to make plans for my performance while accepting that I would need to consult others before these could be implemented. I was initially advised I could Sign the penultimate chorus. I consulted my BSL tutors who provided a translation of my chorus:

Your money-grow me need-no.

Your sympathy me need-no.

Your attitude change.

Is that it? Enough.

It took several weeks for me to perfect the chorus as I only spent a few minutes each week receiving tuition from my BSL tutors on my chorus but the person who had

been assigned to assist and prepare me for the performance felt confident I could Sign each chorus, as opposed to only one. I requested a headpiece microphone (as I had to negate twice by shaking my head alongside the Sign for 'need') but as the organisation running the competition is a charity, financially they could not justify the cost.

By this point, it had become apparent that a Deaf individual would be in the audience, the critically acclaimed Jayne Fletcher. Via Facebook, I asked if she or her Deaf friends had any preferences with regard to the colour of the outfit (as I am Caucasian, I realised I should wear dark clothing but having contacted Attitude is Everything, I was informed that I should take into consideration the backdrop against which I would be performing and wear items which contrasted with it). No one expressed any opinions so I Signed the chorus in front of a mirror wearing each potential outfit to check visibility. I asked for natural make-up but this was felt to be too subtle to be visible on the stage, they were as subtle as they could be, however.

I was advised to perform to each person in the room and to prioritise my singing and in my opinion I struck a balance between performing and accessibility. Shortly before I was due on stage, I was approached by two women who asked me what I would be performing, explaining they were Sign interpreters. I recited the lyrics to them, explaining any ambiguities and assuring them that I would have sent lyrics in advance if I had known they would be interpreting. A fellow contributor was reluctant to give the interpreters the name of the song he would be performing, but after I explained the situation, he did provide the details as requested. After the performance, I noticed Jayne and her guests applauding in BSL, I responded by

Signing 'thank you'. During the interval, and after the show had ended, I spoke to her via an interpreter, but also found the confidence to Sign to her. Jayne understood my Signing both on stage and off it.

I am pleased with how accessible I was able to be, but had it been a concert which I had organised and if I had been given sufficient funding, I would have been able to give an even more accessible experience for Deaf audience members. I received positive feedback and no complaints about my Signing; I therefore believe that Signing did not ruin my performance and would encourage future performers to be as accessible as possible. I was pleasantly surprised at how simple it was to Sign and sing simultaneously and I plan to learn the full song at some point.

APPENDIX 2: CONSENT FORM.

N.B. as explained during the thesis, I developed the research questions and my model of d/Deafness after completing my participant research. I would request that this is borne in mind when reading the following appendices.

Consent form for the study

Critically Evaluating the Social Model of Disability with Reference to Deaf Individuals in Adapted Mainstream Popular Music Concerts.

Conducted by Amy Simmons, University of Birmingham, England.

Please answer the following questions by marking the appropriate column:

Questions:	Yes	No
Has the information provided to you concerning this study been presented in a comprehensible manner?		
Have you been given the opportunity to ask questions and voice any concerns regarding this study?		
Do you feel that you have been given enough information regarding this study to understand what the study is about and to provide informed consent?		
Do you understand that you are free to withdraw from this study, at any point, without justifying your decision and at no detriment to yourself?		
Do you consent to have your interviews, if applicable, recorded on a Dictaphone?		
Do you consent, at present, to have the information you provide used in this study?		
Do you wish to be issued a pseudonym in any (at present not anticipated) publications detailing this research?		
Do you wish to be issued a pseudonym in my thesis?		

Your signature will signify to me, Amy Simmons that you are participating of your own accord and are able to provide informed consent. Furthermore, it will certify that you have had

adequate opportunity to discuss the study with me and that all questions have been answered to your satisfaction, although this does not preclude your right to ask questions during or following the interview, or the completion of the questionnaire, should any arise.

Signature of participant:.................................... **Date:**................

Name (block letters):...

Signature of investigator:.................................... **Date:**................

Please keep your copy of the consent form and the information sheet together.

Amy Simmons

Contact details

Email:

APPENDIX 3: PARTICIPANT INFORMATION SHEET.

PARTICIPANT INFORMATION SHEET

I, Amy Simmons, an MPhil (B) Cultural Inquiry student from the School of Languages, Cultures, Art History and Music at the University of Birmingham, Edgbaston, England, am undertaking research on Sign Interpretation during popular music concerts.

Focus of the study

The research concerns concerts throughout which Sign interpretation was provided, for the purpose of comparison preferably those concerts which took place following the Disability Discrimination Act (2005). The research will evaluate the effectiveness of the Disability Discrimination Act (2005) and the recent models of disability, such as the social model (Oliver, 1983) which suggests that disability is the product of social and/or environmental inaccessibility and not simply the effect of physical or impairment. The research will attempt to determine;

- Whether the bio-psycho-social model of disability compares favourably to the social model.

- Whether the Disability Discrimination Act (2005) improved provision for d/Deaf concert goers, through a comparative analysis of pre and post 2005 case studies.

What will you be required to do?

You will be invited to participate in either an interview or complete a questionnaire, involving a limited number of questions, for which in-depth responses are preferable.

Place and duration of interview

The interview will take place in a location convenient to you and should take no more than 30 minutes of your time.

Consent and right to withdraw

At any point until August 8th 2011, you have the right to withdraw your information from the study. You can expect no negative consequences as a result of this decision, the decision not to participate or respond to a particular question. It is imperative that I obtain your

informed consent; every effort has been made to provide full information but please do not hesitate to enquire further, using the contact details at the bottom of this page.

Data storage

Interview and questionnaire data will not be available to third parties for marketing or other purposes. I am solely responsible for the storage of the data during and following the study. Research and information storage will be conducted in the most stringent accordance with the University of Birmingham's Codes of Practice for Research, therefore, data will be destroyed ten years after the completion of the study (September 2021).

Confidentiality

The decision to remain anonymous or provide confidential information will be your own; if you wish to remain anonymous, you will be provided with a pseudonym, although I do not expect the content of the interview or questionnaire to reveal sensitive information. Please indicate on your questionnaire or during your interview whether information is confidential and not to be utilised in my thesis. I do not anticipate the thesis will be published (it will be viewed solely by my supervisors, an examiner and a limited number of proof-readers), but in the event that this is no longer the case, your permission for your data to be published will be sought. No data will be available on public computers although I am not fluent in Sign; therefore if this is your preferred method of communication, it will be necessary to involve an interpreter (either your own provider or an interpreter known personally to me who will not charge for his services).

Right to information

At your request, you will be issued with a complementary copy of my thesis and, prior to the date of submission, all participants will be provided with a copy of each mention in the thesis of themselves or the data obtained from their interview or questionnaire to ensure no accidental misrepresentation has occurred. You may ask questions at any point.

Further queries

If you would like further information on the research, please do not hesitate to contact me, Amy Simmons, at

APPENDIX 4: QUOTES FROM PARTICIPANTS.

Joanne Potter:

"Before we start, I just want to say I'm really sorry. When I met you at [*event*] the other day, I don't feel like I looked at you enough, I felt as though I spent all my time looking at your interpreter, and I know how that feels, having Asperger's, sometimes people talk to me through my mentor too, so, I am sorry and I hope you'll forgive me" (me before my interview with Joanne).

"Do you know what 'DEAF' stands for?" "No?" "We say it means 'Deaf Expect All Free'!"

"As long as the interpreter's good, being d/Deaf isn't a disadvantage."

Chris Ginsburg:

"I've heard you're thinking about going to one of the Signed shows at [*theatre*] and handing out questionnaires, you've got to be careful with that, there was a night not so long ago when a group of researchers went out to a theatre in [*town*] and they wanted to take Deaf audience members away to their lab to test their perception of pain in their big toe!"

"Let's say you're Deaf and you want to see [*a show at a theatre*]. You'd contact the theatre and put in a request for an interpreter. They'd then pass it on to the tour manager and it would be their responsibility to book an interpreter, but you might get there on the night and they'll say 'sorry, we haven't booked an interpreter for you'."

"There was an incident last year where a lady wanted to go and see Britain's Got Talent, but they refused to book an interpreter so she couldn't go."

"People said, 'go on, it's kids, it's perfect for you!' And I said, 'no, I hate [*cartoon*], I'd rather stick pins in my eyes than watch it!"

Paul Whittaker:

"We've been dealing with a case involving the [*arena*], someone wanted an interpreter for the Steps tour, and they're refusing to let anyone interpret!" (Chris Ginsburg, after the interview with Paul).

"Sometimes, people have come up to me and said, 'you [as an interpreter] were more entertaining than the performance itself!'

"See, d/Deaf people are a notoriously difficult group of people to help! They'll take the access services, but they don't want to be seen as disabled!"

"Most big arena tours aren't interpreted; you get the odd one or two big rock-type arena tours, like the Spice Girls, but generally, you don't get Sign interpretation at those kinds of concerts."

Rachel Xerri-Brooks:

My main job is working with deaf volunteers and the DDA does not currently cover volunteering so this area of work has been left behind.

[A good interpretation is] One that not only gets the meaning of the song across but does so in a musical style which reflects the music. This can include smooth signing for legarto and 'jerky' signing for stacatto etc but most importantly their being a rhythm and musicality so that it is clear singing is happening rather than speech. I like to keep to the timing of the song as much as possible and this sometimes means the song can be a bit more SSE than BSL but all the deaf people I have interpreted for have said that they preferred this. I also think the signer needs to be a bit more animated like with performance sign but not take over from the performers (i.e. stand in front of them like I have seen before.).

All services should be made accessible to all people but realistically this is not always possible for groups that have a small budget and BSL is not the only access requirement for people generally. I still think it is their responsibility in the first place but charities and government initiatives should be there to help with the cost and advice in this area.

A lot of work has been done on [disability] since 1983, it is still a problem but much less so than before.

Judith Renshaw:

It is better for [interpretations] to be arranged without request. The translation process is very detailed and lengthy. This is especially the case with humour and musical theatre. I prefer to be involved at the rehearsals so that I have a very clear understanding of the language involved.

A song that is signed word for word and with no musicality is a very poor interpretation. A good interpreted performance would show the flow and speed of the music and would use BSL to portray the meaning, emotion and mood of the song.

The theatre should pay for [interpreters] or the company. Access to the show should be equal and in line with that of other audience members. A disabled wheelchair user would nor be asked to pay for a ramp into the building, a deaf person should have the same rights.

Having worked with deaf people for many years the vast majority will identify themselves as disabled. There are on occasion some that do not. Deaf people are capable of anything that a hearing person is however they still need to use interpreters to access services for this reason I would say that deaf people are disabled. But I feel this is only made worse and is the case by a society that is ignorant to the needs of a deaf person. The question I sometimes feel is that society is disabled in the restrictive view and therefore limits others.

I really feel that the biggest motivation [to provide access] is the DDA and the compliance with that. Many companies are only interested if they think they have a legal requirement and so only provide the bare minimum of access required.

The only impact [of the DDA] on the theatres is that they feel forced into providing interpreted performances. For deaf people the impact is more profound and empowers them to stand firm over what is their right to services.

Hayley Baker:

I feel that [one's interpreting style] depends on the audience you are interpreting for. I feel that music is important in the interpretation as it helps to set the tone/ mood. The interpretation needs to reflect the emotions and the intent.

I think [interpretation] should be as a matter of course. Interpretation to all shows (at least one night interpreted) should happen as a matter of course rather than in response to a request. Theatre/art forms/concerts etc should all be accessible.

Michael Chase:

I do not believe a song should be narrated. If the interpreter is not moving to the rhythm of the song in SOME way, I do not believe it is properly expressing the music. I also believe showing the tempo of the song, the essence of the song, is

more important than the actual lyrical interpretation. More can be obtained by body language than signs, in the case of music.

The act and the venue [should pay] - BOTH are benefiting from the audience member's purchase to the concert.

I believe that the stigma on deaf individuals exist both by the deaf and hearing cultures. Each one isolates itself. However, I believe it is slowly changing as more access is available.

Naomi Bearne:

It depends on the audience, the event, the reason an interpreter has been requested. A good signed song allows a deaf audience member to get what they want from a performance.

It depends on the size and popularity of the venue. I think that large mainstream venues should provide access as a matter of course but smaller more independent venues might not find this practical.

The government [should pay] because they pay for other access arrangements, and because in other countries (such as Finland) this would be considered a state matter.

I think there is a common misconception that lay society considers Deaf people to be disabled. I do not consider this to be the natural view of society, rather a view that has been heavily influenced by the media and medical discourses. I know many Deaf individuals who interact well with hearing society and would not be considered disabled by their colleagues, family, neighbours. (By this I do not mean Deaf people who use speech, i mean Deaf people who use sign language).

I think that acts should want to make their art accessible to a wider audience. Some acts suit interpretation more than others. Some performers have international careers based on the use of sign language as integral parts of their performance. The best example of this is probably Signmark, a Deaf rapper and a hearing rapper who co-perform, they are currently signed with Warner records.

It seems the DDA had very little power over this area because of the use of the term 'reasonable adjustments'. This meant nothing, and in one instance a profoundly Deaf friend was told they could sit in the lip-reading section of the theatre to watch Derren Brown (how ridiculous!)

APPENDIX 5: SURVEYS:

Original Sign interpreters' survey:

When have you interpreted concerts?

- Prior to the DDA, 1995.
- Prior to the DDA, 2005.
- After the DDA, 2005.

Which impacts, if any, has the DDA (2005) had upon your line of work?

Annually, approximately how often are your services requested for a concert situation?

What, if any would you consider the positive and negative impacts of an act or choir arranging Sign interpretation as a standard service?

What, in your view, constitutes a particularly good or poor Sign interpretation of a song?

Who should pay for Sign interpretation and why?

- The Deaf service user.
- The concert organiser.
- Charitable organisation.
- Other (please specify) and/or I wish to elaborate.

Mike Oliver's social model of disability (1983) suggests that society disables individuals with impairments by failing to meet their needs. Please give your opinion on this theory.

In comparison to concerts, how often are your services required for works of musical theatre?

- I am asked to interpret concerts more frequently.
- I am asked to interpret musical theatre more frequently.
- No difference.
- I wish to elaborate.

Please give your opinion(s) of choirs and/or acts which provide Sign interpretation as a standard service. For instance, which motivation(s) do choirs and acts have for doing so? Do motivations differ depending on the choir or act? Please give all opinions you feel relevant.

Which characteristics do you share with the acts you typically interpret for (only respond if you feel entirely comfortable in so doing)? Is sharing characteristics with an act important, why or why not? As this is the final question, if there is any issue which I have not covered but you feel would be relevant, please ellaborate. As a

student, if you have constructive criticism for me which would improve this or future questionnaires, please do share this. Thank you for your time.

Original d/Deaf Signers survey:

Select all that apply. When did you attend the Signed concerts?

- Prior to the DDA, 1995.
- Prior to the DDA, 2005.
- After the DDA, 2005.

What, if any, would you consider the benefits of providing Sign interpretation as a standard service during a tour, and, if any, the benefits of you personally booking an interpreter for a concert?

What, if any, would you consider the disadvantages of providing Sign interpretation as a standard service during a tour, and, if any, the disadvantages of you personally booking an interpreter for a concert?

In your experience, are lyrics accurately and meaningfully conveyed using Sign?

- Yes.
- No.
- Mostly yes.
- Mostly no.
- Another opinion (please specify).

Which would you prefer?

- Sign interpretation as a standard service.
- Personally booked Sign interpretation.
- I am indifferent to this.
- I have an alternative suggestion.
- I wish to elaborate on this answer.

During a well-Signed performance, is deafness an advantage, a disadvantage, neither, or both? Please elaborate.

- An advantage.
- A disadvantage.
- Neither.
- I would like to elaborate.

Mike Oliver's social model of disability (1983) suggests that society disables individuals with impairments by failing to meet their needs. Please give your opinion on this theory, if possible with reference to your personal concert experiences.

How, if at all, could the Sign interpretation provided during concerts you attended have been improved? Please specify the year of the concert (or if you cannot recall the exact year, please state the name of the act and estimate the year).

Please give your opinion(s) of choirs and/or acts which provide Sign interpretation as a standard service. For instance, which motivation(s) do choirs and acts have for doing so? Do motivations differ depending on the choir or act? Please give all opinions you feel relevant.

Which if any characteristics should Sign interpreters share with the performers? As this is the final question, if there is any issue which I have not covered but you feel would be relevant, please elaborate. As a student, if you have constructive criticism for me which would improve this or future questionnaires, please do share this. Thank you for your time.

Updated Sign interpreters' survey

Have you interpreted performances where you were booked for a specific audience member, where the performance was an access performance or both?

- I was booked by a specific audience member.
- I interpreted during an access performance.
- Both.
- Other (please specify).

Please specify the act(s) or play(s) (and companies if possible) for which you have interpreted?

Do you have a particularly positive or negative view of any companies you have interpreted for?

- Yes, a particularly positive view of an act or company.
- Yes, a particularly negative view of an act or company.
- No, I have no strong opinions on anyone I have interpreted for.

To your knowledge, have you been the subject of discrimination and/or prejudice? If appropriate please elaborate.

- Yes, prejudice.
- Yes, discrimination.
- Neither.
- Rather not say.
- I wish to elaborate.

When have you interpreted concerts, prior to 1995, prior to 2005 but following the 1995, or following 2005?

- Prior to 1995.
- Following 1995 but prior to 2005.
- Following 2005.

Is it more preferable in your view for an act to arrange Sign interpretation as a matter of course or for Sign interpretation to be provided in response to a specific request? Why in either case?

What, in your view constitutes a particularly good or poor Signed interpretation of a song?

Annually, how many performances do you interpret? If you have been asked to Sign during a concert, which medium of entertainment do you interpret more of, musical theatre or concerts?

Who should pay for Sign interpretation and why?

In a society without widespread knowledge of Sign, are Deaf individuals disabled in your view (not by their physiological differences but by society)? Please elaborate in either case.

What might be the motivations which acts, choirs or theatre companies have for booking Sign interpretation, in your opinion? Please give all opinions you feel relevant (for instance, if it differs depending upon the type of troupe).

Do you interpret for both genders? Can you discuss whether it is challenging to interpret for the opposite gender/those with whom you have little in common?

In your view, have the Disability Discrimination Acts impacted in any way, either on your line of work or the concert/theatre experiences of Deaf individuals who use Sign? If so, which way/ways?

As an MPhil student, I am still developing my skills as an interviewer; do you have any improvements in my technique or approach which you could recommend, or constructive criticism? Is there anything further you wish to add, if so, what?

Updated non-ESOL d/Deaf Signers' survey:

Have you attended performances where you specifically booked an interpreter, where the performance was an access performance or both?

- The interpreter was provided at my request.
- I did not specifically request an interpreter.
- Both.
- Neither.
- Other (please specify).

Please specify the act(s) or play(s) (and companies if possible) which was performing/being performed?

Do you have a particularly positive or negative view of any companies you have seen?

- Yes, positive.
- Yes, negative.
- No, I have no strong opinions of any acts seen.

If you attended a concert, what were your motivations for doing so?

To your knowledge, have you been the subject of discrimination and/or prejudice? If appropriate please elaborate.

- Yes, prejudice.
- Yes, discrimination.
- Neither.
- I wish to elaborate.

When did you attend Signed concerts/performances?

- Signed concert(s) before 1995.
- Signed concert(s) after 1995 and before 2005.
- Signed concert(s) after 2005.
- Signed musical(s) before 1995.
- Signed musical(s) after 1995 and before 2005.
- Signed musical(s) after 2005.

Is it more preferable in your view for an act to arrange Sign interpretation as a matter of course or for Sign interpretation to be provided in response to a specific request? Are there advantages and disadvantages for both approaches? Why in either case?

Aside from booking an interpreter personally or the act or company booking Sign interpretation for access performances, are there other potential arrangements which are preferable in your opinion?
What, in your view constitutes a particularly good or poor Signed interpretation of a song?

Who should pay for Sign interpretation and why?

How might the Sign interpretation services you received during performances been improved?

In a society without widespread knowledge of Sign, or in environments with poor Sign, are Deaf individuals disabled in your view (not by their physiological differences but by society)? Please elaborate in either case.

In a well-Signed concert or performance, is being Deaf an advantage, disadvantage, neither or both? Please elaborate?

- An advantage.
- A disadvantage.
- Neither.
- Other (please specify).

What might be the motivations which acts, choirs or theatre companies have for booking Sign interpretation, in your opinion? Please give all opinions you feel relevant (for instance, if it differs depending upon the type of troupe).

Which characteristics should Sign interpreters have in common with the act or company for which they are interpreting, if any?

As an MPhil student, I am still developing my skills as a researcher; do you have any improvements in my technique or approach which you could recommend, or constructive criticism? Do you have any further comments?

ESOL d/Deaf participants' survey:

N.B. having since begun to learn BSL, I now appreciate that this questionnaire should have been written in BSL structure rather than using simple terms.

Did you ask for a Sign interpreter at the concert or play, or were they there without you asking for them?

- I asked for a Sign interpreter.
- They were there without me asking for a Sign interpreter.
- Sometimes I ask for a Sign interpreter, other times there is already a Sign interpreter there.
- I do not know.

Who did you see in concert or what play did you see? Please tell me the name of the company who put on the play if you know it.

Do you really like or dislike anyone that you saw in concert or any company whose play you saw?

- Yes, I really like one or more of the people or companies I saw.
- Yes, I really dislike one or more of the people or companies I saw.
- No, I do not really like or really dislike any of the people or companies I saw.

Why did you go to a concert, if you went to one?

Has anyone ever discriminated against you or been prejudiced against you, that you know about? If yes, write more about it if you want to. Prejudice - the person dislikes you but does not know you. Discrimination - the person stops you from doing something, like a job, because of something that would not stop you from doing the job.

- Yes, prejudice.
- Yes, discrimination.
- I do not want to say.
- No.
- I want to say more.

When have you seen interpreted shows; before 1995, between 1995 and 2005, or after 2005?

- Before 1995.
- After 1995 and before 2005.
- After 2005.
- I do not remember.

Which is better in your opinion; to ask for a Sign interpreter or for a company or act to have already booked one? Are both good and bad in their own ways? Please say why you think that?

What makes some interpretations of a song good and other interpretations of a song bad?

Can you think of a better way to have a Sign interpretation service at a performance than you booking an interpreter or the act or company booking an interpreter; if so, what?

Who should pay for Sign interpretation and why?

How could the Sign interpretation you saw at the concerts or plays have been better?

A man named Mike Oliver said that disability is not in a person's body but in society. A person in a wheelchair is not disabled if there are lots of ramps, lifts and people do not think badly of them, for example. Do you agree or disagree? Is being Deaf a disability if there is no Sign interpreter or if there is a Sign interpreter who is bad?

If a Sign interpreter is very good, is being Deaf at a concert or play good, bad, neither or both? Please tell me more?

Why do you think acts or theatre companies might book Sign interpreters? If you think different types of performers (e.g. singers, choirs, theatre companies) have different reasons, what are those reasons?

Should Sign interpreters be or look like the act they are interpreting for and in which ways (e.g. age, sex)? For example, is it okay in your opinion if a 50 year old man interprets the lines of a 20 year old woman?

I am still learning how to research and I want to get better at it. Is there anything I could have done better or anything else you want to say?

Quantitative responses to the original questionnaire:

In which capacity have you been in a Sign interpreted music concert?

- A d/Deaf or hearing impaired audience member: 3.
- A hearing audience member: 7.
- A Sign interpreter: 2.

Select all that apply. Have the Sign interpreted concerts you were involved with been held:

- Prior to the Disability Discrimination Act (1995): 1.
- Prior to the Disability Discrimination Act (2005): 4.
- After the Disability Discrimination Act (2005): 10.

Select all that apply. I have attended concerts where:

- Sign interpretation was provided as a standard service: 7.
- Sign interpretation was booked by a specific audience member: 4.
- I am unsure who booked the Sign interpretation: 3.

Select all that apply. Which, if any, of the following Sign interpreted performances have you attended and what is your opinion of the Sign interpretation provided if you have a view on this?

- Spice Girls: Spice World Live (1998). Well interpreted: 0.
- Spice Girls: Spice World Live (1998). Poorly interpreted: 0.
- Spice Girls: Spice World Live (1998). No opinion: 0.
- Rainbow Chorus (Brighton-based): any Signed performance. Well interpreted. 1.
- Rainbow Chorus (Brighton-based): any Signed performance. Poorly interpreted: 0.
- Rainbow Chorus (Brighton-based): any Signed performance. No opinion: 0.
- Rainbow Voices (Birmingham-based): any Signed performance. Well interpreted. 1.
- Rainbow Voices (Birmingham-based): any Signed performance. Poorly interpreted: 1.
- Rainbow Voices (Birmingham-based): any Signed performance. No opinion: 0.
- I have not seen any of the above concerts: 10.

Select all that apply. Do you have a strong opinion of the acts whose Signed concerts you attended?

- Strong positive opinion: 9.
- Strong negative opinion: 3.
- No strong opinion: 3.

Which of the following statements most closely matches your view of the Disability Discrimination Act (2005)?

- It has enhanced the concert experiences of Deaf individuals: 8.
- It has not enhanced the concert experiences of Deaf individuals: 0.
- I am not in a position to form a view of the Act in this respect: 5.

If you attend(ed) concerts as an audience member, what are/were your motivations for doing so?

- Enjoyment of the audible aspects of the music (melodies, rhythm etc): 6.
- Enjoyment of the vibrations: 3.
- Enjoyment of the lyrics: 2.
- Special effects: 5
- Enjoyment of seeing the act or company live: 7.
- Excitement: 7.
- Audience participation (such as light waving, dancing): 1.
- Costumes: 4.

- Set design: 4.
- Attending as part of a friendship/family group: 7.
- Being amongst others who share your opinion of the act: 4.
- Other: 2.

If you are a hearing concert attendee, is Sign interpretation during concerts:

- A service which enhances my own concert experience: 8.
- An unnecessary distraction: 1.
- A necessary distraction: 1.
- I have no opinion on the matter: 0.
- This does not apply to me: 2.
- Other: 1.

To your knowledge, have you been the subject of discrimination and/or prejudice?

- Yes, discrimination: 3.
- Yes, prejudice: 3.
- Neither: 7.
- Rather not say: 2.

If you wish, please specify the nature of the prejudice or discrimination: 4.

APPENDIX 6: RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE PRACTICE

Throughout the research, one issue which numerous participants referred to was the unsuitability of a specific interpreter for interpreting music. Anyone who is considering interpreting live music events may be well advised to attend a Sign-song workshop, by way of example, those organised by Jayne Fletcher. In this way, the interpreter will learn techniques to improve the service they provide to d/Deaf audience members, such as timing, musicality and appropriate linguistic decisions.

Hayley suggested that all shows should be interpreted for at least one performance for each venue on every tour. This would increase consumer choice and business for Sign interpreters. Whilst in some cases d/Deaf patrons of theatres are entitled to vote for the performances they wish to be interpreted, unless the votes are unanimous, currently, some voters will not see their choice of performance in an accessible format.

Michael referred to the current system of booking tickets and how it could be simplified. Potentially, ticket companies should allow all individuals whilst registering online to state their disability or Deafness, provide evidence of this and register their access requirements. This would enable them to book tickets with greater ease and again increase choice, as there is less chance of tickets selling out before they have submitted their evidence of disability or Deafness.

Finally, Judith suggested that Sign interpreters were often prevented from attending rehearsals for live music events, which results in a poorer quality interpretation. The solution is simple: Sign interpreters should be allowed into rehearsals and if this is not possible, a recording should be provided of the rehearsal so the interpreter has access to the script and how the script is delivered.