

THE DEAF HERITAGE COLLECTIVE:
COLLABORATION WITH CRITICAL INTENT

KIRSTIE JAMIESON

Lecturer

School of Creative Industries
Edinburgh Napier University
EH10 5DS, Edinburgh, United Kingdom
e-mail: k.jamieson@napier.ac.uk

MARTA DISCEPOLI

Researcher

School of Creative Industries
Edinburgh Napier University
EH10 5DS, Edinburgh, United Kingdom
e-mail: M.Discepoli@napier.ac.uk

ELLA LEITH

Independent Researcher

e-mail: ella.leith@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The paper reflects upon the Deaf Heritage Collective, a collaborative project led by Edinburgh Napier University's Design for Heritage team and Heriot Watt's Centre for Translation And Interpreting Studies. The project aimed to advance discussion around the British Sign Language Act (Scottish Government 2015) and bring into being a network of Deaf communities and cultural heritage organisations committed to promoting BSL in public life. The aim of this paper is to contextualise the project and its creative approach within the distinctly Scottish context, and the ideals of critical heritage, critical design and the museum activist movement. This paper presents the context and creative processes by which we engaged participants in debate and the struggles we encountered. We describe these processes and the primacy of collaborative *making* as a mode of inquiry. We argue that by curating a workshop space where different types of knowledge were valorised and where participants were encouraged to "think with" materials (Rockwell and Mactavish 2004) we were able to challenge the balance of power between heritage professionals and members of the Deaf community. By harnessing the explanatory power of collaborative *making* we debated the assemblages of epistemic inequality, and the imagined futures of Deaf heritage in Scotland.

KEYWORDS: Deaf heritage • BSL (Scotland) Act 2015 • critical heritage • critical design • participatory research

INTRODUCTION

Unacknowledged by the UNESCO conventions that seek to categorise and establish hierarchies of cultural value, sign languages across the world are denied the epistemic status of heritage. In the shadows of an increasingly globalised and commercialised heritage industry, sign languages largely remain unrecognised as symbolic spaces and practices of cultural identity. This exclusion sits uneasily amongst an emphasis upon endangered languages (UNESCO 2003; 2010) and the perceived threat of linguistic extinction at the hands of globalisation and economically powerful languages (Austin and Sallabank 2011).

The distinct lack of Deaf heritage in our museums and in our historic built environment points to the continued resistance to understanding D/deaf lives culturally (the convention D/deaf is borrowed from Deaf Studies scholarship and will be explained below). Heritage discourses do not identify sign languages positively as the products of human activity that are socially transmitted and embedded in distinct practices. Instead, the rich heritage of sign languages has been elided within heritage discourse.

In lieu of a cultural approach to sign languages, the universalising category of 'disability' often subsumes sign language and Deaf identity to a medicalised category based on a *lack of hearing*. This reductive conceptualisation limits what can be said about D/deaf people and Deaf culture. Positioned within a disability discourse Deaf identity is restricted to a handful of social rather than cultural domains, including welfare bureaucracy, pensions and benefits, statistics, medicine, and education (Grue 2016).

Our initial research of the status of Deaf culture within the Scottish heritage context, revealed that museum and heritage professionals often uncritically situate Deaf communities and British Sign Language (BSL) within a disability framework where D/deaf people are only imagined as visitors, at the point of access/consumption rather than at the point of production of heritage content. Deaf culture's *outsideness* of authorised heritage discourse (Smith 2006) relates to broader structural inequalities wherein Deaf culture is denied the epistemic status aligned with education institutions such as Deaf Schools, Deaf arts spaces and National Museums. There is what might be described as a systemic denial of Deaf culture in public life, and in the cultural and education institutions bestowed with the authority and infrastructure to reflect the diversity of society.

This inequality has been addressed through a legal change in Scotland. On September 17, 2015, the British Sign Language (Scotland) Act (hereafter the BSL Act; see Scottish Government 2015) was passed and Scotland became the first country in the UK to grant legal status to BSL. The formal recognition of BSL as a language of Scotland through the BSL Act marked a seminal moment in Scottish life and beyond. The formal duty placed on Scottish ministers to promote and facilitate the promotion of BSL was accompanied by a pledge from the Scottish Government "to make Scotland the best place in the world for people whose first or preferred language is BSL to live, work and visit" (Scottish Government 2015). The legal mandate brought with it an emphasis upon culture and public life and invoked a call to action from cultural institutions such as museums and heritage organisations to play a role in the representation and experience of Scotland's D/deaf communities.

Although the BSL Act did not create any enforceable rights, or provide a roadmap for the content of public bodies' language plans (De Meulder 2016) it nevertheless signalled a historic moment. The recognition of BSL as an official language made way for registering the symbolic value of Deaf cultural heritage and the preservation of its historic practices, spaces and identities. It also revealed an absence of engagement between Scotland's cultural institutions and D/deaf communities, which in structural terms signified a lack of equality and access to cultural spaces, resources and experiences of public life. The revised status of BSL posed a series of complex challenges to the heritage sector, not least because museum and heritage professionals were unsure how to engage with D/deaf communities, and how to renegotiate the space between disability and culture. The D/deaf community's formalised rights to cultural expression, representation and investment provided us with an opportunity to create a heritage network comprising of representatives of Scotland's Deaf community and its professional heritage networks.

We come from a heritage and design background and align ourselves with a participatory and critical approach to heritage that echoes the ambitions of the Museum as Activist movement. Over two years, we developed the Deaf Heritage Collective project, which sought to advance discussion around the BSL Act and bring into being a network of Deaf communities and cultural heritage organisations committed to promoting BSL and Deaf heritage in Scotland's public life. Our aim at the outset was both to explore collaboratively Deaf culture's marginal status and develop a creative platform from which participants could communicate new ways of thinking about and designing Deaf heritage. These aims were sustained by a wider ambition to call to account the professionals who produce heritage materialities from which Deaf culture has been excluded.

This paper describes the context and creative processes by which we engaged participants in debate and the struggles we encountered. We begin by considering the reflexive and politicised nature of Deaf identity and Deaf heritage before describing the challenges posed to non-deaf and non-signing researchers working in the field. We then contextualise the project's ambitions in relation to critical heritage, critical design and the museum as activist. Following from this, we discuss three workshop activities and the debates they generated. Finally, we conclude with a brief discussion of the project's outcomes and the new conceptualisations built through our collaborative approach.

HERITAGE AND DEAF IDENTITY

Awareness of D/deaf lives beyond a pathologised audiological status has been the subject of Deaf activist work since the 1970s. Much of this activist work has invoked a distinction between the audiological and the cultural, often expressed in the literature through the convention D/deaf. The use of deaf denotes a condition of hearing loss only, with no presumption that the individual has any knowledge of, let alone preference for, a sign language; whereas Deaf is used to refer to members of a signing community who share practices, histories, traditions and coded behaviour.

More recent research moves away from this binary to reflect upon the complexity of identities and linguistic practices caught between an oversimplified dichotomy (Kusters et al. 2017). Nevertheless, we have chosen to use the capitalised emphasis to

signify a culturally Deaf community and heritage. This choice reflects our own disciplinary distance from the prevailing debates, and our own effort to reflect the significance of Deaf culture to the subject of museums and heritage organisations.

The D/d convention remains a powerful mechanism through which to highlight the conscious identification with an oppressed Deaf past, cultural values, practices and identity. To be more precise, Deaf is politicised in a way that reflects the processual formation of a Deaf community: as a consciously developed alternative to the oralist (the privileging of speech in deaf education) and audist (the conferring of superiority to those who can hear) construction of deaf as a pathological deficit. Choosing the Deaf identity is a political and cultural celebration and disavowal of an oppressive societal context. To be Deaf is *to choose to belong* to a heritage, to a shared history and a shared linguistic investment in Deaf futures.

THE LIVED EXPERIENCE OF DEAF HERITAGE

Heritage as a concept has a strongly diachronic element; in the Deaf world, this diachronicity has a different resonance due to the strong horizontal lines of transmission. For example, to be considered 'traditional' in the Deaf world, a story must be felt to resonate with the 'personal': a traditional story is one that says something that is felt to be authentic about the experience of being deaf in a hearing society and, crucially, about 'discovering' one's culture.

There have been Deaf communities in Scotland since at least the 18th century and arguably long before, yet within each generation the vast majority are born into non-Deaf families and therefore enter the community horizontally (Solomon 2012), through the sharing and privileging of personal experience. In his studies of families with disabled and transgender children, Andrew Solomon (*ibid.*) reveals the formative role of horizontal solidarities in the development of a self-affirming identity. In lieu of vertical identities passed down from parents and grandparents, the author argues that deaf children often discover Deaf identity horizontally in the shared pride of a common language and cultural history. However, unlike minority spoken language groups, Deaf communities cannot take the domestic vertical transmission of either language or culture for granted, leading to narratives of personal experience (often, although not exclusively, transmitted in a sign language) becoming a core means of passing on cultural knowledge. For many hearing people, this is a challenge to their assumptions about what heritage is: it would be rare for a brief story about a hearing person's experience of education a mere decade ago to be framed in terms of heritage. However, within Deaf storytelling culture, the personal testimony of a young deaf person from a mainstream school meeting a Deaf adult for the first time has greater resonance than the personal: each autobiographical narrative represents a seminal moment of connection to Deaf culture, an experience mirrored by other Deaf people across the centuries.

Heritage from this perspective is attentive to the affective relations within communities and finds its significance in the self-identification, solidarity, support and cultural transmission of the community. This is not block-buster heritage, but heritage as memory, marginalised identity and belonging. In the context of the community's lived transmission of Deaf culture through BSL Deaf heritage becomes an act of reclamation;

an identity and a right to cultural spaces that have been disappearing from British cities and towns since the late 20th century. In particular, the disappearance of Deaf clubs and residential schools, which were historically permanent sites of identity formation and heritage transmission (O'Brien et al. 2019), has limited the traditional opportunities for cultural transmission.

A major factor in this decline was the shift in education policy in the 1970s and 1980s towards mainstreaming; now, the vast majority of deaf children attend mainstream schools, are frequently the sole deaf child in their peer group, and have limited opportunities to meet other deaf children, or adult Deaf role models and so learn BSL. They are therefore less likely to gravitate towards Deaf clubs on leaving school, and the consequent reduction in numbers of members, combined with financial constraints, has led to many Deaf clubs closing. In place of physical Deaf clubs, Deaf people are increasingly establishing cultural spaces online, most notably on Facebook (for example the DEAF LAND UK closed group), and as occasional, temporary 'take overs' of mainstream settings such as pubs. However, these spaces privilege those who are confident accessing virtual or 'culturally hearing' spaces respectively, and it is perhaps too early to determine whether these new spaces are filling the vacuum left by the decline of the Deaf club as an institution. Certainly, many Deaf people from hearing families have reported their first entrance to a Deaf club, as an established physical venue, as a seminal moment of shared Deaf experience and sensoria, and as formative in their realisation of their own Deaf identity. As one interviewee described in BSL in a Deaf oral history DVD (*Presenting the Past*, 2015), "I felt like I belonged there – like putting on an old pair of slippers and feeling immediately comfortable and relaxed. That changed my life" (translated English subtitles provided on the DVD). As Frank Bechter (2008: 61) observes of the majority of signers who "are not born signers", the Deaf community is, by necessity, "a community of 'converts'".

This idea of 'conversion' is one aspect of the dynamic "process by which Deaf individuals come to actualise their Deaf identity" (Ladd 2003: xviii), which has been termed Deafhood by the Deaf scholar Paddy Ladd. The concept of Deafhood presents an ontological claim to community heritage and is part of a wider cultural argument for the widespread access of "sign language learning and knowledge and deaf socialisation" for every deaf person (Kusters and De Meulder 2013: 429). Fundamentally, Deaf culture can be defined by a strongly horizontal identification and transmission of culture (i.e. from peers) rather than a vertical one (i.e. from family); proportionately very few individuals grow up with Deaf culture as their home culture, and those who do tend to acknowledge this as a privilege. Furthermore, the vast majority of children born to deaf parents are in turn hearing, and although many hearing children of deaf parents consider themselves to be 'culturally Deaf' due to their formative home experiences, they are overwhelmingly likely to have hearing children of their own who tend to 'revert' to identification with the majority hearing culture. This phenomenon has led to the Deaf community being described as "one generation thick" (Davis 2007, quoting Robert Hoffmeister),¹ with the transmission of Deaf heritage recognised as vulnerable to disruption between generations, unless the deaf individual receives sufficient and supported opportunities to socialise with others with the same identification (itself dependent on the availability of such opportunities, knowledge that they exist, and the willingness of non-deaf family members to support engagement with them).

It has been argued that the lack of these opportunities results in an existential sense of being “caught between a rock and a hard place” in terms of actualising either a culturally Deaf, or a culturally hearing identity (DEX 2003). As Solomon (2014: ix) observes of the Deaf community, “true membership [... has] a great deal to do with the actual shared experience of deafness”, whether linked to its differently organised sensoria or to shared experiences of marginalisation. Even when the transmission of certain aspects of Deaf heritage has been disrupted between generations (for example, community knowledge of Deaf-led education programmes prior to and despite the introduction of Oralist education), other aspects are continuous, i.e. a peer-transmitted, constantly regenerating heritage of stories about living within and (crucially) resisting oppression from hearing society. Ladd (2003: 308) alludes to this in his description of deaf schoolchildren sharing through storytelling ‘the 1001 Victories’ that they and others like them “had wrung by ingenuity from the world”, and a hunger for knowledge of other Deaf lives has been reported by children and adults alike. Given the reduction in physical spaces that valorise Deaf culture, and given that historically Deaf culture has by necessity been covert (Ladd 2003: 329), elevating Deaf heritage to the public domain becomes a powerful affirmation of the Deafhood journey itself.

LEGITIMACY AS HEARING RESEARCHERS: INTERLINGUAL HERITAGE NETWORKS

It is widely acknowledged that Deaf communities tend to be cautious and even mistrustful of the research agendas of hearing academics. As the majority of researchers who venture into Deaf communities are not themselves deaf, there is a legacy of problematic and imbalanced relationships between researchers and research participants, “fraught with problems, prejudice, mistrust, misunderstanding, unmet expectations, identity crises and pervasive mythologies” (Baker-Shenk and Kyle 1990: 65). In short, Deaf people often report “feelings of powerlessness and apathy in relation to the [research] programmes and activities of hearing people” (ibid.: 66). In relation to Deaf heritage, desire for greater mainstream recognition is tempered with grounded concerns about artefacts, stories and spaces being appropriated by and/or misrepresented by hearing heritage professionals and museum curators.

In light of these concerns, in the early stages of the project we sought the guidance of the charity Deaf History Scotland on how to navigate this history of mistrust. We should acknowledge that, although we benefited from the cooperation and guidance of the whole committee, our primary liaison was the sole hearing member of that committee, its then secretary Dr Ella Leith. An academic researching Deaf heritage, Ella had been compelled to reflect upon her privilege in relation to the education, cultural and heritage sectors, where

doors opened to me that did not open to my colleagues on the committee, and that much more prestige was attached to me-as-researcher describing *their* lived experiences, than there was recognition of them as experts about their own and other D/deaf experiences.

Ella's role within Deaf History Scotland was frequently that of an ambassador to the hearing world, approaching and attempting to enthuse heritage institutions and academic project leaders about Deaf heritage, with the aim of opening opportunities for Deaf History Scotland to expand its reach and fulfil its remit to promote and preserve Deaf heritage.

A non-deaf, non-native signer taking on the role of representing the heritage of D/deaf communities to hearing audiences is inherently problematic, especially since the language of this representation – English – poses, in both its spoken and written forms, a problem for many D/deaf people. Academia, in particular, is a “discursive landscape that was not designed for [D/deaf people]” and, indeed, could almost have been “designed specifically to exclude deaf signers” (Bechter 2008: 69). Access to higher education is effectively restricted for many whose primary language is BSL, and there is more generally a crisis of low outcomes in deaf education (O'Neill et al. 2014). As an academic, Ella had access to the sources contributing to the broader institutional context of Deaf heritage. As she explains:

Too frequently it became apparent that I, a hearing person, had acquired in a very short time a greater knowledge of the very history that many deaf people describe themselves as ‘hungry’ to learn. Uncomfortably, I was sometimes treated as an authority *by deaf people* in regard to key aspects of *their* heritage. It is crucial to valorise deaf lived experiences over academic ‘authority’, while also working to make the academy accessible as a community resource.

Without insight into the power dynamics at play from the ‘hearing-facing border’ of the Deaf world, the development of the Deaf Heritage Collective would probably have taken a far less informed pathway. Ella's cross-border position allowed her to “broker understanding across boundaries, translate perspectives and language, and be aware of how elements of one practice would be perceived, interpreted and misunderstood in another” (Cameron et al. 2019: 86), which developed trust between the Deaf History Scotland committee and the project leaders. It is highly unlikely that, without Deaf History Scotland's buy-in and guidance, the Deaf Heritage Collective would have resonated with the community as it did.

ACTIONING OF HERITAGE

As part of the decision to claim an evolving ‘collective’ in our project title (Deaf Heritage Collective), we agreed upon a definition of ‘collective’ that was sensitive to the different language communities and areas of expertise. Throughout the touring workshops we presented participants with the working definition of collective as a process of working together as a group to achieve a common objective (see Photo 1). Our approach and definition emphasize the *social action of heritage* – the people, places and values that are brought into a discursive frame transforming and re-evaluating meanings and significance through debate and collaborative making. It is this *actioning* of heritage through critical design that we wished to pursue from the outset.

It is within this context that our project sought to engage different communities in debate about the possibilities afforded by a new legal status of BSL in Scotland. The

two-year project began in January 2018 and was structured through four touring workshops and exhibitions in Glasgow, Inverness, Edinburgh and Stirling. These four cities were chosen to reveal more local representations of Deaf culture, geographic provision and cultural resources. In addition to inviting D/deaf participants from across Scotland, we also invited Deaf historians and academics from Museum Studies as well as heritage professionals and curators from Scotland's cultural sector. Responses to our invitations were initially either negative, or reflected an industry-wide lack of understanding of Deaf heritage. More than half of our invitations to industry professionals were met with an attempt to re-direct us to museums' 'community access' staff. This widespread response revealed what we came to recognise as a historically inadequate approach to inclusion at the point of heritage consumption rather than production. Moreover, the prevailing logic revealed the complicity of the heritage sector in the continuing exclusion of D/deaf and disabled *contributive relations* to museums' contents and narratives.



Photo 1. The exhibition board, which provided a working definition of 'collective' as we used it in the Deaf Heritage Collective project. Photo from DHC Archives.

CRITICAL HERITAGE, CRITICAL DESIGN AND THE MUSEUM AS ACTIVIST: A PARTICIPATORY APPROACH

The research team comes from a design background, specifically critical design and heritage studies. Our interest lies in the ethical responsibility of heritage to engage in issues of equality, and in the capacity of participative and performative methods to facilitate what Schofield et al. 2019 refer to as ‘plural heritages’. Like the Museum as Activist movement, critical design “highlights the processual nature of knowledge” (Jamieson and Discepoli 2021) and advances democratic values through praxis-oriented social change (Shor 1992). From this vantage point, we argue that the museum as activist consolidates the capacity of design and design methods to enable diverse modes of engagement, problematise the status quo and subvert categories of researcher/researched. In this way, both critical design and the museum as activist advance the capacity of participatory methods and community heritage to “confront entrenched views in order to create alternative futures” (Le Dantec 2016: 30). Like Bernadette Lynch (2021), we recognise that the museum as activist offers designers a timely opportunity to reflect on asymmetries of power and to consider the museum’s relation to marginalised groups pragmatically through the prism of what she refers to as the ‘useful museum’.

Our creative approach to the project reflects a growing methodological emphasis upon collaborative workshops that has evolved through community heritage where the focus is upon non-academic partners and the “convergence of different types of knowledge” (Stuttaford et al. 2012). In the context of our work, the methods of critical design echo Nina Simon’s (2010) summoning of the ‘participatory museum’ and her focus upon design’s potential to disrupt the authority of the museum to support diverse voices in ‘doing heritage’ (Johnston and Marwood 2017) and in the creation of heritage content.

Our emphasis upon different types of knowledge is key to our belief that heritage can expose and elevate stories of oppressed and marginalised groups (Rose 2016), and that heritage offers the possibility of new beginnings (ibid.). As researchers, we align ourselves with the practices and ideological motivations associated with critical design rather than a more normative commercial definition of design. Influenced by critical social theory, critical design is often associated with the practice of making things that do not solve a problem. Instead, objects are often designed in order to bring problems into sharp relief.² Nonetheless, critical design retains design’s overarching aim to move a situation towards a preferred outcome.

Only it does this indirectly, by making people aware of the consequences their present actions and lifestyle have on future; by emphasising their own responsibility and capability to improve their lives; by pointing out ideological constraints that influence the people’s perception; and generally, by promoting critical thinking (Jakobsone 2017: S4256).

Early in the planning stages, we decided we would ask participants to design artefacts as a means of developing debate between Deaf communities and heritage professionals. By asking participants to collaboratively design Deaf museums and BSL souvenirs we sought to develop the untapped capacity of heritage processes (Winter 2013) to assem-

ble new future-making relationships (Harrison 2015) between mainstream heritage organisations and marginalised Deaf communities.

Rodney Harrison's (2013) insistence upon the critical uses of heritage imagines its capacity as an enabler in combatting inequalities, social exclusion and historically located prejudices. Through this critical frame, the *making of heritage* is imbued with an increasingly politicised intent that extends the role of heritage to engage with marginalised communities and to tell the stories of oppression and inequality.

Critical heritage, critical design and the museum as activist invest in materials and spaces where communities have increased agency in the telling of their own stories. Each of these three disciplinary positions provide a rich resource apt for critically engaging with social barriers, cultural power and historic biases. As a context to the Deaf Heritage Collective project, they support an approach to creative and critical dialogue that questions how museums and heritage spaces might develop more accessible, transparent, representative and engaging spaces for marginalised communities.

PLAYFUL INTERLINGUAL AND INTERMODAL COLLABORATIVE WORKSHOPS

Rather than consider the bringing together of hearing and Deaf worlds, we sought to create a temporary space within which different experiences, expertise and professions might be explored through collaborative and highly visual activities. Negotiating the challenges of a proposed interlingual and intermodal project provided us with an opportunity to develop a performative set of methods that could bring people from different linguistic modalities together as equal participants. We decided to create a series of activities that could be worked on over the course of a few hours, to visualise the potential of museums and heritage organisations to represent Deaf culture.

Creating interlingual and intermodal events is an immensely challenging process, especially events that are predicated on discussion. Our emphasis upon the social aspect of heritage is twofold; firstly, from the beginning we were interested in the *social action of heritage* that might foreground Deaf people, places and values. Secondly, we wanted to create a social space where representatives from the Deaf community and heritage professionals could think about Deaf heritage. In our attempt to bring together a network of Deaf communities and heritage professionals it was important to avoid "the traditional binaries [...] of Deaf worlds and hearing worlds, of Deaf lives 'segregated from' or 'assimilated into' hearing societies" (Murray 2008: 102). Joseph Murray (*ibid.*) sees the categories "not in opposition to one another, but as mutually formative", arguing that "Deaf people live simultaneously in hearing spaces and in Deaf spaces".

In order to facilitate these social aspects of heritage we decided to harness the potential of collaboratively *thinking through making* (see Photo 2). Geoffrey Rockwell and Andrew Mactavish (2004) make a useful distinction between 'thinking about' and 'thinking with' artefacts arguing that 'thinking with' artefacts holds powerful explanatory power that has potential for critical insight. Adopting the authors' distinction, we developed collaborative activities designed to bind participants together in acts of thinking about representation, power and heritage. Through the use of artefacts, we summoned the symbolic, sensory and performative aspect of material culture, instru-

mentalisising objects as tools to anticipate Deaf heritage. This design research approach created a common ground for deaf and hearing participants where the expressive potential of materials could be used to articulate values, identities and change.



Photo 2. A photograph from the Stirling workshop showing creative exploration around mixed language tables. Photo by Will Clark.

TOWARDS A DEAF SPACE

The curation of a playful series of workshops designed to bring together D/deaf participants and heritage professionals could not have happened without a team of BSL–English interpreters (see Photo 3). It is crucial to book a minimum of four BSL–English interpreters for workshops to allow for breaks, and to spread the cognitive load; best practice is for interpreters to have a break after 20 minutes. However, even following these simple guidelines it is not straightforward: most interpreters work primarily in community settings, such as interpreting doctors’ appointments or parents’ evenings, and, in Scotland, there are a limited number of interpreters who have the skillset and the confidence to work in high-stakes ‘conference’ settings where academic language and complex ideas are likely to be used, and where the interpreter is conspicuously placed in front of a large audience with few or no opportunities to clarify meaning for themselves or ensure understanding between interlocutors. Additionally, these highly trained professionals are expensive to book and in high demand. Even with sufficient provision of interpreters, standard formats of presentation and round table discussions all privilege the hearing members of the group, as outlined below.



Photo 3. Photograph of the Edinburgh workshop showing an interpreter at work. Photo by Dominic MacNeill.

In terms of presentations, hearing people take for granted that it is possible to split one's attention between the presenter and their slides, for example, or to take notes whilst listening. This exacerbates the inevitable time lag when interpreting between languages, and can leave deaf members of the audience struggling to follow. Consequently, it is not enough simply to provide interpreters; the Deaf Heritage Collective workshops needed to valorise BSL, and to shift further into the minority domain, following the social rules of Deaf events and creating a space for D/deaf attendees to take ownership. The easiest and most organic way for this to happen is to reach a critical mass of D/deaf people in order to make events inviting and accessible for the wider D/deaf community. If enough attend, an impromptu Deaf space may emerge in which format is reconfigured to correspond to Deaf norms, i.e. where signing is the primary language, and clear sightlines are maintained for all participants. At the first Deaf Heritage Collective event in Glasgow, D/deaf attendees appeared quickly to identify a welcome opportunity to share experiences with each other primarily, reinforcing their horizontal cultural affiliation, and with the hearing attendees only secondarily.

Several of the hearing attendees initially reported feeling "awkward" and "overwhelmed" in what had quickly become a culturally Deaf-dominant space; this awkwardness is itself useful and instructive. As H-Dirksen Bauman (2008: viii-ix) puts it, the discovery of one's hearingness in the face of cultural deafness affords a "critical perspective through which [...] [to interrogate] the phonocentric ideologies in the world in which [...] [we are] raised".

COLLABORATIVE WORKSHOP ACTIVITIES

The format of each workshop followed a similar structure inasmuch as presenters provided a context to the activities' themes. In our first workshop the theme was 'Deaf Heritage?', a deliberately broad and probing introduction that sought to gauge the various conceptions of the term's use and value. The day began with an introduction on the uses of heritage and the provocation of what it might be and do. The presentations from two academics sought to identify the problem of Deaf culture as existing on the margins of public life and at the same time highlight the opportunity brought about by the BSL Act. The third presenter, a Deaf cultural ambassador, shared her experience of managing the Deaf History Scotland archives. The stark reality of the precarity of Deaf stories, objects and spaces was emphasised when the presenter recounted instances of clearances of schools, homes and unofficial archives (see Photo 4) – where the destination of Deaf heritage was most often a skip.



Photo 4. A photograph of the archives in Deaf History Scotland. Photo from DHC Archives.

As the day progressed, activities were organised around tables to enable participants to engage with some of the themes that had been discussed. Tables were organised to bring together Deaf participants and heritage professionals, thereby encouraging dialogue across languages and experiences. During the first workshop two participative activities were designed to provoke conversation around what Deaf Heritage is and where it might be located. The first activity was a game of Bingo, chosen because the game is traditionally popular amongst Scotland's D/deaf communities, with regional competitions featuring in Deaf clubs across the country.



Photo 5. Bingo card designed to solicit various definitions of 'Deaf heritage'. Photo from DHC Archives.

The Bingo card was designed to be completed by each mixed language table, where participants first had to discuss and agree how to complete the card (see Photo 5). Each table was facilitated by a BSL-English interpreter and there were also English speakers with various levels of BSL at most of the tables. When each table had completed their card, they were put into a bowl and words were 'called' (publicly signed from the stage) by one of the D/deaf participants. What emerged was the various conceptualisations of Deaf heritage in the room. Definitions ranged from conventional terms such as culture, storytelling, tourism and history to terms we would more readily associate with difficult heritage, namely oppression, freedom, identity, equality and rights, to specific terms exclusive to the histories of D/deaf communities such as oralism, BSL, Deaf schools, Deaf club, the Deaflympics and lampposts.



Photo 6. Photograph taken during the collaborative making of the Deaf Museum. Photo by Elina Karadzova.

The second activity of the first workshop took the form of a design probe, which is a method that “encourage[s] subjective engagement, empathetic interpretation, and a pervasive sense of uncertainty as positive values” (Matthews and Horst 2008). Our probe came as a box of museum models and a scale model of an intersection of a typical museum space. A probe kit was given to each mixed language table with a brief that asked each table “What Will the Future Museum of Deaf Culture Look Like? What Will It Show and How Will It Be Curated?”

The discussions that followed were intense and revealed divisions in how Deaf heritage should be told. The process of collaboratively making the model created discussion around a number of points; for example, the importance of telling the story of oralist schools and expressing the lived experience of oppression through an aesthetic that captured the relations of power and subordination (see Photo 6). Other models went further still, renouncing the capacity of a conventional museum to do justice to the marginalised status of Deaf culture.

According to Mike Michael (2012: 174), “the requirement is that probes probe: they must be sufficiently provocative, novel, entertaining, open, inviting to prompt answers that are unexpected, expressive and creative”. This shared experience is not necessarily a comfortable process because the aim is to throw up the peculiar, the hidden, the intimate, the troublesome and the contradictory. Our use of cultural probes might be understood as ‘boundary objects’ which Etienne Wenger (2000) argues can take the form of artefacts, discourses, or processes. What is common to all boundary objects, he suggests, is that they play an integral role in helping participants manage and leverage boundaries of knowledge and experience. The model Deaf Museum was attacked and defaced not to destroy the possibility of a future Deaf Museum, but to materially communicate the multi-faceted power of museums to both exclude Deaf lives, and communicate the lived experiences of oppression. By scoring the walls of the model museum and inserting scissors into the model, the future museum designed by participants narrated a difficult heritage; one that demanded to be acknowledged within a frame of injustice and oppression (see Photo 7).

Our second workshop provided an opportunity to develop an activity that responded to the concept of BSL infrastructure, a way of thinking about the requirements and networks currently missing, but necessary to create more equality in Scotland’s heritage sector. We devised a BSL infrastructure probe kit that was comprised of children’s wooden bricks, a dynamo, paper, Sellotape and scissors. The brief stated

The Scottish Government commits to a long-term aim that is ambitious in its remit to change the lives of BSL users and place Scotland as the best place in the world for BSL users to live and visit. However, in practical terms Culture and the Arts have little by way of infrastructure; how will lives be changed and how will careers in the arts be enabled? Questions remain unresolved as to how the government will create more meaningful opportunities in the cultural sector, but you may be able to offer insight as to what kind of BSL Infrastructure will work.

This is your chance to work together as a group to identify and build a BSL infrastructure.

Narratives are an integral part of the relations between people and things and have a speculative potential within design research to tell the story of possible futures. In the case of the BSL Infrastructure activity, participants collaborated to consider levels of priority as well as how elements of a proposed infrastructure might be related through processes and geographies (see Photo 8). Around each table participants debated the requirements of access and equality across rural and urban divides and across different types of heritage organisation. Participants took seriously their role in the collaborative planning of a BSL heritage infrastructure and patiently waited as others took their turn to describe what they saw as a priority. Although this was a time-consuming process, the various iterations, conflicting ideas and debates about how discrete parts might fit together revealed a commitment to imagining different possibilities.

In the fourth workshop, we returned to the subject of the Deaf Museum, but with an emphasis upon merchandising, asking participants to prototype a Deaf culture souvenir (see Photo 9). The gift shop is usually a considerable area in museums and heritage sites, and an extended site of learning (Kent 2009) where visitors continue to engage with the subjects raised through exhibits. Currently, there are no Deaf or BSL museum souvenirs and their absence from the language of museums is significant, speaking as it does of the lack of Deaf culture in public life. Souvenirs are useful artefacts through which to anticipate potential Deaf heritage encounters for two reasons. Firstly, they offer what Graeme Evans (2000) describes as “a meeting ground” between visitors, museums and cultural origin, which he argues is “both authentic and staged”. In this way, the speculative BSL souvenir offers a staged encounter with Deaf culture.



Photo 9. Photograph showing the BSL Discovery Kit and the making of a souvenir. Photo by Will Clark.

Secondly, the souvenir presents Deaf culture as an economic value, which ambiguates medically reductive correlations with disability, and triggers new conversations about the mobilities and aesthetics of Deaf culture, D/deaf people and Deaf artefacts.

We wanted our participants to consider the entanglement of the prevailing *absence* of a BSL souvenir in relation to Deaf identity, Scottish culture, consumerism and design. We also wanted participants to consider the souvenir as a significant object in the cultural representation of Deaf people and BSL in Scotland. The short brief that asked each table to design a BSL Discovery Kit explaining (see Photo 10):

The gift shop is where we buy our over-priced souvenirs, Viking books, Archaeology DIY kits, tote bags and Egyptian hieroglyphic rulers. In this way, the gift shop supplements museums' educational aims through merchandise. So, we have provided you with a potential piece of future BSL merchandise – a BSL Discovery Kit for which you need to design the contents.

For Discussion

- What would be an appropriate souvenir in the Deaf Museum?
- What kind of objects would enhance the learning experience of a Deaf Museum?
- What objects would introduce visitors to BSL?
- How can you explain Deaf Culture through small interactive objects?
- Can a museum shop sell a fun object that also raises Deaf Awareness?
- Give the BSL Discovery Kit a price tag!



Photo 10. The design brief for the BSL Souvenir (front and back), playfully titled 'Enter Through the Gift Shop'. Photo from the DHC Archives.

Participants were unsure how to engage with this activity. Deaf participants initially resisted the connection between Deaf heritage and ‘tacky’ souvenirs. We attempted to explain that our aim was to explore if the Deaf souvenir could challenge conventional ideas of Deaf culture and transform its outsider relation to consumer culture. Through discussion, it emerged that Deaf participants initially saw this activity as demeaning and did not see how a souvenir could develop the conversation around Deaf culture in public life. Lengthy discussions as to the possibility of a Deaf souvenir led to wider discussions about materials, packaging, marketing, pricing, and of course customers.

DISCUSSION: THE PLAYFUL SOCIAL ACTIONING OF DEAF HERITAGE

The argument from the critical margins of heritage is that official, or authorised heritage discourse (Smith 2006) disregards alternative histories such as Deaf history because they do not cohere with the national imaginary, or the commercial imperatives of heritage. Indeed, Deaf histories endure beyond the mainstream national imaginary. In the context of Scotland, the BSL Act 2015 made formal claims to Deaf heritage possible.³ With this legal framework, a new cultural–historical setting has emerged wherein a critical consciousness towards D/deaf communities, culture and language can be achieved. As Deaf culture comes into view through the formal recognition of BSL, so too the protection of Deaf heritage emerges as a responsibility of heritage organisations and funders. Within this transition there is a political recalibration of Deaf identity – one related to Deaf rights, agency and culture. The Deaf Heritage Collective aimed to bring D/deaf communities, heritage professionals and researchers into conversation to advance discussion around the BSL Act and bring into being a Deaf heritage network. In order to negotiate the potential challenges and flows to interpersonal communication we chose to create social and playful events that would enact the assemblages of heritage: its system of values, hierarchies, professional skills, official categories, spaces and funding mechanisms. By adopting a playful attitude to the workshop space, we were able to harness the ability to unmake and remake understandings of Deaf heritage. Presented in a playful way, we sought to privilege “experience as a relational device, binding people together through objects, open[ing] up a new direction for ethical care and sharing of heritage with diverse stakeholders” (Marstine 2017: 46). We asked participants to think with component parts: to conceptualise, plan and build a heritage system.

By approaching Deaf heritage in such a way, we see the responsibility to facilitate access to cultural production as ideological and political (Werner et al. 2019). Throughout the series of workshops our emphasis was upon supporting new collaborative routes to Deaf heritage rather than ‘access’ to consumption, which is a dominant disability approach that entrenches marginalised communities as vulnerable and dependent rather than “inhabiting their own active agency” (Lynch 2021: 25). The participatory workshops were therefore designed to democratise the field of heritage and engage both heritage professionals and D/deaf participants as experts. By creating a platform for mutual understanding, we hoped to support the development of new thinking, new networks and heritage partnerships. In this way, the workshops this article describes,

can be understood as part of and co-creations of “the very phenomenon to which they provide access” (Knudsen and Carsten 2015: 50).

Bridging critical design and critical heritage as we do responds to Tom Schofield and his colleagues’ (2019) argument for more interdisciplinary engagement between critical design and critical heritage. The authors argue that both critical heritage and critical design aim to reveal the processes and invested interests behind social and cultural values. We argue that the marriage of critical design and critical heritage coheres with the activist potential of museum practice. Like the human rights approach to museums, critical heritage and critical design provide a critical and participatory framework through which to engage previously marginalised communities in complex ideas about civil society, heritage, representation and social agency.

Over the duration of the two-year project, the collaborative actioning of Deaf heritage involved testing ideas, prototyping, developing and sharing conceptual understandings of Deaf culture. This actioning was sustained by creative tools through which participants could generate and communicate their insights and experiences. Participants harnessed the explanatory power of model museums, BSL souvenir kits and building blocks to communicate complex ideas that challenged the status quo.

Through a series of collaborative activities, the platform of the workshop facilitated the exploration of possible, probable, plausible and preferable Deaf heritage futures (Bland and Westlake 2013; Coulton et al. 2016). Workshops were designed to playfully provoke collaborative debate and discussion about the future of Deaf heritage and BSL in Scotland’s museum and heritage sector. Each workshop sought to create a platform where the political status of BSL and the lived experience of BSL users could be discussed and where testimonials of Deaf experience were valorised.

During the first workshop, the model Deaf Museum functioned as an imaginative act in *thinking together* about the potential future of Deaf heritage in Scotland. The opportunity to consider the contents of a Deaf Museum generated intense debate amongst D/deaf participants and provoked reflection not only about potential exhibits of Deaf schools and clubs, but also about the Deaf Museum’s narrative and learning experience. At one table, D/deaf participants insisted that the Deaf Museum’s function should include testimonies of oppression. This led to further discussion about how oralist ideology and oppression might be communicated to both hearing and D/deaf visitors. Themes of oppression were repeated across the first workshop revealing tensions and divergent views as to what Deaf heritage meant to its community. At some points during the workshop, the heritage of Deaf schools was described through personal recollections of injustice. Some of our hearing participants reported feeling uncomfortable and guilty, while others described feeling dedicated to enacting change. Follow-up conversations with hearing heritage professionals revealed a wide breadth of positions vis-à-vis national approaches to Deaf heritage. One professional saw their responsibility as pertaining to the national protection of D/deaf collections and explicitly distanced their organisation from any activist-oriented activity that might support the D/deaf community maintaining ownership of collections (comprised largely of donated objects). Another heritage professional saw a route to BSL inclusion through volunteer guides, but stopped short of elevating D/deaf contributors to a commensurate professional wage, or as co-researchers, or PhD research students.

In preparation for the second workshop, we developed an activity that prompted participants to build a 'BSL infrastructure' with wooden blocks. The blocks were to be labelled according to the collaboratively agreed requirements of each table's proposed BSL infrastructure. This collaborative activity was designed in response to the Deaf Museum activity and D/deaf participants' insistence on Deaf-led cultural spaces, narratives and events. However, initially it was met with scepticism by one participant who saw the blocks as 'childish'. We joined his table to work with the group and to consider the concept of BSL infrastructure more deeply. To our surprise, the concept BSL infrastructure did *not* have an immediate BSL translation and was causing some confusion. The lack of a distinct BSL sign to communicate 'infrastructure' of resources prompted a wider conversation. We interrupted the planned activity to ask participants to think about the necessary BSL language of 'infrastructure'. Everyone in the room stopped building for a moment and a deaf participant took to the stage to propose a new sign for BSL infrastructure, one that extrapolated the sign for architectural infrastructure, to communicate the interconnectedness of Deaf culture in public life.

By collaboratively working through the concept of BSL infrastructure participants were able to explore how interconnected networks between museums, community halls, schools, theatres and festivals function. In this way, a much-needed focus upon the economic and political practices that sustain heritage institutions was introduced to the second workshop. The focus upon cooperatively building a BSL infrastructure raised the stakes in terms of thinking about the distribution of resources and issues of equality.

The final workshop activity took the theme of designing a BSL souvenir. Commodification and the economic imperative for heritage is a key theme within Harrison's (2013) critical heritage work, but the generative potential of thinking through souvenirs remains untapped. Although only a partial telling of history can be represented through the souvenir, it nevertheless extends our relationship with heritage experiences. For Susan Stewart (1993) there is a "substituting power" to the souvenir that allows the consumer to make personal connections, claim proximities and reframe historical and cultural distance. Stewart's argument that the souvenir 'domesticates' the exotic is useful here because it allows us to think about the power of the BSL souvenir to curate engagement with Deaf culture. Participants chose to give form to BSL in a number of ways; one group chose to create a lamp in the form of a hand clasping a lightbulb, to symbolise the power of the hand, another group used tape-measures to create a playful kit designed to introduce people to the communicative spatial rules of BSL. After an initial hesitation, participants embraced the playful latitude of the souvenir and designed critical artefacts to raise awareness of sign language and Deaf culture.

CONCLUSION

Informed by critical design and critical heritage, our methodological aim was to construct a collaborative playful space that facilitated debate through shared practices of making. We wanted to create a *social atmosphere* where networks could form naturally through interactions, personal expression and movement. We therefore decided that the *social actioning* of heritage ought to be presented in a playful way. This is not to sug-

gest that we wanted to detract from the seriousness of Deaf culture and the inequalities that render it hidden and denied from public life. Instead, we see 'playful' as referring to an 'emotional attitude' towards people, objects and situations: "Playfulness reambiguates the world. Through the characteristics of play, it makes it less formalized, less explained, open to interpretation and wonder and manipulation." (Sicart 2014: 28)

Asking participants to collaboratively make things allowed us to shift from the predominance of English as the dominant mode of communication to a more visual paradigm. Each workshop asked participants to produce co-created objects that provocatively and performatively articulated participants' felt experience. By working together on complex issues of how and where Deaf culture might be claimed, represented and practiced D/deaf and hearing participants were confronted by injustices perpetrated by the sector's reliance on a paternalistic view of disability and marginality. In some instances, the act of co-creating established a more level playing field between participants and at other times it completely recalibrated the expert/marginalised dynamic. In these instances, D/deaf participants not only took to the floor to share their expertise, but also symbolically claimed their role as collaborator, researcher and advisor.

Throughout the project, our emphasis was upon D/deaf cultural production rather than cultural consumption. Our focus and collaborative approach sought to disrupt the heritage industry's paternalistic ideology of 'inclusion'. The shift from 'inclusion' and 'access' is long overdue: heritage organisations are uniquely positioned to open up new aesthetic and political space wherein as both teachers and learners (Lynch 2021) they can employ their craft of using the past to support the self-organisation and futurity of marginalised communities.

Since the completion of the project, we have been approached by heritage organisations keen to support similar activity, but organising interlingual workshops comes at a high cost that the sector has not yet prioritised. However, by exposing the fragility and contingency of Deaf heritage to a wider audience new projects have emerged in Scotland. The most significant of which is the change within the national organisation Historic Environment Scotland, which offered its first Deaf internship. There is also a Heritage Lottery funded project that began early in 2020, which aims to develop national Deaf-led research and exhibitions of Deaf heritage. From a design perspective, perhaps the most exciting opportunity is to develop BSL souvenirs for a pilot project with a heritage organisation. Although initially resisted, the souvenir activity encouraged participants to test the boundaries of potential Deaf tourism and engage new audiences in issues around Deaf culture, language and identity. Interestingly, the souvenir was mined for its capacity to playfully confront misunderstandings related to D/deaf identity and at the same time, celebrate its otherness (Swanson and Horridge 2004).

Looking to the future, we can celebrate the Heritage Lottery project and gradual moves to include D/deaf professionals in the heritage sector. In the international arena, UNESCO recognises the endangered status of sign languages (see UNESCO 2010), something that brings with it the potential for change. However, the recent closure of Deaf Connections in Glasgow (Scotland's largest D/deaf space) signifies a less optimistic future: the disappearance of another permanent cultural space fundamental to the sharing, practice and enactment of Deaf identity displaces Deaf heritage and narrows the opportunity for its transmission.

In lieu of the museum as activist, Lynch (2021: 3) offers instead, a more pragmatic view of the ‘useful museum’, which she confers an *enabling* role in the service of “acts of recovery” and “acts of defiance”. This, we argue, is precisely the role required of Scotland’s heritage sector. As a useful museum both the National Museum of Scotland and Historic Environment Scotland have a wealth of spaces and resources wherein Deaf identity might be practiced, shared and exhibited. Under the auspice of a useful museum we call for a more pragmatic Deaf role for the National Museum of Scotland, specifically to host a Deaf Club, a Deaf Exhibition and a future Deaf Museum.

NOTES

1 The term ‘one generation thick’ is primarily known in the context of Hoffmeister’s (2008) writing on the particular ‘border’ position of the hearing children of Deaf parents. However, the term has also been used in relation to the Deaf community as a whole, for example in the documentary *Through Deaf Eyes* (2007). Davis (2007: 5) credits Hoffmeister with applying this term more widely: “The deaf, hearing children of deaf adults, people with disabilities, and queer folk are, as the deaf-studies scholar Robert J. Hoffmeister has written, only ‘one generation thick,’ having parents and children most likely different from them”. The authors of this article have been unable to locate Hoffmeister’s earlier writing on this subject.

2 Critical designers clearly state that they would rather identify problems – both existing and future – and ask questions than provide answers. They acknowledge that critical design is problem finding instead of problem solving (Dunne and Raby 2013: vii). Although critical design projects sometimes also offer utilitarian solutions, these are all speculative, and the situations in which they are meant to be implemented are mainly fictional (Jakobson 2017: S4256).

3 The very idea of Deaf heritage is potentially supported in another way in Scotland, i.e. by Scotland’s advocacy of Intangible Cultural Heritage (ICH). In contrast to the UK English-based Government, which has chosen to date not to sign the UNESCO Convention on ICH, Scotland, with a growing sense of its distinctive national identity and political coherence, has positively embraced the pluralising concept of ICH, which legitimises sub-national community identities (McCleery and Bowers 2016). Scotland’s eagerness to embrace ICH reflects an effort to escape the authoritative claims to a linear narrative that belongs to a United Kingdom. In Scotland, ICH offers the possibility of re-making a past that suffuses the present with hybridity, fluidity and plurality.

REFERENCES

- Austin, Peter K. and Julia Sallabank, eds. 2011. *The Cambridge Handbook of Endangered Languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Baker-Shenk, Charlotte and Jim Kyle. 1990. Research with Deaf People: Issues and Conflicts. – *Disability, Handicap And Society* 5 (1): 65–75. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/02674649066780051>.
- Bauman, H-Dirksen. 2008. Introduction: Listening to Deaf Studies. – *Open Your Eyes: Deaf Studies Talking*, edited by H-Dirksen Bauman. Minneapolis, MN; London: University of Minnesota Press, 1–32.
- Bechter, Frank. 2008. The Deaf Convert Culture and Its Lessons for Deaf Theory. – *Open Your Eyes: Deaf Studies Talking*, edited by H-Dirksen Bauman. Minneapolis, MN; London: University of Minnesota Press, 60–79.

- Bland, Jessica and Stian Westlake. 2013. Don't Stop Thinking about Tomorrow: A Modest Defence of Futurology. – *NESTA*. <https://www.nesta.org.uk/report/dont-stop-thinking-about-tomorrow-a-modest-defence-of-futurology/> (accessed March 15, 2021).
- Cameron, Josh; Beverly Wenger-Trayner, Etienne Wenger-Trayner, Angie Hart, Lisa Buttery, Elias Kourkoutas, Suna Eryigit-Madzwamuse and Anne Rathbone. 2019. Community-University Partnership Research Retreats: A Productive Force for Developing Communities of Research Practice. – *Co-producing Research: A Community Development Approach*, edited by Sarah Banks, Angie Hart, Kate Pahl and Paul Ward. Bristol: Policy Press, 69–92. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1332/policypress/9781447340751.003.0004>.
- Coulton, Paul; Dan Burnett and Adrian Gradinar. 2016. Games as Speculative Design: Allowing Players to Consider Alternate Presents and Plausible Futures. – *Proceedings of Design Research Society Conference 2016: Design + Research + Society – Future-Focused Thinking 4*, edited by Peter Lloyd and Erik Bohemia. London: Design Research Society, 1609–1626. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21606/drs.2016.15>.
- Davis, Lennard J. 2007. Deafness and the Riddle of Identity. – *The Chronicle Review* 53 (19): 1–7.
- De Meulder, Maartje. 2016. *The Power of Language Policy: The Legal Recognition of Sign Languages and the Aspirations of Deaf Communities*. Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä Printing House.
- DEX = Deaf Ex-Mainstreamers Group, eds. 2003. *Between a Rock and a Hard Place*. Wakefield: Deaf Ex-Mainstreamers Group.
- Dunne, Anthony and Fiona Raby. 2013. *Speculative Everything: Design, Fiction and Social Dreaming*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Evans, Graeme. 2000. Contemporary Crafts as Souvenirs, Artefacts and Functional Goods and Their Role in Local Economic Diversification and Cultural Development. – *Souvenirs: The Material Culture of Tourism*, edited by Michael Hitchcock and Ken Teague. London: Routledge, 127–146. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315187457-10>.
- Grue, Jan. 2016. *Disability and Discourse Analysis*. London: Routledge. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315577302>.
- Harrison, Rodney. 2013. *Heritage: Critical Approaches*. Abingdon: Routledge. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203108857>.
- Harrison, Rodney. 2015. Beyond 'Natural' and 'Cultural' Heritage: Toward an Ontological Politics of Heritage in the Age of Anthropocene. – *Heritage And Society* 8 (1): 24–42. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1179/2159032X15Z.00000000036>.
- Hoffmeister, Robert J. 2008. Border Crossings by Hearing Children of Deaf Parents: The Lost History of Codas. – *Open Your Eyes: Deaf Studies Talking*, edited by H-Dirksen Bauman. Minneapolis, MN; London: University of Minnesota Press, 189–215.
- Jakobsone, Liene. 2017. Critical Design as Approach to Next Thinking. – *The Design Journal* 20 (1): S4253–S4262. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/14606925.2017.1352923>.
- Jamieson, Kirstie and Marta Discepoli. 2021. Exploring Deaf Heritage Futures through Critical Design and 'Public Things'. – *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 27 (2): 117–133. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13527258.2020.1771750>.
- Johnston, Robert and Kimberley Marwood. 2017. Action Heritage: Research, Communities, Social Justice. – *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 23 (9): 816–831. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13527258.2017.1339111>.
- Kent, Tony. 2009. The Role of the Museum Shop in Extending the Visitor Experience. – *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing* 15 (1): 67–77. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1002/nvsm.368>.
- Knudsen, Britta Timm and Stage Carsten, eds. 2015. *Affective Methodologies: Developing Cultural Research Strategies for the Study of Affect*. London: AIAA.
- Kusters, Annelies and Maartje De Meulder. 2013. Understanding Deafhood: In Search of Its Meanings. – *American Annals of the Deaf* 158 (5): 428–438. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1353/aad.2013.0004>.

- Kusters, Annelies; Massimiliano Spotti, Ruth Swanwick and Elina Tapio. 2017. Beyond Languages, Beyond Modalities: Transforming the Study of Semiotic Repertoires. – *International Journal of Multilingualism* 14 (3): 219–232. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2017.1321651>.
- Ladd, Paddy. 2003. *Understanding Deaf Culture: In Search of Deafhood*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781853595479>.
- Le Dantec, Christopher. 2016. *Designing Publics*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/10513.001.0001>.
- Lynch, Bernadette. 2021. Introduction: Neither Helpful nor Unhelpful: A Clear Way Forward for the Useful Museum. – *Museums and Social Change: Challenging the Unhelpful Museum*, edited by Adele Chynpweh, Bernadette Lynch, Klaus Petersen and Sarah Smed. London: Routledge, 1–31.
- Marstine, Janet. 2017. *Critical Practice: Artists, Museums, Ethics*. London: Routledge. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315272016>.
- Matthews, Ben and Willem Horst. 2008. What Can We Learn from the Probes? The Role of Interpretation in Contributions to Knowledge. – *Working Papers in Art and Design* 5. https://www.herts.ac.uk/_data/assets/pdf_file/0012/12423/WPIAAD_vol5_matthews_horst.pdf ISSN 1466-4917 (accessed December 22, 2019).
- McCleery, Alison and Jared Bowers. 2016. Documenting and Safeguarding Intangible Cultural Heritage: The Experience in Scotland. – *The Routledge Companion to Intangible Cultural Heritage*, edited by Michelle Stefano and Peter Davis. London: Routledge, 185–201.
- Michael, Mike. 2012. De-Signing the Object of Sociology: Toward an ‘Idiotic’ Methodology. – *The Sociological Review* 60 (1):166–183. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-954X.2012.02122.x>.
- Murray, Joseph. 2008. Coequality and Transnational Studies: Understanding Deaf Lives. – *Open Your Eyes: Deaf Studies Talking*, edited by H-Dirksen Bauman. Minneapolis, MN; London: University of Minnesota Press, 100–110.
- O’Brien, Dai; Lisa Stead and Nicolas Nourse. 2019. Bristol Deaf Memories: Archives, Nostalgia and the Loss of Community Space in the Deaf Community in Bristol. – *Social and Cultural Geography* 20 (7): 899–917. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/14649365.2017.1392591>.
- O’Neill, Rachel; Julie Arendt and Marc Marschark. 2014. *Report from the Achievement and Opportunities for Deaf Students in the United Kingdom: From Research to Practice Project*, Nuffield Foundation. Edinburgh: University of Edinburgh.
- Presenting the Past* = 2015. *Presenting the Past. My Firsts – Deaf People At Rest*. DVD produced by Scottish Council on Deafness.
- Rockwell, Geoffrey and Andrew Mactavish. 2004. Multimedia. – *A Companion to Digital Humanities*, edited by Susan Schreibman, Raymond Siemens and John Unsworth. Oxford: Blackwell, 108–120. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/b.9781405103213.2004.00013.x>.
- Rose, Julia. 2016. *Interpreting Difficult History at Museums and Historic Sites*. Rhode Island: RI Publications.
- Schofield, Tom; Daniel Foster Smith, Gönül Bozoğlu and Christopher Whitehead. 2019. Design and Plural Heritages: Composing Critical Futures. – *Proceedings of the 2019 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI ’19)*. New York, NY: Association for Computing Machinery. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3290605.3300236>.
- Scottish Government. 2015. BSL (Scotland) Act 2015. https://www.legislation.gov.uk/asp/2015/11/pdfs/asp_20150011_en.pdf (accessed March 22, 2021).
- Shor, Ira. 1992. *Empowering Education: Critical Teaching for Social Change*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7208/chicago/9780226147864.001.0001>.
- Sicart, Miguel. 2014. *Play Matters*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/10042.001.0001>.
- Simon, Nina. 2010. *The Participatory Museum*. Santa Cruz, CA: Museum 2.0.

- Smith, Laurajane. 2006. *Uses of Heritage*. Abingdon: Routledge. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203602263>.
- Solomon, Andrew. 2012. *Far from the Tree: Parents, Children, and the Search for Identity*. New York, NY: Scribner.
- Solomon, Andrew. 2014. Foreword: Deaf Loss. – *Deaf Gain: Raising the Stakes for Human Diversity*, edited by H-Dirksen Bauman and Joseph Murray. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press: ix–xi.
- Stewart, Susan. 1993. *On Longing: Narratives of the Miniature, the Gigantic, the Souvenir, the Collection*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1515/9780822378563>.
- Stuttaford, Maria; Gabriela Glattstein-Young and Leslie London. 2012. 'Dialogue, Review and Reflect': A Spiral of Co-Learning and Co-Research to Surface Knowledge on the Right to Health. – *Gateways: International Journal of Community Research and Engagement* (5): 115–134. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5130/ijcre.v5i0.2369>.
- Swanson, Kristen K. and Patricia E. Horridge. 2004. A Structural Model for Souvenir Consumption, Travel Activities, and Tourist Demographics. – *Journal of Travel Research* 42 (4): 372–380. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287504263031>.
- Through Deaf Eyes*. 2007. A film by Lawrence Hott and Diane Garey. WETA Washington, DC and Florentine Films/Hott Productions, Inc.
- UNESCO. 2003. *Cultural and Linguistic Diversity in the Information Society*. Paris: UNESCO Publications for the World Summit on the Information Society.
- UNESCO. 2010. *Atlas of the World's Languages in Danger*. Paris: UNESCO.
- Werner, Kim; Kai-Michael Griese and Andreas Faatz. 2019. Value Co-Creation Processes at Sustainable Music Festivals: A Grounded Theory Approach. – *International Journal of Event and Festival Management* 11 (1): 127–144. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEFM-06-2019-0031>.
- Wenger, Etienne. 2000. Communities of Practice and Social Learning Systems. – *Organization* 7 (2): 225–246. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/135050840072002>.
- Winter, Tim. 2013. Clarifying the Critical in Critical Heritage Studies. – *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 19 (6): 532–545. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13527258.2012.720997>.