The issue of 'impairment': An analysis of diverging discourses used to represent the d/Deaf population in America

Lindsay C Nickels
Lancaster University
l.nickels@lancaster.ac.uk

Reference terms used to refer to d/Deaf individuals in America have long been a point of contention within the d/Deaf population. Although this population in its majority prefers to be regarded as members of a cultural and linguistic minority mainstream society often opts for a different view, one that associates them as a disabled, or 'impaired' group. It can be argued that the ubiquitous use of the term 'impaired' in classifying the d/Deaf population is one of the ways in which existing power relations are maintained, constraining the opportunities of those considered 'impaired'. d/Deaf individuals, as well as advocates and allies of the d/Deaf community, believe that the association with the disabled community and classification as 'impaired' promotes the same agenda popular years ago: one where d/Deaf people need the help of hearing people to compensate for their impairment and where the ultimate goal should be to mend said impairment in order to participate in society as a 'normal' person would (Lane, 1995; 1999). This paper presents a small-scale textual analysis that is used to determine to what degree these beliefs are true. The analysis presented in this paper reveals elements suggesting the existence of divergent discourses surrounding the use of the reference terms 'hearing-impaired' and 'd/Deaf'. Conducted within the framework of critical discourse analysis, this small-scale research study employs systems of Systemic Functional Linguistics (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014), including social actor representation (van Leeuwen, 1996) and transitivity, as the means for discourse analysis. Findings will show the discursive strategies in which the term 'hearing-impaired' is used and the extent to which the discursive use of this label supports the ideology that Deafness is deficiency.

1. Introduction

Reference terms used when referring to d/Deaf individuals in America have long been a source of strife for this community. A tight-knit, self-identified cultural and linguistic minority, this group has been characterized as defective for generations through terms such as 'deaf-mute,' 'deaf and dumb,' etc. 'Hearing-impaired,' as the latest of these

varieties, has worn a mask of political correctness and decency despite the Deaf community's open repudiation of it. d/Deaf individuals, as well as advocates and allies of the d/Deaf community, believe the term 'hearing-impaired' promotes the same agenda popular years ago: one where d/Deaf people need the help of hearing people to compensate for their impairment and where the ultimate goal should be to mend said impairment in order to participate in society as a 'normal' person would.

In this paper, I will carry out a small-scale textual analysis to determine to what degree these beliefs are true. Two texts have been chosen for analysis: one that makes use of the term 'd/Deaf' and another that uses the term 'hearing-impaired' as its chosen representation of d/Deaf people. This discourse analysis will help to identify the discourses that surround the use of each of these terms, as well as what discourse features may be present or absent in each. Through these findings, I will be able to draw some conclusions about the discourse in which the term 'hearing-impaired' is embedded and discuss the implications, if any, for the American Deaf community. This will provide some indication about what kind of damage this term may be causing to the overall representation of d/Deaf individuals, for it is possible that a discourse promoting d/Deafness as a problem can have the effect of mobilizing people towards rehabilitative efforts and in turn minimize their identity as a cultural and linguistic minority.

d/Deafness is predominantly considered to be a part of the wider definition of disability; therefore after introducing some general information about d/Deafness this paper will begin with discussion of critical disability discourse and how the arguments found therein specifically apply to the Deaf community. Beyond that there will be a section addressing discourse and identity, with a particular focus on how identities are socially constructed and ascribed to individuals. This will be followed by an explanation of the methods by which the data is to be analysed, the data collection process, and the selected data for this paper. The next section will illustrate the discourse analysis, highlighting specific findings and elaborating on them. Finally, there will be a discussion of the findings in terms of what was previously presented concerning critical disability discourse and identity, and what sort of implications arise from this study.

2. Literature review

This section discusses concepts of critical disability discourse in terms of the social model of disability (Oliver 1990) and as it relates to the d/Deaf

community in America. The social model, as distinct from the medical model of disability, endeavours to move focus from impairment as a person's functional limitations to disability as a person's social limitations established by endured direct and indirect discrimination (Crow 1996). It will introduce the various discourses that exist for d/Deafness as well as common reference terms and social representations that firmly plant these individuals in the medical model of disability. It will also address social representation theory and identity construction in terms of how they manifest discursively and what sort of implications they can have.

Before moving into the first section, it is important to clarify the general term used by the author to identify the d/Deaf population. It has likely been noted that this paper has used the term 'd/Deaf' as its main reference for the population in question. The term 'd/Deaf' is used as an all-encompassing term for the d/Deaf population in America since it incorporates both the reference term 'deaf' and 'Deaf' in one, known in the Deaf-World (Lane, Hoffmeister, & Bahan, 1996) as 'little-d deaf' and 'big-D Deaf,' respectively. 'Little-d deaf' is the reference term indicative of individuals who are deaf in the sense that they cannot hear, but who do not necessarily subscribe to Deaf culture or do not identify with the Deaf-World. To communicate, individuals who are 'deaf' may use sign language, speech, or a combination of the two. Conversely, 'big-D Deaf' is the reference term used to identify a member of the Deaf community. This community is rooted in Deaf culture, which has its own values, practices, language, etc. and views themselves as a cultural and linguistic minority. The reference term that encompasses both of these labels, 'd/Deaf,' is important in this paper since it is not to be assumed that every d/Deaf person referred to through the data and analysis found in this research identifies as a member of the Deaf community. This fact makes it necessary to use the inclusive term 'd/Deaf' so as not to inadvertently exclude any individuals.

2.1. d/Deafness and critical disability discourse

d/Deafness, and therefore the deaf population in America, is constructed in various ways by different groups. These constructions have been articulated in dualist (Lane 1995) and trilogist terms (Brueggemann 1999; Rosen 2003) each representing the view of d/Deafness as it is understood by the text producers: The dualist constructions identified as medical and cultural (Lane 1995), and the trilogist constructions identified as deafness as disability, pathology and as culture (Brueggemann 1999). Rosen (2003:922) takes a slightly different approach, identifying these as 'jargons' used in the constructions of deafness, where these 'jargons' are

said to be "developed by the social institutional stakeholders that work with deaf people in accordance with their agendas and practices." Rosen's 'jargons' are described as aiding the social institutional stakeholders in identifying deaf people and then are used to talk about them.

Rosen (2003) goes on to define the three 'jargons' of deafness as those of essentialism, social functionalism and agency. These stem from constellations of professions and serve to support the agenda of those institutions (Rosen 2003:923). Two of these constellations are informally referred to as the 'healing' professions (i.e. physicians, audiologists, otolaryngologists, etc.) and the 'helping' professions (i.e. educators, legal experts, and others working in a social service realm); they are known formally as the jargons of essentialism and social functionalism, respectively (Rosen 2003). The third constellation is made up of humanists and social scientists, those who could be considered of the critical or activist stance, and is known as the jargon of agency (Rosen 2003).

The characterizations Rosen creates in essentialism, social functionalism, and agency are good in terms of the way the d/Deaf population is represented by society, though the term 'jargon' does not serve quite as much use in discourse analytics. Since these 'jargons' are reflective of social institutional constructions, which can be considered social practices, and as stated by Rosen are used both in accordance with the producer's agenda and also used in identifying d/Deaf people while they are being talked about, it can be said that the construction is used to build the jargon, but is also represented by it. This suggests a dialectical relationship such as what is seen with discourse (Fairclough, 2015). In an effort to use linguistic terms more consistently throughout this document, I will be using the 'jargons' put forth by Rosen (essentialism, social functionalism, and agency) but instead characterizing them as 'discourses'.

In the case of this paper, discourse is viewed as a form of social practice, its dialectical relationship referring to a phenomenon where practices can be built through discourse as well as represented by it (Chouliaraki & Fairclough 1999). More specifically, I will use the term discourse to mean language used in constructing social situations or positions based on the discourse producer's reality and perspective on the world (van Leeuwen 2009; Fairclough 2009).

The discourses of essentialism and social functionalism are where the normalizing paradigm so ubiquitously used to refer to the Deaf community seems to have arisen. This paradigm is that which encapsulates the notions

of intervention and rehabilitation; and maintains the position that such a condition (i.e. d/Deafness) entails both a physical and social deficiency preventing such an individual from communicating. Further, it appears as though the only avenue for communication is an oral/aural one, a fact that would necessitate treatment to restore these individuals to societal norms (Rosen 2003).

The discourse of d/Deafness is married to the discourse of disability, as is seen in essentialism and social functionalism, from which I believe most discourse of d/Deafness is composed. It is often true that the discourse used when referring to d/Deafness and the discourse used when referring to disabled individuals are one and the same (such as what is seen with representing people as having a 'hearing-*impairment*', vision-*impairment*, mental-*impairment*, etc.); therefore, analyzing disability discourse, and keeping in mind those texts of critical disability discourse, is pertinent to discovering the implications of the term 'hearing-impaired' when used to refer to d/Deaf people.

This word 'disabled' is generally believed to describe someone who has some kind of ailment or condition preventing them from participating in 'major life activities' (Americans with Disabilities Act 1990); however, the UPIAS (The Union of Physically Impaired Against Segregation) defines disability as "the disadvantage or restriction of activity caused by a contemporary social organization which takes no or little account of people who have physical impairments and thus excludes them from the mainstream of social activities" (as cited in Oliver 1996:22). This definition implies that 'disabled' is a term that is socially constructed and used as an exclusionary tactic, where exclusion results in oppression and stigmatization (Oliver 1990). Exclusion leaves disabled parties dependent on non-disabled parties (usually medical professionals) to make decisions that affect their lives (Oliver 1990).

The Deaf community is no exception to this treatment, and in fact has endured much harsher means of exclusion in their past (i.e. sterilization and lack of education (Gannon 1981)). The link between d/Deafness and disability has been around for quite some time and while we have witnessed the end of some derogatory labels, such as 'deaf-mute' or 'deaf and dumb,' the oppression through identity construction remains intact in current social representations of the Deaf community (i.e. hearing-impaired). Simply using the term 'disabled' as a representative label has a significant effect on a people who generally refuse to regard themselves as such (Jones & Pullen 1989; Lane 1995). Though not as overtly derogatory, the word 'impaired' carries with it a great deal of negative connotation. Through the term 'hearing-impaired,' we subject upon the Deaf

community not only the idea that they are 'defective' or 'damaged' in some way, but also that they do not deserve the opportunities afforded to the remainder of the mainstream society. Even though d/Deafness is considered to be a 'disability,' it has been noted by many scholars (Lane 1995; McAlister 1994; Lane, Hoffmeister & Bahan 1996; Rosen 2003; Rosen 2008) that there is a presence of a Deaf culture, which mirrors that of a minority culture. Unfortunately, this minority culture carries with it an additional difference separating it from other minority cultures: a slight physical imperfection that yields a degraded social status while also discounting their claim to cultural status.

Changing the ideology requires a paradigm shift where the terms 'd/Deaf' and 'disabled' are not synonymous and as such the label 'hearing-impaired' loses its meaning. To do this it is important to adopt a new perspective on d/Deafness, one where those individuals who choose to identify as part of the d/Deaf community become part of a cultural and linguistic minority, one where the pathological world view is replaced by a world view possessing a discourse of agency (Rosen 2003) and the notion that self-identity is a personal decision and not an ascribed characteristic.

2.2. Social representations and ascribed identities

Since it has been argued that social representations of d/Deaf people are constructed through an essentialist or social functionalist discourse, it seems appropriate to discuss also the theory of social representations, as described by Moscovici (1973; 1984; 1998), a social psychologist. This theory explains that the representations come about through a social process whereby individuals construct said representation from a bank of shared knowledge (Moscovici 1973; Flick & Foster 2007). Flick & Foster (2007:197) add: "social representations, once developed and elaborated, come to constitute our reality." Our reality, then, is built on beliefs and attitudes manifesting as shared knowledge to form representations that can effectively ascribe a certain identity onto a social group. Moscovici (1998:243) better describes this phenomenon in saying that "representations appear similar to *theories* which order around a theme… a series of propositions which enable things or persons to be classified, their characters described, their feelings and actions to be explained, and so on." The fact that this is done based on shared knowledge, and in many cases knowledge that was inherited secondhand rather than ascertained through experience, leaves open the possibility for mis-classification and as such perpetuation of ill perceived identities.

Societal understandings of social groups are built from the identities ascribed through social representations. If a social representation continues to survive, it becomes more firmly ingrained into social norms, is activated more readily when referring to the social group in question, and ultimately makes it less likely to be replaced by a new representation. In the case of d/Deaf people being seen as having a disability, their identity appears to be situated by the hearing population, setting them apart in some way through a social representation of otherness and a discredited status in the world of 'normal' people, who assume they know how best to represent the d/Deaf population (Oliver 1990; Hughes 1999; Beauchamp-Pryor 2011). The question is whether or not the discourse of representation is intended to serve a certain agenda. It could perhaps be considered a discourse of hegemony, elaborated on by Kiesling (2006:264-5) as an "(unconscious) hegemonic strategy consisted in 'marking the Other': a discursive meta-strategy which situates the speaker as a member of a dominant, or central, social group by creating an 'other,' marginalized category."

Discourses, particularly those spoken by the dominant group, translate into "generally accepted ways of thinking" (Kiesling 2006), which makes it reasonable to assume that dominant discourses of social representation can be effective in ascribing a certain identity onto a social group that may be different than their own. If we can consider this discourse that of the hegemonic variety (whether conscious or unconscious), it will simply preserve dominant ideologies, further crystalizing an identity that is damaging to those who bear it. This is what makes analyzing social representations as they pertain to ascribed identity of social groups so imperative to critical discourse studies. Speakers have the ability to utilize the discourse of these social representations in order to purport their own ideologies and, in essence, ensure their power and influence is upheld as their discourse is embraced and re-produced by its recipients (Koller 2012:22).

3. Methodology

The discourse analysis presented in this paper will detail how certain discourse features are used within the two selected texts. Discourse features of texts should be analyzed in order to determine how they might be used strategically for the purpose of promoting a particular agenda or influencing the readership of said text. The analysis will be discussed in terms of concepts presented thus far: a critical review of the social representations of d/Deafness and resulting identities with these different representations (i.e. d/Deaf vs. hearing-impaired).

3.1. Discourse feature for analysis: Processes of transitivity

Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) (Halliday 1985; Halliday & Matthiessen 2004) as a theory claims that language use is functional in its essence, that it is used to make meanings and that social and cultural contexts can influence these meanings (Eggins 2004). An SFL approach specifically asks questions about how language is used and how meanings are developed through the use of language. It aims to "develop both a theory about language as social process *and* an analytical methodology which permits the detailed and systemic description of language patterns" (Eggins 2004:21). Drawing on this approach, processes found in the transitivity system, which looks at clauses in a sentence as forms of representation, describe the action or 'goings-on' in a series of events. Each clause consists of participants, processes, and circumstances that allow the audience to interpret who is doing what to whom. Various types of processes account for various kinds of doing: material, mental, relational, verbal, behavioral, and existential. Knowing who does what to whom provides the necessary information to examine social relationships and, especially in the case of this analysis, social representation. Analysis of this discourse feature will lend some insight into what groups may be represented as performing certain actions as well as help to identify patterns within a particular discourse; and for the purposes of this assignment, patterns of transitivity found within texts utilizing the term 'hearing-impaired' versus those utilizing 'd/Deaf.' For instance, if it is found that 'hearing-impaired' individuals are represented in many actions but are never performing any of these actions, it indicates that when represented as 'hearing-impaired' d/Deaf people are rarely assumed to have any agency since they are not the 'doers' of the actions in which they are involved.

Since this analysis hopes to find distinctive patterns in the discourse surrounding the use of the label 'hearing-impaired' and those surrounding the use of the label 'd/Deaf,' I will not only be examining what type of action is being done but also what specific action is being done. Data about both process type and actual process should reveal information that will shed some light on any divergent discourses that may exist.

3.2. Discourse feature for analysis: Social actor representation

Similar to what was mentioned with the processes of transitivity, social actor representation (see van Leeuwen 1996) also looks at who is doing

what to whom, except the focal points in this area of analysis are how the 'doer' and the 'done-to' are represented in texts (Thompson 2004) rather than what is done. Van Leeuwen (1996) approaches the analysis of social actor representation through a critical discourse analysis lens where sociological and linguistic categories meet. This type of analysis investigates specifically the participants involved in the action, including who they are and in what way are they being presented in the text. Additionally, it explores whether social actors are included or excluded, genericized or specified, or activated or passivized (Koller 2012).

An exclusion of a social actor may mean that they are simply not mentioned in the text at all, known as suppression, or they may be mentioned but not associated with a specific action, in which case they are backgrounded. This linguistic technique can be used to make social actors and representation rather opaque, disassociating them from actions that may normally be contested. In a similar vein actors may be genericized as a means of stripping the agency from those individuals as well as creating a kind of social distance: "symbolically removed from the readers' world of immediate experience, treated as distant 'others' rather than as people 'we' have to deal with in our everyday lives" (van Leeuwen 1996:48). Lastly, actors can be passivized if the author wants to background their role in an activity; therefore, activation and passivation can be employed strategically to highlight the actions of certain actors while downplaying the actions of other actors. Passivation can be seen to possess a similar end as exclusion: to disassociate social actors from particular actions.

3.3. Research questions

With the linguistic features mentioned above in mind, the text analysis present below will have as its focus the following research questions:

1. How is the representation of the d/Deaf population realized differently by text producers when using the label 'hearing-impaired' versus 'd/Deaf?'
2. What actors or actions are represented, how are they represented, why are they represented in that way, and what does this say about the roles d/Deaf people play in these actions? How do these representations differ between text samples?

In addition to the above questions, I am hoping this analysis will provide insight to the overarching question:

3. What conclusions can be drawn about the discursive construction of 'hearing-impaired' and how might it be different than the discursive constructions associated with the term 'd/Deaf?'

The remainder of this paper will be comprised of analyses of two different texts employing the terms in question as well as a discussion of the findings of said analyses.

3.4. Data collection

The presented analysis examines two news articles (found in appendices A & B) published and distributed in the US. Both articles were located through a search of terms 'hearing-impaired' and 'd/Deaf' within the online database of print media, Nexis, and are written in relation to education for the d/Deaf population in America. One article utilizes the term 'hearing-impaired' when referring to this population, while the other utilizes the term 'd/Deaf.' The goal of choosing these two data samples was to analyze the differences (or similarities) in discourse surrounding these two distinct terms when found in the same genre of writing, written around the same time in recent history, and pertaining to the same informational topic. Although the texts are not of the same length, they both should provide enough data from which some tentative conclusions can be drawn.

4. Analysis and discussion

The analysis and discussion of findings found below is first introduced by individual text sample, followed by a brief comparison of the two.

4.1. Text sample 1: 'New York to Teach Deaf in Sign Language, Then English'

This first article was taken from the New York Times, published in 1998, and discusses the decision of a public school for the d/Deaf to change their language of instruction from English (including English-like sign systems) to American Sign Language (ASL), the preferred language of the d/Deaf community. Just from the title and content of the article we can infer that it will promote a discourse of agency rather than essentialism or social functionalism, even though the general discourse found in discussions of education is that from the social functionalism school of thought (Rosen 2003). In order to determine if that inference is upheld, this analysis will

review the participants and processes they are ascribed to, as well as the parties represented as actor, goal, beneficiary, etc.

The acting participants found in the processes of text sample 1 (see table 1 below) do begin to shed a little light on who the social actors are as represented by the text producer. For purposes of this paper, I have only included those actors that may have some crossover between texts and whose role may have some bearing on the discursive construction of the d/Deaf population. The table below (table 1) includes who the participants are, what roles they are in, and how many times they were referenced in the text, both in each role and overall.

This data reveals that the processes in text sample 1 are most frequently ascribed to the school for the deaf as well as experts presented as advocates for deaf children (specialists in deaf education, deaf culture, leaders of organizations for deaf people, etc.) and the changes made by the public school in question. The former is not so much of a surprise considering the article has said school at its forefront. It is noteworthy, however, that the experts advocating for deaf people are not only a frequent participant, but are activated the majority of the time, mainly as 'sayer' (7 occurrences), in a number of different roles. The opponents, on the other hand, do not take a prominent role in the processes presented in text sample 1, claiming an acting participant role only 4 times.

Participants	Participant type (i.e. actor, token, carrier, etc.)	# of references	Total references
New York	Actor	4	5
	Token	1	
School for the Deaf (or rep., PS 47)	Actor	3	12
	Sayer	3	
	Carrier	5	
	Senser	1	
Deaf (children, students, teachers, etc.)	Actor	4	7
	Carrier	2	
	Senser	1	
Schools	Actor	6	6
Experts: those advocating for deaf	Sayer	7	16
	Token	6	
	Actor	2	
	Senser	1	
Experts: opponents	Senser	1	4
	Actor	1	
	Sayer	1	
	Token	1	
Things working/advocating	Carrier	2	5
	Token	2	

for ASL instruction	Actor	1	
American Sign Language	Actor	3	**6**
	Carrier	1	
	Token	2	
Hearing people	Actor	2	**2**
Alumni	Actor	1	**3**
	Sayer	1	
	Token	1	
Research	Actor	2	**2**

Table 1. Acting participants in processes: Text sample 1

In addition to the acting participants, the participants who are acted on (shown in table 2) are important in determining the representation of social actors. This data clearly shows that the d/Deaf population is the participant being acted on the most. Not only are d/Deaf participants acted on most frequently, but categorizing how they are acted on (specific processes) and who is acting on them (acting participants) suggests the use of a separate discourse. When looking at processes activated by opponents of using ASL as the language of instruction, we come across some interesting structures with 'd/Deaf' as the goal:

- *"it fails to prepare deaf people adequately for a hearing world"* ("it" refers to ASL)
- *"how [do] you go about giving a deaf child what they need to have a satisfying and fulfilling life"* (referring to the issue of using ASL as a language of instruction)
- *"They've tried to make us poor imitations of hearing people"* ("us" refers to d/Deaf)
- *"Deaf children tended historically to be viewed as defective beings who needed to be fixed"*

The first two examples were quotes from Arthur Boothroyd, a professor of speech and learning science who was classified in the article as an opponent of using ASL in the classroom. Although represented in a positive light in other areas of the article, here ASL is represented as the party responsible for deaf people's failures and the reason hearing people cannot give deaf children what they need to have a 'satisfying and fulfilling life.' What may be even more disturbing from this example is the illusion that hearing people are the givers of key components needed for a d/Deaf person to have a fulfilling life. In the third example, the social actor is excluded by means of backgrounding with the term 'they', which the reader can retrieve as hearing people who oppose the use of ASL based on what has been stated so far in the text. The final example also makes use of exclusion for we see who is being viewed as 'defective beings who needed to be fixed' but it is unclear who is viewing them in this manner; again I would refer to this as backgrounding since the elusive 'they' could also be easily retrieved as the acting participant of this

process. These examples imply discourse that leans more towards the essentialism/social functionalism realm.

Participants	Participant type (i.e. goal attribute, etc.)	# of references	Total references
Deaf (students, children, people, etc.)	Goal	13	**17**
	Beneficiary	1	
	Attribute	2	
	Value	1	
Education	Goal	1	**1**
Hearing-impaired	Goal	1	**1**
Students	Goal	2	**2**
ASL	Goal	3	**3**
School for Deaf (PS 47)	Phenomenon	1	**1**
Failure	Phenomenon	2	**4**
	Goal	1	
	Attribute	1	

Table 2. Participants acted on in processes: Text sample 1

Beyond those examples given above, the processes being 'done to' the d/Deaf participants appear to be more neutral: *teach, educate, should be treated like bilingual students not disabled ones, are enrolled,* etc. It may also be interesting to note that the strategy of exclusion is employed several times in relation to d/Deaf participants being acted on, though always in terms of backgrounding. Exclusion can serve different purposes, though in these cases it seems to be because the goal is already known to the audience. Some of these examples include:

- *"all teachers will teach* [d/Deaf students] *primarily in sign language…"*
- *"the first public school that will grant* [d/Deaf students] *a diploma…"*
- *"The teachers…have to communicate* [with d/Deaf students] *in the language…"*
- *"some* [d/Deaf children] *are enrolled in special state-supported schools"*

Based on these findings it can be said that text sample 1, where the label d/Deaf is used over hearing-impaired, shows d/Deaf participants as both those that are the 'doer' and the 'done to', though more frequently the 'done to' participant. Also, when referring to an 'opponent' of d/Deaf people using ASL as a primary means of communication, the opponent is often excluded as the actor or some other factor is represented as the actor that is preventing the d/Deaf participant from succeeding, such as ASL or a lack of help from hearing people.

4.2. Text sample 2: 'Few Ohio preschools focus on helping hearing-impaired kids'

Text sample 2 is taken from the Akron Beacon Journal, published in 2006, and discusses a fairly new program in Ohio meant to foster interaction between 'hearing-impaired' kids and their hearing counterparts. Beginning with the title, some traces of the discourse of social functionalism are already present as these kids are positioned straight away as the recipients of 'help' from the new preschool program. The following analysis will work to determine whether this discourse is present throughout the text. In keeping with the theme of analysis for the previous text sample, we will review the participants and processes they are ascribed to, as well as the parties represented as actor, goal, beneficiary, etc.

Evident from the findings presented in table 3, text sample 2 has as its acting participants mostly the program that is the central topic of the article and those associated with it, including teachers and Carrie Spangler, who is an audiologist but is included as though a direct part of the preschool program. Two key differences between this data set and what was found with text sample 1 are the lack of d/Deaf or 'hearing-impaired' actors and ASL as an actor. Though this text sample includes an expert, Carrie Spangler, there is only one who is mentioned throughout, suggesting a lack of varied perspectives on the program and its efficacy. An interesting addition to the acting participants in text sample 2 is the presence of specific references to a child enrolled in the program (Ben Bravis) and his mother (Janette Bravis). Employing specification in the representation of social actors can be used to support different intentions yet have the general purpose of pulling a specific actor into the readers' immediate experience, making them someone they have to 'deal with', according to van Leeuwen (1996:47). In this case it appears to be used as a tactic for making the experience more relatable for the readership, as though the people mentioned are just like the readers or those people the readers may know personally. This is mostly evident through the author opening the article with a scene of this boy arriving home from school and his mother's concern for her son's experience during the day, an experience all parents can relate to. Reading about something that affects an individual instead of a generic group of people draws the reader in to make a personal connection. Also unique to this data set is the inclusion of 'children with no hearing problems' as an actor who is to serve as a peer role model although their purpose as a role model is unclear.

Participants	Participant type (i.e. actor, token, carrier, etc.	# of references	Total references
Ohio preschools	Actor	1	**1**

Stark project (program for HI kids)/teachers	Actor	9	
	Carrier	4	**15**
	Token	2	
Other program	Token	1	**1**
Mom (Janette Bravis)	Senser	1	**3**
	Sayer	2	
Ben Bravis	Actor	2	**2**
Educational Service Center	Actor	2	**2**
Audiology Center/audiologists	Actor	2	**3**
	Token	1	
Carrie Spangler	Sayer	4	
	Carrier	1	**7**
	Senser	1	
	Token	1	
Children	Carrier	1	**1**
Hearing loss	Actor	1	**1**
Children w/o hearing loss	Actor	1	**1**

Table 3. Acting participants in processes: Text sample 2

Similar to text sample 1, a clear pattern emerges when analyzing who is being acted on: 'hearing-impaired' participants are the most common choice. I should note that the number of references to 'hearing-impaired' participants in table 4 includes any occurrences where the participant is 'hearing-impaired' regardless of whether or not that word is used to describe them; this means a reference to children when referred to as children in the program as well as one reference to the boy (Ben Bravis) who is introduced as 'hearing-impaired' in the beginning of the article. What are not included in this table are the verbiage components of verbal processes and longer phrases that only came up once; however, some of those will be discussed here.

Participants	Participant type (i.e. goal, attribute, etc.)	# of references	Total references
Hearing-impaired (students, children, people, etc.)	Goal	7	
	Beneficiary	2	**10**
	Attribute	1	
Hearing aids	Goal	1	**1**
Stark project	Goal	3	**3**
Children with no hearing problems	Value	1	**1**
Significant hearing loss	Attribute	1	**1**
Voices/mouth	Goal	2	**2**
high-tech equipment	Value	1	**1**

Table 4. Participants acted on in processes: Text sample 2

Even more interesting than 'hearing-impaired' represented as goal/beneficiary so often in this text are the types of processes they find themselves on the receiving end of. The seven references to 'hearing-impaired' participants as goal include processes *help* (x3), *serve, evaluate, affects*, and *forcing*; and when beneficiary, the processes are *provide support to*, and *serve as role model to*, all of which are transformative processes suggesting the 'hearing-impaired' population needs to be changed in some way. This is not the case in text sample 1 where there is a mixture of creative and transformative material processes being done to the d/Deaf population. Moreover, the participants who are performing these actions include *schools*, *Stark project (program)*, *audiologists*, *hearing loss* (that which affects), *teachers of the program*, and *children with no hearing problems*, all of whom are hearing. This provides some evidence to support the idea that d/Deaf or 'hearing-impaired' individuals are constantly being acted on by hearing people. These types of processes being done to 'hearing-impaired' participants are good indicators of the presence of a discourse that leans more closely towards essentialism/social functionalism and less towards agency.

The data from the tables above also suggest a heavy emphasis on speech and hearing even though the article is meant to focus on education. Audiologists and Carrie Spangler are displayed as acting participants ten times whereas preschool and the Educational Service Center (ESC) are only presented as acting participants three times, one of which is referring to ESC housing audiologists. 'Hearing aids,' 'voices,' 'mouth,' and 'high-tech equipment' are all represented as participants being acted on, however education is never mentioned as an actor or a goal. It's as though the topic that draws people into reading this article is conveniently excluded from the actual text that is found within. This suppression could be an indicator that the article intentionally seduces the reader with the idea of a promising educational program for 'hearing-impaired' children and then ignores the very concept of education and instead focuses on training these children to hear. This, of course, puts the child's 'disability' at the forefront resulting in a jargon that promotes intervention and rehabilitation to return the child to the social norm, that which is embodied by the 'children with no hearing problems' who are serving as role models.

4.3. Comparing text sample 1 & text sample 2

The above analyses have detailed many examples from each text that demonstrate patterns in the discourse surrounding the use of 'd/Deaf' and 'hearing-impaired.' There are some major discrepancies between the texts,

one of which includes the roles fulfilled by d/Deaf participants. In the first text sample, d/Deaf participants are represented both as the acting party and the party being acted on in processes, whereas in the second text sample they are never realized as an acting participant. In the latter, the 'hearing-impaired' kids have no agency and are not represented as people who can do things for themselves but rather as people who should have things done to/for them. The second large discrepancy is in the text samples' focus on education. Both articles portray education as the target of the text; however, while text sample 1 continually refers to the educational change and takes time to include comments from supporters and opponents of said change, text sample 2 simply alters the focus to one that discusses the rehabilitation of 'hearing-impaired' kids' hearing and speech inabilities. The processes being done to the d/Deaf/hearing-impaired participants were also quite different. Those in text sample 1 where d/Deaf kids are the goal include actions that have no real negative connotation, such as *teach* and *educate* (see above for more detail); whereas those in text sample 2 include 'hearing-impaired' kids as goals of actions such as *help*, *serve*, and *force*, all of which have an implication of the kids not having the ability or wherewithal to do things without the help of a hearing person.

5. Conclusion

The above analysis and discussion clearly illustrate a difference in discourse when employing the term 'hearing-impaired' over 'd/Deaf.' More research, perhaps more varied in its approach, is needed to determine if the patterns shown in this brief textual analysis are consistent across a broader range of texts. Although somewhat limited in scope due to length constraints and a very small sample of texts, this textual analysis provides some evidence to support the idea that the representation of the d/Deaf population is constructed differently when using different terms. If the term 'hearing-impaired' is continually used, the representation it upholds has the potential to occupy the social space of shared knowledge, creating a reality with serious implications for individuals who are d/Deaf. This could be realized as the continued promotion for the discourse of essentialism/social functionalism and an aim towards rehabilitation rather than adopting the perspective of agency and regarding the d/Deaf population as a cultural and linguistic minority. This analysis serves as a springboard for more in depth research, which I intend to carry out, that will aim to reveal the extent to which these representations are rooted in social discourse.

REFERENCES

Beauchamp–Pryor, Karen. 2011. Impairment, cure and identity: "where do I fit in?"
    Disability & Society 26(1). 5–17. doi:10.1080/09687599.2011.529662
Brueggemann, Brenda Jo. 1999. *Lend me your ear: Rhetorical constructions of deafness*.
    Washington, D. C.: Gallaudet University Press.
Chouliaraki, Lilie & Norman Fairclough. 1999. *Discourse in Late Modernity*. Edinburgh:
    Edinburgh University Press.
Crow, Liz. 1996. Including all of our lives: Renewing the social model of disability. In
    Jenny Morris (ed.), *Encounters with strangers: Feminism and disability*. London:
    Women's Press.
Eggins, Suzanne. 2004. *An Introduction to Systemic Functional Linguistics*, 2nd edn. New
    York: Bloomsbury.
Fairclough, Norman. 2009. A dialectical-relational approach to critical discourse analysis
    in social research. In Ruth Wodak & Michael Meyer (eds.), *Methods of Critical
    Discourse Analysis*, 162-186. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
Fairclough, Norman. 2015. *Language and power*, 3rd edn. New York: Routledge.
Few Ohio preschools focus on helping hearing-impaired kids. 2006. *Akron Beacon
    Journal.*
Flick, Uwe & Juliet Foster. 2007. Social representations. In Carla Willig & Wendy
    Stainton-Rogers (eds.), *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research in psychology*,
    195-206. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
Gannon, Jack. 1981. *Deaf heritage: A narrative history of deaf America*. Silver Spring,
    MD: National Association of the Deaf.
Halliday, Michael A. K. 1985. *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. London: Edward
    Arnold.
Halliday, Michael A. K. & Christian M. I. M. Mattheissen. 2004. *Introduction to
    Functional Grammar,* 4th edn. New York: Routledge.
Hughes, Bill. 1999. The Constitution of impairment: Modernity and the aesthetic of
    oppression. *Disability & Society 14*(2). 155–172. doi:10.1080/09687599926244
Jones, Lesley & Gloria Pullen. 1989. 'Inside we are all equal': A European social policy
    survey of people who are deaf. In Len Barton (ed.), *Disability and Dependency,* 127-
    137. Bristol, PA: Taylor & Francis Inc.
Kiesling, Scott F. 2006. Hegemonic identity-making a narrative. In Anna De Fina,
    Deborah Schiffrin & Michael Bamberg (eds.), *Discourse and Identity,* 261-287.
    Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Koller, V. 2012. How to analyse collective identity in discourse – textual and contextual
    parameters. *Critical Approaches to Discourse Analysis Across Disciplines 5*(2). 19-
    38.
Lane, Harlan. 1995. Constructions of deafness. *Disability & Society 10*(2). 171–190.
    doi:10.1080/09687599550023633
Lane, Harlan. 1999. *The mask of benevolence: Disabling the deaf community.* San Diego,
    CA: DawnSignPress.
Lane, Harlan, Robert Hoffmeister & Ben Bahan. 1996. *A Journey into the DEAF-
    WORLD*. San Diego, CA: DawnSignPress.
Lee, Felicia R. 1998. New York to teach deaf in sign language, then English. *The New
    York Times,* B3.
McAlister, Jamie. 1994. Deaf and hard-of-hearing criminal defendants: How you gonna
    get justice if you can't talk to the judge? *Arizona State Law Journal 26*(Spring). 163–
    200.

Moscovici, Serge. 1973. Foreword. In Claudine Herzlich (ed.), *Health and illness: A social psychological analysis*. London: Academic Press.

Moscovici, Serge. 1984. The phenomenon of social representations. In Robert Farr & Serge Moscovici (eds.), *Social Representations*, 3-69. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Moscovici, Serge. 1998. The history and actuality of social representations. In Uwe Flick (ed.), *The Psychology of the Social*, 209-247. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Oliver, Michael. 1990. *The politics of disablement: Critical texts in social work and the welfare state.* London: Macmillan.

Oliver, Michael. 1996. *Understanding disability: From theory to practice*. London, UK: Macmillan.

Rosen, Russell S. 2003. Jargons for deafness as institutional constructions of the deaf body. *Disability & Society 18*(7). 921–934. doi:10.1080/0968759032000127335

Rosen, Russell. S. 2008. Descriptions of the American deaf community, 1830–2000: epistemic foundations. *Disability & Society 23*(2). 129–140. doi:10.1080/09687590701841166

Thompson, G. 2004. *Introducing Functional Grammar,* 2nd edn. London: Arnold.

United States Department of Justice Civil Rights Division. 1990. *Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990* (P.L. 110-325). http://www.ada.gov/pubs/adastatute08.pdf

van Leeuwen, Theo. 1996. The representation of social actors. In Carmen Rosa Caldas-Coulthard & Malcolm Coulthard (eds.), *Texts and practices: Readings in critical discourse analysis*, 32-70. London: Routledge.

van Leeuwen, Theo. 2009. Discourse as the recontextualization of social practice: a guide. In Ruth Wodak & Michael Meyer (eds.), *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*, 144-161. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.