

RESEARCH OUTPUTS / RÉSULTATS DE RECHERCHE

Register variation in LSFb

Paligot, Aurore; Meurant, Laurence

Publication date:
2013

Document Version
Peer reviewed version

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for published version (HARVARD):

Paligot, A & Meurant, L 2013, 'Register variation in LSFb: The influence of the metalinguistic function', *Theoretical Issues in Sign Language Research (TISLR)* 11, London, United Kingdom, 10/07/13 - 13/07/13.

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal ?

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

We formulate the hypothesis that, if two discourses have similar conditions of production and formality levels but differ in their use of the metalinguistic function, the metalinguistic discourse would exhibit the lower rate of phonological deviance compared with the non-metalinguistic one.

Contexts

+ Metalinguistic		- Metalinguistic	
C1	LSFB grammar sequences	pamphlet about the situation of SL interpretation	C2
			+ Formal
			- Formal
C3	discussion on technical terminology	spontaneous conversation about people	C4

Methodology

FOUR CONTEXTS We compared four productions of the same signer, two of them displaying an extensive use of the metalinguistic function.

VARIABLES On the basis of a preliminary analysis, six phonological features were selected. These were assumed to be potentially sensitive to contextual variation. Variables were coded for three contextual factor groups : formality factor (+/- formal), metalinguistic factor (+/- metalinguistic) and context factor (C1, C2, C3, C4).

CODING In each context, at least the first 30 occurrences of variables 3 and 6 were coded, as well as at least the first 60 occurrences of variables 1, 2, 4 and 5 (Total : 1329 tokens).

ANALYSIS Two independent Rbrul analyses were conducted on each set of variables. The first analysis investigated the overall significance of context on variation, while the second analysis calculated the respective strengths of the metalinguistic and the formality factors on variation compared to each other.

Selected variables

V1 Behavior of the non-dominant hand

V2 Suppression of movement repetition

V3 Contact in symmetric signs

V4 B handshape loosening

V5 Location dissymmetry of 2-handed signs

V6 Lowering of forehead located signs

THE INFLUENCE OF CONTEXT Four variables appear to be very sensitive to context and share the same overall pattern of variation. Deviant forms of these variables gradually increase while the degree of emphasis placed on the language itself decreases. The behavior of the non-dominant hand is a significant indicator of speech carefulness. Variables 2 and 3 do not vary according to context (syntactic elements and speed rate may respectively explain their variation).

V1 V6 V4 V5

FORMAL - METALINGUISTIC INTERACTION Results show an interaction between formality and the metalinguistic function for the dissymmetry in two-handed signs (V5) and the lowering of forehead located signs (V6).




The low rate of dissymmetry in the location of two-handed signs (V5) is a marker of very careful speech productions. Conversely, the high rate of lowering of forehead located signs (V6) marks very relaxed speech.

Bayley R. 2003. "The Quantitative Paradigm". In Chambers, J.K., The Handbook of Language Variation and Change. Hoboken: Wiley-Blackwell.
Halliday, M.A.K. 1978. Language as Social Semiotic: The Social Interpretation of Language and Meaning. London: Edward Arnold.
Hoopes, R. 1998. "A Preliminary Examination of Pinky Extension: Suggestions Regarding Its Occurrence, Constraints, and Function". In Lucas C., Pinky Extension and Eye Gaze: Language Use in Deaf Communities. Washington, D.C.: Gallaudet University Press, 3-17.
Hoopes, R. et al. 2002. "Analyzing Variation in Sign Languages: Theoretical and Methodological Issues." In Dively V. et al., Signed Languages: Discoveries from International Research. Washington, D.C.: Gallaudet University Press, 135-162.
Jakobson, R. 1963. Essais de Linguistique Générale. Paris : Editions de Minuit.
Meurant, L. and Garcia, B., "Signing about signing: Sign metalinguage in LSF and LSFb". Theoretical Issues in Sign Language Research 10, Purdue University, 30 septembre - 2 octobre 2010, West Lafayette, Indiana, USA (poster presentation).
Quinto-Pozos, D. et al. 2010. "Register Variation in Mimetic Gestural Complements to Signed Language". In Journal of Pragmatics 42, 557-584.
Schembri, A. et al. 2006. "Name Dropping: Location Variation in Australian Sign Language." In Lucas C., Multilingualism and Sign Language : from the Great Plains to Australia. Washington, D.C.: Gallaudet university press, 121-156.
Zimmer, J. 1989. "Toward a Description of Register Variation in American Sign Language." In Lucas C., The Sociolinguistics of the Deaf Community, San Diego: Academic Press Inc., 253-272.



Results

Context influence on deviant forms



THE INFLUENCE OF THE METALINGUISTIC FUNCTION Formality has a greater impact on variation than the metalinguistic function.

The variable that is the most influenced by the metalinguistic function is the loosening of the B handshape (V4).



Results suggest that the metalinguistic function is a factor of register variation in LSFb. This factor distinguishes between more and less careful speech productions in discourses with the same level of formality. The formal to informal continuum has been refined by taking this factor into account.

However, the difference between the formal and the less formal contexts might be due to the difference between the monologue and the dialogue modality. The study should be expanded with more interaction formats.

We would like to thank Silvia Gabarró López and Bruno Sonnemans. Our research is funded by a F.R.S-FNRS Research Fellow Grant and the F.R.S-FNRS Incentive Grant for Scientific Research n° F.4505.12.