



National Consortium of Interpreter Education Centers

Translated and published with permission from RID.

# Determining Register in Sign-to-English Interpreting

By Risa Shaw

## Register in Discourse

Register is a discourse variable of immense importance in making communication possible, but because it involves knowledge that several different disciplines claim as their own it has not been studied as much as its importance warrants. Linguists can claim that such linguistic variables as syntax, lexicon, phonology help set and maintain register. Paralinguistic features are also directly involved; e.g. intonation, pausing, and rate of speaking. But social variables context, setting, the participants in the discourse operate both with and apart from linguistic ones. Psychology enters as well, particularly in the process of deciding among alternate behaviors and judging their effects. Sociolinguistics helps in uniting these disparate analyses of register, for its field is that of discourse functions and the ways these interact with each other and with social factors.

Although register has received little direct and sustained attention, the following remarks may help to make clear what is meant by register. Wardhaugh refers to several distinguishing features:

People do have a wide range of choices available to them when they speak: they can be technical or non-technical, formal or informal, conscious of their role or unconscious of it, familiar with the listener or distant; and so on. The consequences will show in the language they use; the amount of technical terminology employed; the kinds of omissions made and tolerated; the types and complexity of grammatical constructions; the standards of grammatical "accuracy" observed. (1976).

Bolinger adds to this list the importance of tone of voice, or intonation (1975). McEdwards describes register as "the product of [one's] conscious and unconscious selection of the topic, the organization, the diction, the vocabulary, the syntax, and the imagery allowed

[one] by [one's] premises to communicate [one's] emotions and ideas" (1968).

In his 1961 book *The Five Clocks*, Martin Joos, who refers to register as style, makes a very useful division into five levels. (Presumably because "style" has come to have so many meanings, the word *register* is currently preferred for the matter in hand.) A brief listing of the definitions by Joos follows:

Frozen style is characteristic of poetry and liturgy; not a word can be changed; ambiguity is its special form of politeness;

Formal style is marked by personal detachment, cohesion of form and organization, absence of participation, explicit pronunciation, grammar that tolerates no ellipsis, careful semantics, and a clear intention to inform;

Consultative style also intends to be informative but supplies background information, includes the addressee(s) in participation, has complete grammar and clear pronunciation; Casual style is marked by ellipsis and slang (participants are on first-name terms and can supply what is left out); background information is likewise absent; there is little reliance on listener participation but treatment of the addressee as an "insider;"

Intimate style is a personal code shared only by those using it and is full of jargon and omissions that would puzzle others.

Most of the time sign language interpreters work in the middle three levels, of register, although Joos's frozen style might be appropriate in interpreting certain rituals. (The kind of relationship calling for communication in intimate style excludes any third party, even an interpreter, by definition.)

Register is a complicated phenomenon. Its numerous indicators are neither isolated nor static. It is a combination of linguistic, sociological, and psychological factors, some or all of which may determine the register a communicating person uses at any time. This is not to imply that register is impossible to investigate but only to warn that there is rarely an absolute.

The investigation reported here is an attempt to identify indicators of register in selected portions of two lectures presented in ASL, and in the interpretations of each made by two interpreters. The results are used to suggest desiderata for training interpreters.

### **The Data**

Ideally one would be able to determine register immediately and directly from live discourse, but to do so might well require a large part of a lifetime; therefore, in this preliminary attempt to describe register in interpreted material I have used videotaped material, but material so structured that many of the important sociolinguistic variables can be known. The data tapes are professionally produced by Sign Media, Incorporated of Silver Spring, MD (distributed by T. J. Publishers, also of Silver Spring): *Interpreter Models Series: ASL-English (Lectures)*. The series includes two tapes so far, the first presenting interpretation from English to ASL, and the second, used in this study, interpretation from ASL to English.

The producers of the tapes first recorded two half-hour lecture presentations by two Deaf speakers along with two simultaneous interpretations of each. For the final product, they then selected from each a segment of about eight minutes, in which one can watch: (a) the Deaf lecturer's presentation only, (b) that presentation with one spoken interpretation on the sound track, or (c) the same presentation with the other interpreter's voice audible.

The Deaf signer-presenters were chosen because they were experienced in Sign presentation to an audience, in working with interpreters, and grew up using ASL. Both are in their 30s, have masters' degrees in education, teach deaf students, have Deaf parents, and are bilingual in ASL and written English. The producers asked them to give 20-30 minute talks on a topic they were comfortable with. They were asked not to read from a paper and to be as extemporaneous as possible. Speaker-signer 1, female, gave a linguistic and cultural discussion of teaching English through ASL. Speaker-signer 2, male, gave a narrative account of his experiences as a househusband.

Nine hearing and five deaf were invited by the producers to be the speakers' audience. The nine hearers were not acquainted with signing and had to depend on the interpreter; the five deaf participants were fluent in ASL.

Filming took place in a specially prepared room. Speaker and podium were on a platform 18 inches above floor level. A collapsible partition split the room in such a way that the speaker could see the people on both sides, but they could not see each other. Thus two interpreters for the speaker could interpret simultaneously for the two halves of the audience, each of which was made up of hearing and deaf persons. The interpreters and the deaf part of the audience had a clear view of the speaker; the non-signing hearing audience was positioned near enough the interpreter to hear clearly.

The interpreters wore headphones to prevent hearing each other's voices and spoke into a 23 separate microphone directly linked to the audio recording equipment. They were selected for their national reputations, the producers' knowledge of their capabilities, experience in conference interpreting, and their commitment to the field. Both were in their 30s at the time of filming; both are bilingual native users of ASL and English with deaf parents; and both have at least eighteen years of professional interpreting experience and ten years experience in training interpreters. Both are considered to be at the top of their profession nationally by the interpreting and Deaf communities.

Interpreter A was born and raised on the East coast, holds a master's degree in counseling, and is currently completing a Ph.D. dissertation in linguistics. Interpreter B was born and raised in the Southwest and on the West coast, holds a master's degree in education, and has done interdisciplinary work on the Ph.D. level.

### **Determining ASL Registers**

Verification of the source message register was the first step taken, in order to compare the interpretation register with the original, to determine influence of the source register on the interpretation register, and to examine the interpreters' ability to manipulate register indicators. A native ASL user, who is a qualified and recognized expert in ASL linguistics examined the videotapes of the speaker-signers and judged that Speaker 1 stayed consistently in an upper consultative register. The grounds for this determination are: the topic (linguistics), genre (lecture), goal (to persuade), presentation of background information (not assuming listener knowledge), crisp "pronunciation" (careful sign and manual letter production), reliance on audience comprehension signals (eye contact seeking indications a chunk of information was understood), controlled but present "intonation" (subdued affective signals of face and body, and force of signs), consistent use of space (distinct and deliberate placement of topics and nouns), non-rapid delivery (relative low speed of signing), and a cohesive and organized presentation (clear and connected points).

The same judge determined that Speaker 2, who was giving a personal account of his

experiences as a househusband, was generally in an upper casual register, although he often shifted into consultative register. The grounds for this determination are: the topic (staying at home with his son), genre (personal narrative), goal (to entertain), absence of background information (assuming listener knowledge), little reliance on audience participation (brief eye contact with individual members of the audience), increased ASL "intonation" (distinct and shifting affective signals of face and body and force of signs and body movement), rapid delivery (fast signing and fingerspelling throughout, except for slowing for emphasis), less organized presentation (numerous asides), and strong use of dialogue (impersonating the characters in the narrative).

### **Selection of Data**

For analysis I chose a segment two minutes and 27 seconds long from Speaker 1's presentation, and another two minutes and 17 seconds long from Speaker 2's. These provided a cohesive piece of discourse, several subtopics within the segment, sufficient data but a manageable size for analysis, and little culture-bound information that would have forced difficult decisions on the interpreters. The 147 and 137 seconds of tape provided an overwhelming amount of data to be considered as pertinent to register. I consequently adjusted the depth of the analysis to the scope of the project.

### **Coding Transcriptions**

I used conventional orthography in transcribing the data. Phonetic transcription would have provided much unneeded information but did note certain phonetic features; e.g. assimilation ("gonna", "wanna") and elongation of syllables ("s-speak"). I coded for the following keys to register: intonation, pausing, lexical items, increase in speech rate, and sentence boundaries. I also took note of laughter, individual word stress, and run-together words. All transcription work was performed by native English users., and intonation was evaluated by a recognized expert in phonology. (The Appendix gives the complete transcripts of all four interpretation segments.)

Pausing data was coded by ear and stopwatch to 0.1 sec. accuracy, and it was deemed that 0.4 seconds was a significant delineation point. Stress on individual words, laughter, run-together words, change in speech rate, and sentence boundaries were identified by native-speaker intuition.

### **Data Analysis**

Five categories seemed worthy of special attention after I became familiar with the data: speaking rate, pausing, syntax, intonation, and lexical choice. Each was analyzed separately and as related to each other, also for each interpreter across speakers (intra- interpreter). When differences between interpreters appeared, these were compared and contrasted. The categories are presented and discussed below.

Interpreter speaking rate was calculated by counting the number of words in the selection and dividing by the time. The rate of the speaker-signers' original performance was not calculated, although it may be of interested in a related study; and as shown by interpreter rate, the speaker-signers' rates were different:

	Speaker 1	Speaker 2
Interpreter A	167.92wpm	210.43wpm
Interpreter B	173.47wpm	225.53wpm

Table 1. Rate by speaker and interpreter in words per minute.

It appears that both interpreters increased their rate of speaking because of Speaker 2's more rapid rate of signing (25.32% and 30.01% respectively). The increase in speaking rate is fully in accord with the difference in register of the two presentations. Pauses are not considered in the calculations of speaking rate but were measured and counted and total pause time calculated for each interpreter:

	Speaker 1	Speaker 2	Totals
Pauses under 1.6 sec.			
Interp. A	32	43	75 (161, or
Interp. B	42	44	86 89.94%)
Pauses over 1.6 sec.			
Interp. A	15	1	16 (18, or
Interp. B	2	0	2....10.06%)
Total pauses			
Interp. A	47	44	91 (179, or
Interp. B	44	44	88 100%)

Table 2. Interpreters' pauses by speaker.

The total number of pauses across speakers is similar, with nearly 90% of all pauses being 1.6 seconds or less in length. Interpreter A, however, used many more long pauses than did Interpreter B, and all but one of her long pauses were made during her interpretation of Speaker 1's presentation. I take this as a strong indication in A's interpretation of the register difference between speakers, but see below. the percentage of actual speaking time (seconds of speaking, *ss*) and pause time (seconds of pausing, *sp*) is shown below:

	Speaker 1		Speaker 2	
	Interp. A	Interp. B	Interp. A	Interp. B
<i>ss</i>	60.9	74.01	78.04	82.13 %
<i>ps</i>	39.10	25.99	21.96	17.87 %

Table 3. Percentage of speaking and pausing time .

Both interpreters are speaking a smaller percentage of the total time for Speaker 1, another indication that Speaker 1 uses a more formal register than Speaker 2 by allowing more time for audience comprehension, signing slower, and using crisper pronunciation. Again Interpreter A's pause rate appears different across speakers; her overall pause time for Speaker 1 is considerably greater than that in the rest of the 'ps' line.

Syntactic difference was assessed by noting sentences as simple and non-simple (i.e. compound, complex, and compound-complex) In Interpreter A's rendering there were 19 sentences for Speaker 1 and 35 for Speaker 2. Interpreter used 26 sentences for S. 1 and 44 for S. 2.

	Speaker 1		Speaker 2	
	Interp. A	Interp. B	Interp. A	Interp. B
sim.	32	42	46	61 % ....(54%)
non-s	68	58	54	38. % (46%)

Table 4 . Percentage of simple and non-simple S's.

Table 4 shows that judged by the proportion of simple and non-simple syntactic structures used by both interpreters, Speaker 2 is being interpreted in a more casual register than is Speaker 1. It also appears that less complex syntax, with greater speaking rate and smaller pause time, leads to greater speed.

I also examined as part of the syntactic analysis false starts and non-agreement between subject and verb:

	False Starts		Non-agreement	
	Spkr. 1	Spkr. 2	Spkr. 1	Spkr. 2
Interp. A	2	10	2	3
Interp. B	16	9	0	4

Table 5. False starts and non-agreement across speakers.

Coherent organization and grammatical accuracy as indicators of more formal register show again the difference of register in the speakers. These indicators, however, may be affected by interpreter performance; Interpreter A makes more false starts in interpreting for Speaker 2, but the reverse is true of Interpreter B.

### Intonation

Roach (1983) lists four functions of intonation: *attitudinal*--conveying emotions and attitudes; *Accentual*--denoting prominence and stress; *grammatical*--indicating features of syntax and grammar; *discourse*--signaling expectation of flow and turn-taking. He describes the semantics of intonation patterns thus: A fall is "associated with completeness and definiteness," a rise, with "incompleteness and uncertainty or questioning," a fall-rise, with "feelings of hesitation, contrast, reservation, or doubt," a rise-fall, with "strong feelings of approval, disapproval, or surprise," and a wider pitch range "tends to be used in excited or enthusiastic speaking."

Bolinger (1975) corroborates by explaining this within the context of the physiology of speech and the nervous system. He states that the "universal lowering of pitch towards the ends of unexcited discourse results automatically from running out of lung power," and that an "equally universal raising of pitch for questions and other keyed-up utterances is probably the result of higher nervous tension in the body as a whole, which has the effect of tensing the vocal cords."

The number of occurrences and their locations of rising and falling intonation within a syllable or larger unit were charted for the interpreters' performances, and are shown below.

	Speaker 1		Speaker 2	
	Interp. A	Interp. B	Interp. A	Interp. B
total	92	145 (100%)	115	114 (100%)
falls	71 (77%)	97 (67%)	79 (69%)	78 (69%)
rises	21 (23%)	48 (33%)	36 (31%)	36 (31%)

Table 6. Interpreter pitch changes across speakers.

I expected to find more intonation shifts in both interpretations of Speaker 2 because of his highly affect-laden personal narratives, but Table 6 indicates otherwise. The interpreters agree closely on Speaker 2, but for Speaker 1, Interpreter B has 27.2% more intonation shifts than she does for Speaker 2. This would not be expected from the literature on intonation and may indicate a problem in control of intonation for more formal registers, or it may come from an idiosyncrasy of the interpreter. Interpreter A shows more intonation shifts than Interpreter B for Speaker 2, and she distinguishes between registers across speakers by her use of intonation patterns. This seems to indicate that more formal registers require greater control of intonation; while a greater range is allowed and accepted within less formal registers.

### Lexical items

Categories of lexical items examined were contractions (e.g. *I'd*), phonetic assimilations (*gonna*), repairs and repetitions, the word *and*, and more formal and less formal words and phrases.

	Speaker 1			Speaker 2		
	Total	Interp A	Interp B	Total	Interp A	Interp B
	Total	Interp A	Interp B	Total	Interp A	Interp B
contr	19	12	7	32	15	17
assim	2	1	1	24	17	7
repet	15	5	10	19	11	8
<i>and</i>	28	13	15	54	26	28
-formal	50	17	33	101	52	49
+formal	80	49	31	31	17	14

Table 7. Interpreters' lexical patterns.

We can see that both of the interpretations of Speaker 2 are more formal in diction than those of Speaker 1, but the lexical evidence is not consistent across interpreters and so is not a conclusive indicator of speaker register. The lexical evidence does indicate a difference in organization and cohesion of the discourse interpreted; e.g. Interpreter A shows a 120% increase in repairs and repetitions from Speaker 1 to Speaker 2, which does indicate a register difference in her interpretations. Indeed Interpreter A's register difference between speakers throughout shows a greater register difference than does Interpreter B's.

## Summary

The analysis clearly shows that both interpreters used different registers for the two signed presentations. It also indicates a greater difference in register across speakers in the interpretation of Interpreter A. Both interpretations show the following properties indicative of their register. For Speaker 1 there was more pause time, crisper pronunciation, and more complex syntax in the work of both interpreters. For Speaker 2 in both interpretations there was greater speaking rate, use of more contractions, assimilations, use of *and*, more informal words and phrases, and simpler syntactic structures.

A's interpretation differed more from speaker to speaker than B's; specifically containing greater shifts in speaking rate, more pause time, intonation change, and syntax, difference, as well as fewer false starts. (11 repetitions and repairs interpreting Speaker 1 as against 5 interpreting Speaker 2).

Interpreter B made less distinct adjustments and showed greater inconsistency in registers across speakers, with more false starts and more intonation shifts for Speaker 1 than for Speaker 2, but less adjustment in syntactic structure and pause time.

Both interpretations included aspects of consultative and casual register as did both presentations by the original speakers, but there were differences in register indicators in the interpretations, implying that registers exist within ranges and lack discrete boundaries but have definable properties. Any given utterance will present itself as more or less in "X register," depending on its aspects and their interaction. Thus, the attempt to isolate and define register indicators so that they can be monitored and regulated in the interpreting process appears quite feasible and consistency is essential to register determination. A multitude of factors are involved in interpretation; perhaps some such description as this of register indicators and knowledge that consistency in their use is essential may reduce some of the stress the many problems of interpretation impose on interpreters and their audiences.

## Implications for interpreter training

Register as text variety is 'embedded' in situation. It reflects individual experience...control of a range of different registers results from experiencing different kinds of situations demanding different kinds of behavior. (Gregory & Carroll 1978)

Ability to act effectively as interpreter in any situation is directly related to the interpreter's experience and knowledge. As Gregory and Carroll put it, the ability to manage register is no exception, and interpreters to comprehend and express registers appropriately need to have experienced a range of them. Training procedures should sharpen the students' ability to recognize individuals' use of register indicators, to expand their own range and regulating behaviors, and to monitor their own language performance in different kinds of communicative situations as well as during actual interpretation. Special attention needs to be given those indicators foreign to or not in the usual behavior of each student, and to the importance of the way indicators can act on one another as well as on the overall message. Ideally students of interpreting would acquire skill in register control through actual experiences in their lives, but most do not enter training programs with such background, nor can they be "given" the experience. Therefore, curriculum must be developed to address these needs specifically. The students need to be exposed to the linguistic behaviors and the opportunity to try them out in and out of the classroom.

Register is as well the realization of the semantic possibilities of language. It defines what can be



meant in the situation. Register is, then, culturally determined, since it is the culture of a society which determines the patterns of environments in which language can occur. (Ibid.)

This point must never be forgotten, especially not by those who train interpreters. Register analysis must be done separately in each language--English and ASL--so as not to cause interference or confusion about how the culture of the users of each language determines what register is appropriate for what occasions. Register, as with all linguistic and sociological aspects of communication, must always be considered in context while realizing its dynamic nature. Interpretation itself is dynamic.

### References

- Bolinger, D. 1975 *Aspects of Language*. (2nd ed) NY: Harcourt.
- Gregory, M. & S. Carroll 1978 *Language & Situation: Language Varieties & their Social Contexts*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Joos, M. 1961. *The Five Clocks* . NY: Harcourt.
- McEdwards, M.1968 *Introduction to Style*. Dickenson Publ. Co.
- Roach, P. 1983 *English Phonetics & Phonology: A Practical Course*. Cambridge & NY: Cambridge Univ. Press
- Wardhaugh, R. 1976 *The Contexts of Language*. Boston: Newbury House.

Speaker 1/Interpreter A

(That's why it's stay-has been around for so long / because it has stayed / within the community // and it's been sheltered)

1. 'd like to talk a little bit about // the way deaf and hearing children learn language //
2. now the typical American hearing child // learns English growing up //
3. when they're born // even though they can't use the language overtly // parents will talk to them / using baby talk or whatever even / though the child may not understand at that point /
4. they will continually expose / the child / to spoken English /
5. plus there will be other family members extended family and friends who will talk to the baby play with the baby and expose the baby to English //
6. (cough) in addition there's um the media like tv and radio // which also provide additional auditory input //
7. and then the child develops // the knowledge of the rules // and the grammar of the language // intonation patterns //

- um how to express their feelings and how to use the language <sup>S1/IA</sup>  
 in different functions //
8. and that's just the natural acquisition process for a hearing child ///
9. now when a deaf child // if they have deaf parents // the deaf parents will use ASL with them all the time //
10. same way that a hearing child communicates with the hearing parents ///
11. and the child will get to know // ASL's rules // know how to show their emotions know how to use ASL in different situations
12. so really they're :very very: parallel //
13. now those children who learn ASL from their parents :and have this first language as their native language: / they tend to do better // in terms of learning English :and they tend to be more skilled at English as a second language because they already have: a first language as a base //
14. now this other group // of people that we're talking about

S1/IA

- // are // deaf children who are born to hearing parents and  
 that's about ninety percent of the deaf population / who  
 are born to hearing parents //
15. a-and they usually do not know ASL // and so there's alot of  
 communication difficulties and problems //
16. and many parents do not know how to deal with deafness ///
17. and so they continue to try to expose the child to language  
 and they will continue to use spoken English with the child  
 even though the child cannot receive any of that input: ///
18. and their(?) / extended family and friends and they'll put the  
 radio on and tv just like // as if their child were hearing ////
19. and so the child who's relying totally on the eyes is  
 not getting the language that the parents think that they're  
 giving them /////

---

(so they do not develop the rules and the grammar and how  
 to express themselves in that language in different  
 situations)

## Speaker 1/Interpreter B

(Those are three reasons that ASL has managed under such difficult circumstances to survive through the years)

1. I'd like to talk now about /// deaf and hearing children //
2. and how they / learn language and :make a comparison between the two: ///
3. first let's talk about hearing children of hearing parents here in America for example //
4. they speak English //
5. the parents // :speak English :and they bear a child and that child /// as the child grows // the parent-s talk / whether the child understands or not
6. they continue to contto speak //
7. they //// may the the baby may or may not understand may look at them and not understand a word
8. but the parents the aunts the uncles the cousins the brothers sisters friends // ev-ryone comes and talks at that baby //
9. the child is constantly bombarded with English as / he or

S1/13

- she grows //
10. tv // radio and a variety of media /// are constantly  
bombarding that child 'til that child learns English  
learns it's rules / learns how to combine words and /// how  
to use inflection how to show emotion //////////////
11. how to how to structure things like questions statements and  
commands
12. ya know // all the inner workings of the English language //
13. now let's compare that to a deaf child born of deaf parents ///
14. deaf parents sign ASL to that deaf child in the very same  
way day-in all day long // very same way that hearing parents  
s-speak to their deaf to their deaf :to their hearing child: ///
15. :so therefore a child who is deaf of deaf parents grows up  
learning the rules / gets comfortable with the language: ///  
in exactly the same way that an English speaking child  
learns English from hearing parents //
16. and their language is good //
17. their first language /// is / :they have excellent first  
language skills and they can transfer those language skills

S1/1B

- to their <sup>f</sup>second language when they learn English
18. they <sup>f</sup>tend to to learn English more <sup>F</sup>easily: //
19. :now let's look at the <sup>f</sup>third <sup>r</sup>case: //
20. hearing <sup>f</sup>parents who have / a <sup>f</sup>deaf <sup>F</sup>child ////////////////
21. you <sup>f</sup>know out of <sup>f</sup>all the deaf <sup>f</sup>children born in the United States :out of all the deaf children born <sup>F</sup>period ninety percent: are born to hearing <sup>F</sup>parents //
22. now when <sup>f</sup>that <sup>r</sup>occurs there's a g-reat deal of dis-com-<sup>F</sup>fort
23. hearing parents often know <sup>F</sup>nothing a-<sup>f-r</sup>about how to // <sup>f</sup>teach a / a <sup>f</sup>deaf <sup>f</sup>child or what to do about a <sup>F</sup>deaf child /
24. they will continue <sup>f</sup>to <sup>r</sup>talk just as they would to a hearing <sup>f</sup>baby /// :even though the deaf child can't <sup>f-r</sup>hear:
25. <sup>f</sup>friends // <sup>r</sup>relatives :and so <sup>r</sup>forth will come <sup>f</sup>over and <sup>f</sup>talk at <sup>f</sup>that <sup>f</sup>child: //
26. tv and <sup>f-r</sup>radio will continue to be <sup>f</sup>played but because the ears are closed <sup>f-r</sup> / the deaf child is <sup>F</sup>not getting the language <sup>r</sup>input //

---

(so the deaf child grows up with no sense of language developemen-t when they get to be five or six years old and go into school typically the deaf child doesn't know English but doesn't know ASL either.)



Speaker 2/Interpreter A

(no preceding utterance-begin at beginning of the tape)

1. Well // after the birth of my son / now comes the interesting part /
2. I wanna talk 'bout about my experiences raising my son //
3. now my son's name is Larwan //
4. now :my name's Larry my wife's name is Wanda so we took the first halves of our two names and put 'em together: //
5. and we got Larwan ///
6. now my wife decided not // to work the first year after the baby was born // and then we talked about what should we do //
7. ya know :sh-is my wife gonna continue to stay home: and / do the mother role and I'm gonna continue to work /
8. well we talked it through and we decided why not reverse roles ///
9. so / when my son was fourteen months old // my wife went to work and I decided // to stay at home /// to take care of my son
10. and lemme tell ya boy // "what an experience" ////

S2/IA

11. ahh I couldn't believe it
12. I mean wanna talk about being at home /// my routines at home and outdoors 'n shopping 'n doing all the different kinds of things that I've learned taking care of him //
13. tell ya my son has gave has given me alot of wonderfully interesting activities and headaches too /
14. and I'm really I-I'm amazed at mothers and how they can take care of not only one child but s-several children
15. I don't know how they do it //
16. well ya know my son is-a my st-son is s-deaf //
17. and he would-a try to communicate w-with me using these different gestures ///
18. and at first I :didn't understand him and I thought he was just making things up: //
19. but ya know // that's not true at all
20. he was really communicating
21. he really had these ideas //

S2/IA

ready to go to the bathroom so I protect myself:~ //

35. so it was really funny I kinda watched his little games when  
- he does this ///

-----  
(washing clothes is one of my favorite things to do to)

Speaker 2/InterpreterB

(no preceding utterance-begin at beginning of the tape)

1. What I wanna talk about <sup>f</sup>now is my experiences with my son <sup>F</sup>//
2. my son's name is <sup>F</sup>Larwan //
3. :my name's <sup>f-r</sup>Larry //
4. my wife's name is <sup>f-r</sup>Wanda /
5. we took half of each of our <sup>f</sup>names put it together and make <sup>f</sup>  
<sup>F</sup>Larwan: ////
6. my wife stayed home after the birth of our <sup>f</sup>baby and / and  
took care of him for a <sup>f</sup>year while I <sup>F</sup>worked /
7. and then we talked about :should we exchange <sup>r</sup>roles should I  
stay <sup>r</sup>home what should we <sup>r</sup>do and should my wife go back to  
<sup>F</sup>work: //
8. so we said <sup>R</sup>hey why don't I <sup>R</sup>stay home and / my wife go back  
to <sup>r</sup>work /
9. and we agreed to do that
10. we had-t :really <sup>f-r</sup>good communication and cooperation: /
11. well <sup>F-r</sup>Larwan // when he was <sup>f</sup>fourteen <sup>f</sup>mon-ths <sup>f</sup>old // my wife  
went back to work and <sup>r</sup>I took over the ch-care taking of our

S2/18

- child //
12. and it was n-ot easy let me tell you
13. I went through some really tough times //
14. there are four things I'm gonna talk about /
15. the things I do at home // what I do shopping / the out of doors / and our routines //
16. those four things are the things I'd like to talk about as a housefather //
17. when I stay at home // Larwan gives / does so many wonderful activities and he's so active: and / gives me alot of headaches too
18. I think mothers are just fabulous who stay at home and have three four different kids you know ///
19. communication is one important thing to talk about
20. my son Larwan is deaf //
21. and so we sign to each other
22. but sometimes I think he makes up the signs
23. ya know he uses really / wild signs ///

24. but then it turns out that the signs are purposeful ya know S2/18  
 and they're not off the wall //
25. so I have to watch real carefully and pretty soon I tune in  
 to what it was / that Larwan was saying //
26. and ya know it's funny I noticed that what he does is he's  
~~so~~ visual he picks up on everything that he'll watch what my  
 wife and I say and then he'll pick up on those things / and  
 use them himself
27. and they start out real gross and then they m-ove to really  
 refined //
28. 's fascinating to watch the development of those signs //
29. when we play we do so many things
30. we have in our house we have lots of rooms 'n //
31. it's a big house /
32. an-d a I have to really make sure that my house is childproof
33. :I feel like I need to walk around with him on a leash: //
34. but I don't
35. I want him to feel free ////
36. I'm fabulous for example at changing diapers

S2/IB

37. this is one of my skills //
38. when I first started I was a mess because he he pitched  
 right into my face and :all those kinds of things
39. :but it happened one and only one time /
40. because now I know how to cover him up real fast: //
41. and :I can tell by looking at his facial expression whether  
 I have to hurry or not: in covering up //
42. / I think mothers do that
43. they learn / from their fa their baby's facial expressions
44. I guess I won't go into that any further //

-----  
 (Washing clothes is another thing I've enjoyed)

## THE ACQUISITION OF ENGLISH BOUND MORPHEMES IN SIGN FORM