One Village, Two Sign Languages: Qualia, Intergenerational Relationships and the Language Ideological Assemblage in Adamorobe, Ghana

One village, two sign languages: Qualia, intergenerational relationships and the language ideological assemblage in Adamorobe, Ghana

Introduction

"Adamorobe signing is SWEET", "The signing in Adamorobe is HARD", "Adamorobe's deaf people should sign in an EYE-HARD way". These are disourses about signing in Adamorobe Sign Language (AdaSL), a sign language used in Adamorobe, an Akan farmer village in southern Ghana distinguished by a history of hereditary deafness. Calling AdaSL SWEET (Figure 1) is typical for most deaf youths from Adamorobe, who have gone to school for an extended period and acquired another sign language there, Ghanaian Sign Language (GSL). Seeing AdaSL as HARD (ie. tough, stern) and connecting it with being EYE-HARD (ie. confident) (Figure 2) is central in language discourses of older deaf people, who have limited command of GSL. By calling AdaSL SWEET, HARD and so on, deaf people in Adamorobe attribute qualia - sensuous qualities which include eg. hardness, lightness, dryness, straightness - to different forms of signing (Gal 2013; Harkness 2015). The fact that deaf Adamorobeans express qualic evaluations in different ways across generations is central to this article.

Figure 1: SWEET (movement in picture is a repeated one)
Figure 2: EYE-HARD

Deaf generations in Adamorobe have had differential exposure to AdaSL and GSL. Oral history locates the onset of hereditary deafness in Adamorobe in the late 18th-early 19th century. A relatively high number of deaf people were born there due to the circulation of a recessive gene for deafness through intermarriage. Deafness has been passed on through the generations, and while it is not the case that the majority of inhabitants is deaf, there is a sizeable deaf population. Currently 35 deaf people aged approximately between 10 and 80 reside in Adamorobe, a number which has been relatively stable over many years (see Kusters 2015a). The village's hearing population has recently increased sharply, and is currently numbering around 3500. As a result of intense social-and kin relationships and interactions between deaf and hearing people in the community, a sign language gradually emerged and developed over time into a fully fledged language: Adamorobe Sign Language.

Deaf people in Adamorobe have been exposed to GSL on a regular basis through weekly church services and through short stints of schooling since the late 1950s, resulting in limited knowledge and use of GSL. Around 2000, almost all deaf children from Adamorobe were sent to a large residential school for deaf children in Mampong, where GSL is used in class and in leisure time. At the time of my latest field trip to Adamorobe in 2018, this cohort of 10 deaf youths was aged between 19 and 31, had ceased or completed school and six of them had children themselves. It is the first time that a full cohort living in Adamorobe rather than at the school is fluent in GSL; and most of them are fluent in AdaSL as well. People within this cohort interact frequently with each other but also with deaf people who are older than them and with hearing people, using both AdaSL and GSL intensively on an everyday basis.

In deaf discourses in 2018, deaf youth who had gone to school were grouped as YOUTH (Figure 3) and deaf people over 31 who had not gone to school recently and for a sustained period were called ELDERS (Figure 4). These are glosses of signs, chosen by me to reflect the signs' meaning in this context. In AdaSL, both signs cover a broader semantic field: the sign YOUTH also covers CHILD(REN)/YOUNGER-THAN/SUBORDINATE/OFFSPRING/YOUNGER-RELATIVE and the sign ELDERS also is used to signify OLDER-THAN/OLDER-RELATIVE/ANCESTOR/IMPORTANT-PERSON/BOSS. The two signs are generally used to point out individual status and age differences, but by deaf people of various ages they are also consistently used to distinguish and label two groups of deaf people. Importantly, rather than their

exact ages, it is recent sustained schooling and the related GSL fluency that sets the deaf youth apart as group. In the remainder of this article, I adopt these emic categories of youths and elders.

Figure 3: YOUTH (movement in picture is a repeated one)

Figure 4: ELDERS (movement in picture is a repeated one)

Deaf perspectives on AdaSL are embedded in a "language ideological assemblage" (Kroskrity 2018), ie. clusters of language ideologies and other ideologies that impact on language use, including but not limited to qualic evaluations of lived/sensuous experiences. Based on field work stints in Adamorobe spread over a period of 10 years, I analyse how language ideologies are connected to discourses on formal education, future prospects, adulthood, respect and reciprocity, linguistic repertoires and language practices of youths and elders, all in the context of shifts in intergenerational relationships.

More specifically, looking at how signing cohorts form, relate, and shift, I show how qualic evaluations of language are expressed differently by people from different generations, and are related to qualic evaluations of behaviour. For example, as I set out below, there are parallels in discourses about AdaSL being HARD in the sense of stern and tough, deaf people being hard of character, having "hard blood" (ie, strong and healthy blood) and being hardworking strong farmers. Qualic evaluations of language, of people's qualities and of social relationships permeate discourses about intergenerational differences, constituting a recurring theme in the language ideological assemblage. Also, these qualic evaluations often display moral projects: central to the use of sensuous (qualic) metaphors to talk about language and about people's qualities and relationships are moral evaluations (Gal 2013). It is by doing longitudinal intergenerational research that shifts and changes in qualic/moral evaluations in particular and the language ideological assemblage in general can be identified.

Research in linguistic anthropology, sociolinguistics and applied linguistics that looks at linguistic differences across generations typically focuses on language shift, intergenerational language transmission, language endangerment and language revitalisation (eg. Henne-Ochoa and Bauman 2015; Kroskrity 2018; Meek 2007; Lee 2009; Suslak 2009; Wyman 2009). In the context of Adamorobe, the continued existence of AdaSL is uncertain because the population of primary users (ie deaf people) is ageing: deaf people are no longer born in Adamorobe on a frequent basis. The reason is the overall reduction of intermarriage within the village (through which the "deaf gene" initially had been circulated), in combination with a marriage prohibition for deaf people who are expected only to marry and procreate with hearing people because deaf-deaf unions invariably produced deaf offspring (Kusters 2012). In addition to the 10 youths in the 19-31 cohort who recently ceased or finished schooling, two deaf youths aged 18 and 19 were still in school in 2018. Together they constitute the last sizeable group of deaf people of similar age in Adamorobe.[1] Another factor impacting the continued existence of AdaSL is a shift in socialisation patterns in Adamorobe, leading to a general decrease in the frequency of AdaSL use with hearing villagers.

However, the central focus of this article is not on the endangerment of AdaSL, but rather on qualic evaluations of AdaSL across generations over a period spanning ten years. I show that in Adamorobe, deaf youths' linguistic enthusiasm for AdaSL was not negatively impacted by GSL proliferation, AdaSL language devitalisation, and intergenerational conflicts between deaf inhabitants of Adamorobe.

Data was gathered during a total of 10 months of field work in 2008, 2009, 2012 and 2018, consisting of participant observation and informal conversations, individual interviews and group interviews with deaf people aged between 8 and 80. I learned GSL in 2006 during a three month stay

---

[1] Apart from them, there is one younger deaf girl (aged 11) from Adamorobe who also is at school, and (at least) one child around 8 or 9 who does not go to school (yet).

as a volunteer at a deaf school in Ghana, and learned AdaSL in 2008. I am conversant in both, but am more proficient in AdaSL than in GSL. During my last visit in 2018, I mostly focused on the cohort of youths, doing two group interviews with them in addition to informal conversations and participant observation.

Going forward, I start with a brief literature review on how language ideologies are connected with other kinds of ideologies, and discuss the use of qualia in such discourses. I then move to a short description of contexts of unimodal sign bilingualism, to continue with an overview of the history of AdaSL and GSL use in Adamorobe across different age cohorts. Thus having set the scene, I analyse discourses on intergenerational differences as well as on AdaSL use as expressed by deaf elders, showing how these often take the form of qualic evaluations (eg AdaSL as HARD) and are associated with discourses about deaf AdaSL signers' behaviour. This is followed by an account of everyday AdaSL-GSL code-switching and brokering practices, that proceeds into analysing how the youths characterise AdaSL as SWEET and DELIGHTFUL, which is for them related to code-switching practices. Thus a language ideological assemblage emerges, in which qualic evaluations form a recurring theme (ie, a *leitmotif*). Throughout, I not only link different ideologies (on language and on social behaviour) with each other, but also with language practices. Ideologies are inherent in these practices but also can contrast with them.

The language ideological assemblage and qualia

"Discourse about language frequently coincides with discourse about other practices", remarked Meek (2007, 29) in her account of language shift in a Northern Athapascan community in Canada. To frame this entanglement of language-related and other discourses in a holistic way, I am inspired by Hill's (1991) and Kroskrity's (2018) approaches to language ideologies and generations. In her seminal account on language ideology and discourses about respect in Mexico, Hill (1991) shows how language ideology is central to nostalgic discourses about youth having more respect in the past. Those in Hill's study express the idea that the use of Mexicano language is appropriate to show respectful behaviour such as proper greeting, and listening and responding to commands, as opposed to speaking Spanish or mixing Spanish and Mexicano, which is associated with loss of respect. Hill (1991) shows that these ideas are embedded in a "discursive system" in which connections are made between a set of "major rhetorical themes". These themes include the quality of ties between people in the Mexicano community; the economy which was less favorable than in the past; occupation with factory work and schooling rather than with farming as in the past; and the use of Mexicano in the past versus Spanish today. In Hill's participants discourses, language ideologies and other themes are connected by practices of chaining and rhetorical parallelism. For examples, people talk about language mixing and then turn to the problem of respect; or talk about the more favorable economy in the past when everything was cheaper and things were requested in Mexicano; or they relate schooling with Spanish and with being rude and unruly.

Similarly, Kroskrity (2018) explores how language ideologies are embedded in a larger aggregation of ideologies, focusing on the Western Mono in New Mexico, a community practicing extensive borrowing from other languages (syncretism), and the Village of Tewa, a community valuing multilingualism yet resisting language mixing and borrowing into their language (purism). Kroskrity shows how different language ideologies connected to multilingualism are associated with divergent patterns of language shift in these communities. In response to research that looks at a *single* ideology such as purism or syncretism, Kroskrity wants to "redirect attention to the interaction of clusters of ideologies that occur within or across linguistic communities" (2018, 2), coining the notion of the "language ideological assemblage":

> language ideologies as part of a larger complex of relevant beliefs and feelings, both Indigenous and externally imposed, that may complement, contest, or otherwise dynamically interact with each other to modify language ideologies and linguistic practices.

In Kroskrity's study, those assemblages include ideologies about language shift, new technologies, the function of language (eg. utilitarian versus identity expression), the political economy and patterns of colonization. Similarly, in this study I look at the interrelationships between different sets of discourses including, but not limited to, language ideologies.

A recurring pattern in the language ideological assemblage in Adamorobe is that of qualic evaluations. Qualia are "pragmatic signals (indexes) that materialize phenomenally in human activity as sensuous qualities" (Harkness 2015, 573). These qualities include sound, texture, taste, smell, shape, and spatial orientation. Examples of qualic evaluations are stink, warmth, hardness, straightness; and qualic evaluation usually occurs in contrast sets, such as hard versus unhard, light versus heavy, narrow versus embroidered (Gal 2013). Qualia focus attention on the "feeling of doing" linguistic practices, phatic practices, practices organized around objects or things, and body-focal practices (Harkness 2015). There is thus "transference from one semiotic order to another [...] and from one sense organ to another" (Chumley 2013, 170): eg "lightness" can be attributed to objects, human bodies, or language. In the process of qualic evaluations of language, similarities are identified between language forms on the one hand and the sensuous experience of eg. objects. Through a process of repetition, these evaluations become conventionalised in language ideologies. Examples of qualic language ideologies are "hard words", "plain speaking", "talking straight" (Gal 2013). According to Gal (2013,32), qualic labels of language can refer to sounds, grammar, lexicon, rhetorical form and so on. Gal (2013) also points out that there does not need to be unanimity about qualia: different groups of people can ascribe different qualia to the same register or language. In Adamorobe, we see this in youths' attribution of qualic labels to AdaSL compared to deaf elders'. A key difference between youths' and elders' linguistic repertoire, which impacts their qualic evaluations of AdaSL, is that youth are bilingual in AdaSL and GSL.

Unimodal sign bilingualism

The use of two sign languages on an everyday basis could be called "sign bilingualism", however this term is often used in the context of bimodal bilingualism in a signed language and a spoken/written language. In the context of Adamorobe I look at *unimodal* sign bilingualism: bilingualism in two sign languages. Existing studies on unimodal sign bilingualism seem to have focused mostly on language contact and code-switching between the two sign languages. Examples include, but are not limited to: (1) Countries where different schools for deaf children (eg with different religious heritages or in different regions) use different sign languages. There are typically one or more minority sign languages and a majority sign language, and minority signers usually learn the majority sign language (eg Adam 2016). (2.) International migration and mobility (eg Quinto-Pozos 2008; Zeshan and Panda 2015). (3) The context of "shared sign languages" (Nyst 2012b), which are the languages that emerged in shared signing communities (Kisch 2008) like Adamorobe, where intergenerational hereditary deafness in close-knit (often rural) communities constituted the breeding grounds for the emergence of local sign languages, ie shared sign languages (De Vos and Pfau 2015; Zeshan and De Vos 2012). In some shared signing communities, such as Adamorobe, some or all deaf signers have learnt a majority (national) sign language in addition to the shared sign language, and this can trigger language endangerment of the shared sign language. Braithwaite (2019) notes that language shift from one to another sign language seems to happen more quickly than is generally the case for spoken languages. Sign language endangerment, especially of small and undocumented sign languages, led to concerns by a number of sign linguists (eg. for Adamorobe: Edward 2018a), and a number of organizations (such as the World Federation of the Deaf and UNESCO), have argued there is an urgency to try and document and/or preserve the dying languages (Braithwaite 2019).

Two features of shared sign languages are crucial with regard to their usage and transmission. First, *hearing* signers play a central role in their emergence, transmission and

continued use. In small shared signing communities where the shared sign language is endangered due to the increased use of a national (majority) sign language, it may even be the case that hearing signers are the "keepers" of the endangered language because they typically have no incentive to learn the national sign language and deaf signers accommodate them by using the shared sign language (Lanesman and Meir 201; Nonaka 2009). Second, in shared signing communities, deaf people of a wide age range are in frequent (everyday) contact, contrasting with the majority of the world where it is not typically the case that deaf children, youths, adults *and* elders are in contact on a daily basis.

Longitudinal research in shared signing communities has generated insights in shifts in language choices and language ideologies over time and how these have been impacted by educational, social and economic changes. Such longitudinal research not only identifies different language cohorts and intergenerational patterns of language use at a given moment of time, but also traces shifts through time. For example, amongst the Al-Sayyid Bedouin, a shared signing community in Israel, both the shared sign language and the majority sign language (Israeli Sign Language) are used intensively by some cohorts (Kisch 2012). Another example is a shift to the use of the majority sign language in the case of Ban Khor, a shared signing community in Thailand (Nonaka 2014).

In the respect of such intergenerational research, there are different ways of conceptualising generations (Whyte, Alber, Van der Geest 2008): (1) generations as genealogical relations of kinship; (2) generations as a principle for structuring society (eg different life stages, maturational age); and (3) generations as cohorts or historical generations. I focus on the latter, showing that deaf people who are born in Adamorobe in the same time period share certain experiences.

A short history of AdaSL and GSL in Adamorobe

The following chronological short history of AdaSL and GSL in Adamorobe is based on historical narratives (collected from participants during my research) and written resources, as well as on ethnographic analysis of language practices and ideologies as I observed in my research between 2008-2018.

Deafness in Adamorobe goes back as far as the community's elders remember: they say that deafness has been present in Adamorobe "since time immemorial" (Kusters 2015a). Adamorobe traditionally was a farming and hunting village and in that respect deaf and hearing people were occupied in similar ways. Deaf people learned AdaSL and everything else from their (mostly hearing) parents and elders, including practical skills such as farming, hunting, trading, and house-keeping, and knowledge of traditional religion and herbal medicine. A large part of everyday life in Adamorobe is conducted outdoors: people are busy cooking, washing clothes, farming and socializing. The 35 deaf people in the village meet and interact with hearing people on a frequent basis, eg. greeting and exchanging news in AdaSL. Deaf people also produce social spaces consisting of deaf people only, in some particular outdoors spots in Adamorobe (see Kusters 2015a). These main meeting places regularly shift, eg. when deaf people relocate within the village, which happens frequently.

In the past 15 years or so, the village has rapidly expanded due to in-migration (related to employment opportunities and its proximity to the expanding capital of Ghana, Accra). Educational levels and employment options (and therefore also living standards) have diversified. Traditional practices in which deaf and hearing people historically interacted a lot through AdaSL have declined, namely communal cooking, eating, working and religious events. The story goes that most villagers used to be AdaSL signers (with varying rates of competency) in the past when the village was much

smaller, but young hearing people are no longer likely to learn AdaSL if they do not live with deaf people in the same housing compound.

The first primary school in Adamorobe was established in 1924, and there are now several others in the village. Since the 1960s, attempts have been made to formally educate deaf people from Adamorobe, first in 1963 in a school in a nearby town called Mampong. The school was established by the Rev. Andrew Foster, an African-American deaf person who established 32 schools for deaf children in Africa (Amoako 2019). In Mampong, the children were taught signs from American Sign Language (ASL) (Oteng 1988). ASL in Ghana changed over time and new signs emerged; it is now called Ghanaian Sign Language (GSL) by the Ghanaian deaf community. GSL and SEE (Signing Exact English: lexical signs from GSL used in English word order) are used alongside written English in the urban and national deaf community in Ghana and in its ten or so schools for deaf children.

The deaf pupils from Adamorobe pulled out of the Mampong school after a few months of schooling for a variety of reasons. In 1974 a deaf unit was established in connection to the Anglican primary school in Adamorobe, where about 15 deaf pupils aged 6 to 14 years were taught by a hearing teacher trained in deaf education in a teacher training institute in Mampong. When I interviewed him, he described his teaching method to me as a combination of lipreading, fingerspelling, speech training, and "some sign language" (ie GSL). The unit closed in 1980 following a disagreement between this teacher and the chief of Adamorobe. After this, a number of deaf people from Adamorobe took part in vocational, literacy and numeracy training inside and outside of Adamorobe, in GSL, for short time periods (see Kusters 2015a for a more detailed account).

GSL and AdaSL are different not only with regard to lexicon but also the movements, facial expressions and the use and size of the signing space (see eg Edward and Perniss 2019). While GSL does include signs for Ghanaian cuisine and customs, AdaSL incorporates a high number of gestures that are also used and understood by hearing people from Ghana and neighbouring countries. AdaSL is also influenced by the spoken language used in the village, Twi, eg. by way of Twi mouthings in AdaSL and Twi compounds that are reproduced in AdaSL (Edward forthcoming; Nyst 2007). Many hearing signers even say that for them, AdaSL and Twi are the same language, used in different modalities (Edward forthcoming; Kusters 2014). Deaf people in Adamorobe do not distinguish the signs used by Rev. Foster from modern GSL. GSL was referred to as SIGNS or SIGN LANGUAGE using the ASL/GSL sign for sign language (two d-hands rotating backwards around each other), as opposed to the AdaSL sign SIGNS (hands twirling around each other – sometimes this AdaSL sign was replaced by or accompanied with the sign ADAMOROBE).

There were thus several cohorts of students among deaf people aged over 31 who had been exposed to GSL: those who had attended Mampong but not the deaf unit in Adamorobe; those who had gone to both; those who only had gone to the unit in Adamorobe; and those who hadn't gone to either but received some literacy training later. However, for all deaf people aged over 31, schooling had taken place so long ago or was so limited that most of their learned but unused literacy skills had vanished and differences in English literacy were pretty much evened out.

Deaf people in Adamorobe have historically been exposed to GSL not only through schooling but also in Christian church services which have been held in GSL for almost 60 years. Rev. Foster was the first one to organise these services, and when he left Ghana in 1965, deaf and hearing people travelling from Accra, representing several different denominations, regularly preached in Adamorobe. Since 1998, a deaf preacher from the Lutheran Church called Kofi Akorful visits Adamorobe weekly and preaches in SEE and/or GSL with the addition of AdaSL signs.

Some of the GSL signs that deaf people aged over 31 learned through schooling and church are still an actively used part of their linguistic repertoires (see below).[2] GSL knowledge seemed to be pretty homogeneous among the deaf people aged over 31, with the exception of Kofi Pare and Kwasi Boahene. These two men in their forties received private literacy lessons in GSL and English by Samuel Adjei, a deaf man who moved to Adamorobe in 1988 and preached in the church before Akorful. Kofi Pare and Kwasi Boahene sometimes interpreted between GSL and AdaSL in church, and Kofi Pare is an influential and respected figure in the community.

In 2000, the Lutheran Church provided initial financial support for the schooling of deaf children from Adamorobe in Mampong, and from then onwards, schooling of deaf children and youth from Adamorobe happened in a more sustained way. The current cohort of deaf youths in Adamorobe acquired AdaSL in the first years of their life from hearing or deaf relatives, and communicated in AdaSL until they started going to the residential school between the ages of eight and 10, where they acquired GSL and written English. The cohort became fluent in GSL which was their most used language over an extended period of time for both education and socialisation.

During my first field work stint in the village in 2008-2009, deaf people (both youths and elders) described Twi, AdaSL, and GSL as three distinct but equivalent languages. At the same time they pointed out the distinctive features of AdaSL in comparison to Twi and GSL. They said that AdaSL was HARD, which is a gloss of a sign, and its meaning does not entirely overlap with the meaning of the English word "hard". It means that AdaSL is unique to Adamorobe and tough to understand for outsiders and even for many people within Adamorobe, which was a source of pride. HARD also means stern, clear, forceful, and expressive, and this was contrasted with the use of the body when signing GSL, which was associated with weak and flabby hand movements (see Kusters 2014). At the same time, deaf elders from Adamorobe were repeatedly confronted with their lack of GSL knowledge in the church services, and in their relationships with the deaf youths. Some deaf elders regretted that they did not know GSL better and blamed their lack of sustained formal schooling. They indicated that there were practical benefits, prestige, and pleasure associated with knowing GSL, and emphasized the value of bilingualism in the two sign languages (Kusters 2014).

When the schoolchildren (who form the current cohort of "youths") came home from the residential school for holidays in 2008, 2009 and 2012, they were inclined to use GSL with each other and with me. When deaf schoolchildren and deaf adults (who form the current cohort of "elders") communicated with each other during holidays, they used either AdaSL or GSL or, in the majority of cases, a combination of both. Most schoolchildren had some fluency in AdaSL, although the lexicon they used seemed to be less varied than that of the deaf adults. I observed that they also signed in a slower and looser way than the adults who signed in a firmer way, and they used a smaller signing space than was generally the case when using AdaSL, comparable to the size of signing space in GSL. There were clear variations in proficiency among the children and youths: six of them had one or two deaf parents, and they were generally more fluent in AdaSL than the others. The adults did not understand all of the GSL that the schoolchildren used with each other, and the schoolchildren did not always understand the way a group of adults would use AdaSL. However, both parties could communicate if they would adapt to each other by signing in AdaSL, often mixed with a limited amount of GSL signs.

A few weeks into the six-week summer holiday in 2009, I noticed that the schoolchildren's language use had shifted to an increased use of AdaSL: they started to use AdaSL when addressing

---

[2] Some hearing relatives of deaf adults have picked up a few GSL signs too (eg the sign FATHER), but this phenomenon was very limited, in apparent contrast with Ban Khor (Nonaka 2014) and the Al-Sayyid Bedouin (Kisch 2012) where a number of hearing people picked up more signs from the school sign language.

me (formerly GSL), used more AdaSL with deaf adults than previously, and used an increasing number of expressions in AdaSL in their signing to each other. Thus the children's immersion in an AdaSL language environment gradually impacted on their language use. Still, some adults criticized schoolchildren who could not sign in AdaSL without a heavy GSL accent to their faces and expected that their AdaSL knowledge would "become more HARD" when they grow older.

In 2018, eight ex-schoolchildren of the group I had previously observed had been in Adamorobe for at least several years, and two had moved out, but visited the village for a few days during my field work. All of them had become noticably more fluent in AdaSL, their strong GSL accents in AdaSL had lessened or disappeared. The youths, who are all fluent in GSL, are not all equally fluent in AdaSL, in contrast to deaf elders who are all fluent in AdaSL, even though there are observable differences in eloquence, intelligence and rhetorical skills. The youths with one or two deaf parents were still the most fluent AdaSL signers and I observed them use a broad register. Deaf youths' AdaSL still looked noticeably different from that of the adults: the adults sign more firmly and youths sign in a more rounded way, generally using less strong facial expressions, perhaps because of their GSL background. Importantly, putting into words these differences does not just represent qualia, but is a qualic act in itself.

Respect, reciprocity and authority, and signing HARD

When deaf youths and elders discuss their relationships with each other, their differences in linguistic knowledge and formal education are *not* the ones that are foregrounded the most. Indeed, language ideologies are entangled with discourses on intergenerational relationships. Like in the accounts of Hill (1991) and Meek (2007), these discourses are typically uttered in the form of moral cricitism and very often circle around the notions of respect, reciprocity and maturity.

Reciprocity between generations includes transmission of material and non-material resources (food, housing, land, knowledge, nurturing and caring), and respectful behaviour (Whyte, Alber and Van der Geest 2008, 6). In Adamorobe, deaf people were very much invested in respect and reciprocity towards their deaf and hearing blood relatives, but also had similar expectations of younger deaf people who were not closely relatives. In 2009 and 2012 this became apparent during the school holidays. During those holidays, the schoolchildren helped at their parents' farms and around the compounds where they lived and in their spare time, they mostly interacted with each other, constituting a few clusters of age-and gender-based friendships. They were reluctant to engage in social interactions with elders and were criticized to their faces for not speaking up and for being too shy and nervous to engage in conversation. They were also vehemently chided for their failure or refusal to comply with traditional Akan greeting practices (Van der Geest 2006), ie not greeting, greeting in the wrong way, or not greeting often enough – and these greetings were expected to be in AdaSL rather than GSL (for examples see Kusters 2015a, 175-176). They were also scolded for their refusal to carry out small tasks for deaf adults, which the latter felt they could request because of their shared deafness, such as washing clothes or getting water from the pump.

In the changing socioeconomic context of Adamorobe, many deaf elders regarded their lack of education and their nonliteracy as failures that limited their possible life choices to subsistence farming (Kusters 2015a), and projected their deep frustrations at not having completed school on the children whom, in their eyes, were looking at a bright future. As in Hill's (1991) account, schooling, disrespect and communication were seen as connected with each other. Some deaf adults emphasised they had supported the children going to school such as by accompanying them to school after holidays. Being jealous of the opportunities offered to the children, they were frustrated when interacting with the children who were seen as impolite, unhelpful, and ungrateful; this led to them frequently scolding and ignoring the youths, which in turn resulted in deaf youths' reluctance to engage with older deaf people. Because of this reluctance, Kofi Pare and several other deaf women and men insisted that deaf youths are EYE-SOFT (Figure 5), a metaphorical compound term

meaning lazy, unengaging, reluctant and/or unconfident. In the context of communication, EYE-SOFT means not calling people's attention to chat, or not taking active part in conversations. Kofi Pare is the aforementioned deaf man who knows more GSL than most other deaf elders, is a respected deaf leader who produced eloquent accounts of commonly held ideologies amongst the deaf people. He also has influence on other deaf people, who often align their ideas with his.

Figure 5: EYE-SOFT

Fast forward to 2018. Most of the former schoolchildren (eight women and two men) lived full-time in the village. Some of them had completed Junior Secondary School or Vocational school, others dropped out before completing their schooling, for example because of problems at the school or pregnancies. In 2008-2009 they had imagined a future for themselves outside the village (for example, in Accra), marrying a deaf schoolmate, doing a vocational job such as being a seamstress, a hairdresser, or having a store, and growing fat because of not having a farming job and having plenty of food, but the reality in 2018 looked quite different for them. Six of them had one or more babies or young children, and most had no partner or planned to leave their hearing partner soon. One young woman lived outside Adamorobe with her baby and her deaf GSL using partner, one lived in Accra, and the other eight youths frequently interacted with each other in Adamorobe (especially the six women). The women were mostly focused on the household and their small children and hoped that a job opportunity would arise. The two young men did jobs such as stone cutting and factory work and did not interact frequently with the women. None of them tended their own piece of farmland (which is owned by lineages in Adamorobe and can be allocated for lineage members' use); an indirect result of the schooling period which came with a different orientation towards the future.

Deaf youths in 2018 socialized more frequently with deaf elders than was the case when most of them had still been in schooling, using both GSL and AdaSL (see below). Deaf elders acknowledged that the deaf youths knew AdaSL well now: their AdaSL had become more HARD over time, however, this had not sufficiently been paired with a more EYE-HARD[3] approach to communication. EYE-HARD is the opposite of EYE-SOFT: it means being confident and engaging. Signing EYE-HARD is often associated with being STRAIGHT, a sign that is used to indicate talking and behaving in a clear, consistent, sincere and honest way, making perfect sense, and not pretending or lying.

When people sign in a way that is EYE-SOFT, because it is unengaging or radiates a lack of confidence, their signing is not SWEET, not DELIGHTFUL, said Kofi Pare. The sign SWEET is also used to describe soft drinks and sugary food, and the sign DELIGHTFUL is also used to describe food or a fresh bath, a fresh wind, or an activity that is enjoyed. In other words, signing in a way that is EYE-HARD, in a clear, expressive and confident way, means signing in a way that is a pleasure for others to look at, to be savoured through the eyes.

For Kofi Pare, signing HARD and being EYE-HARD are related to each other. For example, when deaf people (elders and youths alike) say that particular people (deaf or hearing) do not know how to sign in AdaSL (SIGNING-KNOW-NOTHING) (but sign fluent AdaSL in my eyes), they mean that these people do not sign in a HARD and STRAIGHT way, eg. people who are deemed immature, who whine a lot, or whose morality, intelligence or mental health is questioned. This is an example of how semiotic resources are clustered in metalinguistic discourse, showing how enregisterment happens (cf. Williams 2019). In other words, we get insight in speakers' own understandings of variation: certain usages are seen as proper AdaSL while others are not. Being a good AdaSL signer does not merely mean understanding it and being able to use it, but also being able to use the language as an instrument to narrate, to orate, to demonstrate eloquence, intelligence, general knowledge, and sincerity. Therefore, Kofi Pare explained, signing HARD and being EYE-HARD is something people should aim for:

---

[3] In previous publications I glossed this sign as EYE-STRONG.

Imagine I am EYE-SOFT and someone talks in an EYE-HARD way with me, and tells me that I am too EYE-SOFT. We talk more, and I start thinking more and get angry and start talking engagedly. Then people would see Kofi Pare is getting EYE-HARD and congratulate him, saying that this is very good. All deaf would say: "Good, you are EYE-HARD!". Then all deaf people are connected as one. There are no differences, we are all together one.

In Kofi Pare's eyes (and I have seen other deaf people express this idea as well), signing HARD and being EYE-HARD is something people need to invest in, something people need to learn over time when they mature into an adult, and something to strive for throughout adult life. Remember the schoolchildren's reluctance to speak up in deaf spaces in 2008: despite the traditional Ghanaian custom in which young people listen to their elders rather than speak themselves, some deaf adults were actively attempting to pass on to the children the value of being EYE-HARD. And as the quote above indicates, being EYE-HARD *together* was constructed as a deaf value. Two deaf people who are both EYE-HARD can confidently and meaningfully connect to each other, and being EYE-HARD is a skill or disposition that links deaf people together.

These discourses about deaf people being HARD and EYE-HARD occur in other discourses that do not directly discuss communication. Deaf people feel they have to show each other and hearing people that deaf people are strong not only in their way of talking but also their working and living, partly in response to discrimination (see Kusters 2015a). The discourses include Wittgensteinian language games referring to the origins of deafness in Adamorobe such as stories about strong deaf warriors being the first deaf people in Adamorobe (Kusters 2015b); discourses about deaf people being strong farmers in contrast to lazy, weak and soft hearing people, with "very hard hands" and "very hard and very red blood" that is "very good, strong and healthy" (Kusters 2015a); and stories about conflicts with hearing people, which were brusquely and physically resolved by EYE-HARD and hard deaf people (Kusters 2015a).

Discourses about language use were thus embedded within a broader set of discourses about the *nature* of deaf people in Adamorobe: we see Irvine and Gal's (2000) process of iconization at work here. Iconization means that similarities are constructed across social and linguistic domains: groups of people are literally said to resemble the language (or variety) they speak, eg people who speak a language with an uncomplicated grammar would be labeled as simple (Irvine and Gal 2000). Iconizing labels attributed to deaf people and AdaSL (here in the form of qualia) were often uttered in contrast sets including generalised contrasts not only between deaf and hearing inhabitants of Adamorobe, but also between generations of deaf people in Adamorobe. Indeed, deaf adults expect youths to make this shift to HARD AdaSL use in an EYE-HARD way when maturing into adulthood. This linkage between embodied transformation in the sense of style shifts, and qualic evaluation of language is comparable to Calder's (2018, 2019) account of dragqueens transforming from male-presenting into feminine drag personae, which is featured by the use of a harder and sharper /s/ in their speech: linguistic features thus become linked with embodied transformations.

These qualic discourses formed the reference point for evaluating young deaf people's life styles and behavior: deaf adults' judgement of deaf youths' social personae in the sense of labelling them EYE-SOFT is a moral one. Indeed, qualic evaluations are intrinsically moral: "Social actors evaluate qualia, and qualia are in turn used to evaluate social actors; in the process, aesthetic judgments regarding sensuous experience come to be aligned with moral judgments about social personae" (Chumley 2013, 169). In other words, people morally orient to one another via qualia, which provide "aesthetic and moral anchors of orientation for reflexive, group-defining conduct and thus for the situated enactment of forms of personhood" (Harkness 2015, 576).

As with qualic evaluations of language use that represent moral ideas, elders also evaluated other aspects of the youths' behaviour and life choices morally. Compared to 2008-2012, deaf elders behaved more welcoming towards deaf youths and conflicts about greeting and requests to bring water or wash clothes had reduced. Yet the youths were (still) often chastised, now for being in the position of having no jobs and not going to the farm (farming is a source of pride for deaf elders, see

Kusters 2015a), for having no partners and for having babies whom they would not be able to send to school. Their sexual integrity, morality, social sense and maturity were taken into question, which is typical for intergenerational discourse on morality (Whyte, Alber, Van der Geest 2008). The youths underwent such criticism, responding occasionally, and keeping quiet at other moments.

Deaf elders were very invested in pointing out and enforcing age-based hierarchies, often in contexts where youths received attention. For example, they expressed jealousy when deaf youths were involved in research projects (including mine), for which they were often paid. Deaf elders feel more entitled to financial resources and to researchers' attention than youths because of their seniority, which they foregrounded, backgrounding the latter's schooling and linguistic knowledge, which were strongly desired by them but had been "wasted" on/by youths they deemed disrespectful and immature at times. In short, in these discourses deaf elders are asserting age, hardness and strength over GSL knowledge or school degrees; arguing what good AdaSL use is like (it should be HARD and embedded in EYE-HARD behavior), chaining these comments with moral evaluations of intergenerational differences (cf Hill 1991), foregrounding the importance of respect, maturity, and physical strength.

Then how is the *difference* between AdaSL and GSL conceptualized, especially by the youths who use both languages extensively? I approach this question in the next section, starting with a consideration of the nature and contexts of GSL use.

Code-switching, brokering, and SWEET DELIGHTFUL signing

Most deaf youths and elders seem to be comfortable with using both AdaSL and GSL in the village, and with code-switching. The active GSL lexicon of deaf elders is limited and solid: there is a small but extensively used shared body of GSL signs that has been borrowed into AdaSL. Both elders and youths would use a GSL sign mid-clause when they were signing AdaSL, such as SAFE, ANGRY, KNOW, HELP, DIFFERENT, TIRED. It is not the case that these GSL signs have replaced AdaSL signs: both equivalents were in frequent use, and sometimes used in alternation or duplicated (ie. reiterative code-switching). I argue that GSL signs have found their way into AdaSL not through recent interactions with youths (as is argued by Edward forthcoming) but through the long past of GSL use in Adamorobe.

Youths also frequently used GSL interjections between AdaSL sentences or at the end of an AdaSL sentence, such as BAD or RIGHT, or during short responses such as FINE (ie tag-switching). I often observed youths switch at turntaking, or mid-sentence. Sometimes youths used GSL signs for concepts or names for which there were no equivalent single (rather than compound) AdaSL signs, for example HEADMASTER, UNIVERSITY. They used GSL sign names of places in Ghana, such as Cape Coast and Accra, also occasionally fingerspelled Ghanaian place names (such as Odumase or Kibi), or personal names. Some deaf people (youths but also Kofi Pare) are able and inclined to switch "cleanly" between AdaSL and GSL, while others are more prone to mixing (mostly by inserting GSL signs in AdaSL) and may not be aware of their use of GSL borrowings in AdaSL (as becomes evident during AdaSL linguistic data collection: see Edward forthcoming).

GSL is a resource that is used in practices of concealing information for others (by both deaf youths and elders). For example, GSL is used when wanting to say something hidden from hearing non-GSL users, such as "He is bad!" "He's wrong!" "She's a thief!"(see Kusters 2015a). (Similarly, hearing signers use AdaSL when wanting to conceal something from non-signers (Edward forthcoming). However, deaf youths also use GSL as secret language in front of deaf elders. For example, in 2018 on the crossroads in front of Kofi Pare's house, I saw two young women arguing with an elderly woman in AdaSL, and then talking about her in GSL in a quick aside. In another

instance, one young woman used GSL to ask me when the youths would be interviewed (since she anticipated jealousy from elders who were also present). In those cases, youths would sign in quick GSL with no facial expressions that could give away the contents. This practice has backfired on the youths: deaf elders often were suspicious when youths used GSL amongst each other and emphasised that youths should not insult people who are older; thus asserting their seniority and therefore authority and entitlement to respect.

The fact that GSL is not understood by all deaf people in Adamorobe has led to multiple practices of (informal) interpreting. The most notable example is the church services: Akorful signs GSL/signed English in the songs and prayers, and then switches to a mix of GSL and AdaSL when narrating and discussing a bible story. The latter part was interpreted into AdaSL by Kofi Pare in 2008-2009, and in 2018 also by two deaf youths. Interpretation happened sequentially and with added explanations, and I also saw Kofi Pare using GSL at times in his interpretation from Akorful's GSL. Kofi Pare's GSL seemed to be largely understood by the older deaf people. Similarly, when I addressed the deaf group in my version of AdaSL to talk about my research, Kofi Pare repeated it in his own AdaSL, which would be better understood by the audience. The interpretation processes in the church thus were thus not simply from GSL to AdaSL but also within GSL and AdaSL.

In the village itself, I also noticed a lot of examples of informal interpreting, mostly by the youths, and because of my positioning in the field during my research, many of these examples involved me. Since I mostly used AdaSL, and I can understand and produce AdaSL generally better than GSL, youths would repeat themselves or each other in AdaSL if they had first signed in GSL. Conversely, if they thought I did not understand AdaSL, they switched to GSL or informally interpreted into GSL. However, while people engage in informal interpreting, it is not the case that people in Adamorobe make sure everyone understands, as can be seen in situations where deaf and hearing people are present.

Generally in Adamorobe, hearing people (even when they are fluent signers) will speak with each other even when there are deaf people present, and then sometimes summarise for deaf people into AdaSL (see Kusters 2015a). Similarly, as mentioned above, deaf youths sometimes used GSL with each other when deaf elders were present, and not only for the abovementioned "secret" exchanges but also for other kind of conversations. For example, four deaf young women, Akorful the priest, a deaf man in his forties called Kwame Ofori and I were sitting at Kwasi Boahene and Akua Fiankobea's (a deaf woman and man also in their forties) home, under a shelter. While youths mostly used AdaSL (as they usually do when deaf elders are present), they switched to GSL at a given moment when they were talking with Akorful about school. I saw Kwasi Boahene and Akua Fiankobea looking blankly and I curiously asked them if they understood. By way of response, they produced a summary in AdaSL. When they looked away, one of the young women quickly pointed out to me that their summary was haphazard, and that they only had picked up bits and pieces. Later, Akorful explained to Kwame Ofori that my flight was paid by my university, in a GSL and AdaSL mix. Then Adwoa Kumi (one of the young women) repeated it to Kwame Ofori (her maternal uncle) into AdaSL: "when she wants to come here, she gets money for flying, from her boss in the big school". Adwoa Kumi seems to have an amiable relationship with her uncle, and the maternal uncle is a respected figure in Akan culture.

These examples illustrate that language brokering happens only now and then and with people with high status, visitor status, and with people who are loved and respected and not as an automatic or fully inclusive practice. Interpreting is usually partial, also in the church. In these situations, GSL use that goes beyond the insertion of single signs into AdaSL discourse is connected to lack of access to discourses for deaf elders, and the use of AdaSL (directly or a translation) is connected to respect for people who are older. Not all youths were fluent in AdaSL, so AdaSL use was not always accessible to them either, yet they did not allude to the discourse of respect, which was associated with being older. All these translation practices are reminiscent of similar ones reported in Kisch (2008) and Green (2014).

Now that I have outlined how common code-switching is and how GSL and AdaSL use can include and exclude people, I want to shed light on youths' ideologies on AdaSL versus GSL. In Kofi Pare's discourses, the signs SWEET and DELIGHTFUL are used to describe *a particular style* of AdaSL use, ie mature signing that is EYE-HARD and HARD, but youths use it to indicate AdaSL *itself.* For example, when I asked which language they liked to use and why, they said "AdaSL because it is SWEET/DELIGHTFUL, in contrast to GSL". Already in 2008-2009, some youths said that because of its expressivity, AdaSL was more pleasant to use than GSL, for example the days of the week which are initialized signs in GSL, as opposed to the AdaSL weekday signs which are based on events, history, and customs in Adamorobe. In 2018 the "AdaSL is SWEET" discourse was even more strongly asserted by the young women. So while GSL might be used most of the time amongst youths themselves, that does not mean it is *ideologically* preferred over AdaSL.

When I asked in group interviews with youths what it meant that AdaSL was SWEET, they started demonstrating it rather than explaining it. They rhythmically recited core lexicon (WOMAN, MAN, FARM, SNAIL, OKRA); performed how people talk to children (ie asking "Where is your mommy?", "Where is your daddy?" "Went to the farm?"); demonstrated how people talk about illness, funerals and political parties; explained and enacted how particular traditional dishes are prepared; and parodied the way other people dance, sign or argue, imitating people's distinctive facial expressions and movements. The latter seemed to be among their favorite examples, inciting laughter. For them, SWEET also means funny: youths explained they laugh much more when they use AdaSL. In these long-winded performances they emanated enjoyment, from time to time half-singing their examples in rhythmic ways. They explained and demonstrated that the signs in AdaSL are larger and more expressive than in GSL, which they called "not SWEET". Some youths even said they like AdaSL better, but that they feel more fluent in GSL and are more inclined to use GSL.

In essence, they explained to me that the *feeling of doing* AdaSL is very different to the feeling of doing GSL. For them, AdaSL is embodied in a way that is much closer to everyday life in Adamorobe than GSL is. By coming back to Adamorobe full-time, the youth went through a transition from being GSL-using schoolchildren to being AdaSL-using inhabitants of Adamorobe. Even though they still used GSL, using AdaSL in Adamorobe was a matter of course for them, and intricately connected (through its very context of emergence) to village life, its people, their often ritualised language use, and the preparation of food. In short, AdaSL use is central to their experience of being a deaf resident of Adamorobe.

The reason for deaf youths' and deaf elders' differences in emphases on AdaSL as HARD or SWEET is because AdaSL plays a different role in their respective linguistic repertoires even though they use it in the same or similar contexts in Adamorobe. Calling the language SWEET is presented by youths as an important reason to use AdaSL not only with hearing people (including their own hearing children) but also with each other. Most of them insisted that they also use AdaSL with other deaf youths (ie not only with deaf elders), eg. Janet Owusu explained: "We often sign in GSL and when we get tired of it we switch to AdaSL". In other words, they do not see AdaSL merely as a means of communicating with non-GSL signers in Adamorobe.

Ideologies originating outside of Adamorobe add another layer of complexity here. Youths' foregrounding the ideology of AdaSL as SWEET in such a powerful and confident way could be rooted in feelings of opposition to language ideologies in the wider Ghanaian deaf community outside Adamorobe. For many, the movements and handshapes of AdaSL (and perhaps also the mouthings) remind them of (co-speech) gestures used by illiterate/unschooled deaf people and by hearing people who communicate with them (Kusters 2014). Indeed, signers in West Africa more generally tend to perceive ASL-based sign languages as superior to local sign languages and gestures (Nyst 2012a). Most deaf youths in Adamorobe resist this perspective, and I suspect that this is partly because of their awareness that researchers and visitors are attracted to the village because of its use of AdaSL. These researchers are white deaf and hearing foreigners as well as deaf and hearing Ghanaians.

In this context, deaf people in Adamorobe can make money with the performance and analysis of AdaSL (in contrast to GSL). During the group interviews, there was peer pressure on two deaf youths who wanted to sign in GSL: one indicated she liked AdaSL but felt she was not fluent enough in AdaSL since she lived outside the village and was only visiting, and the other felt resistance to using AdaSL. Both relented under the peer pressure and switched to AdaSL although both switched back to GSL later, probably because they now had demonstrated effort to do AdaSL and/or because I had not explicitly expressed a preference for either of the languages. In other words: youths might have been using AdaSL more readily than usual because I was present as a researcher, and not only because I understood AdaSL better.

Of all the youths, one young man was most reluctant to sign in AdaSL. I saw him using GSL with the other youths, with deaf elders, with me, even greeting in GSL, which I saw no-one else do in 2018. He said he would use a mix of AdaSL and GSL with adults: "It's hard (…) we understand each other (…) but I am more motivated to use GSL". In the group interview he expressed a dislike for AdaSL use and explained: "The reason I would choose GSL over AdaSL is that in the world most people use GSL (SIGN LANGUAGE) - than Adamorobe [signs]". Because of this ideological collapse of GSL with ASL, GSL was not merely seen as the school and church sign language in Ghana, but as a sign language used around the world (Kusters 2015a). I wonder if the negative perspectives on AdaSL in Ghana (outside of Adamorobe) were another element of his perspective on AdaSL. In his case, it is clear how important intrinsic motivation and enjoyment (experiencing language use as DELIGHTFUL) is in the context of the other deaf youths' AdaSL use in Adamorobe.

Conclusion

"Generations and linguistic practices and ideologies are (…) mutually constituted and constitutive", write Henner-Ochoa and Bauman (2015, 130). Deaf Adamorobean youth is constituted as one cohort or generation because of their common educational and linguistic background, juxtaposed with the background of deaf adults aged over 31, ie. the deaf elders. These two deaf historical generations' characterizations of AdaSL are related to a different positioning towards AdaSL or valuation of AdaSL in their linguistic repertoires. They talk about AdaSL respectively in terms of it being SWEET and DELIGHTFUL or as HARD and related to being EYE-HARD. HARD and EYE-HARD are adjectives not referring to AdaSL in itself, but describing *good* AdaSL use, which are embedded in a larger language ideological assemblage connected to everyday language practices and social interactions between deaf youths and deaf elders.

In Adamorobe, both deaf youth and elders comment on the *feeling of doing* language (SWEET, HARD), referring to how AdaSL use feels in the body and face, thereby invoking qualia (cf Hoffmann-Dilloway 2018). Qualities which are attributed to language are related to other cultural categories, eg. valuing hardness in language but also in behavior and bodies. Thus, "the qualia in enregistered speech practices instantiate abstract qualities that can be applied to broader forms of conduct, mobilized for illocutionary force, and linked to specific categories of personhood" (Harkness 2015, 576). This is where Kroskrity's language ideological assemblage and Hill's work on rhetorical parallelism and chaining comes in. By putting deaf people's hard bodies and characters and the hardness of AdaSL on a par with each other, deaf elders create "indexical linkages between qualia emergent in kinds of verbal communication and their suggestion of relatively stable characteristics of kinds of persons" (Harkness 2015, 276).

The context of the 2008-2009 data is that of schoolchildren coming home for holidays, but by 2018 most of them had transitioned back to life in Adamorobe, paired with their transition into adulthood (and in some cases parenthood), and into AdaSL space. In AdaSL space, youths have to greet correctly and in AdaSL, and while code-switching is common, signing in GSL is sometimes regarded as disrespectful, depending on the context. Adults place a high value on signing HARD and

being EYE-HARD, which implicitly means AdaSL use. Deaf elders perspectives on younger generations' signing are related to broader conceptions of what it means to be a deaf adult in Adamorobe (ie EYE-HARD, respectful, mature); ie their signing is not evaluated separately from their overall behaviour and position in the village. The latter are judged in accordance with the expectations of deaf elders' regarding morality and reciprocity which were manifested as requests for assistance when the youths were younger (in 2008-2009). In 2018 the emphasis had shifted to discourses on maturity.

A recurrent theme throughout 2008-2018 is the need to be respectful and sufficiently submissive towards deaf elders: the latter make sure they repeatedly assert age-related authority. The youths' behaviour and signing is also evaluated in relation to the deaf elders' background of limited GSL knowledge and limited formal schooling, which made the elders envious, as observed in 2008-2009. The youths' GSL use is a constant reminder of their privilege in the sense of education and literacy, a privilege that they, in the eyes of deaf elders, sometimes misuse to exclude people.

AdaSL endangerment was not a current theme of conversation when I was there, perhaps contrary to what scholars and organizations focusing on the endangerment of minority sign languages or undocumented sign languages may expect in the context of an impending AdaSL devitalisation (Braithwaite 2019). Deaf people complained about a general decrease both in the number of fluent hearing AdaSL signers and in the number of deaf people in Adamorobe (see Kusters 2015a). However, they did not talk about the possible disappearance of AdaSL. AdaSL is very much alive among deaf people from different generations and is experienced as such. The language is used extensively, it is enjoyed, it is relished, it is also profitable at times. The intergenerational relationship between youths and elders is rife with conflict, but as yet conflict between generations is not paired with a devaluation of AdaSL, nor - within Adamorobe – is AdaSL associated with being old, backwards or unschooled.

Rather, most youths, experiencing signing in AdaSL as SWEET, see this language very much as one of their own, and of their children, as residents of Adamorobe. Kroskrity's definition of the language ideological assemblage also explicitly included influential ideologies outside the community under study; in this case one might point to the ideological collapse of GSL and ASL, the ideological collapse of AdaSL with local gestures, and researchers' interest in AdaSL. Aware of these ideologies, youths resist some of them and adopt others.

In short, the youths' increase in age and all the other changes in dynamics between 2008 and 2018 are connected with a shift in intergenerational relationships and with a shift in the language ideological assemblage. Transition into adulthood and the everyday intensive use of two sign languages is related to particular qualic evaluations of AdaSL signing. The deaf elders mainly foreground AdaSL as HARD, related to respect, authority, maturity, to deaf people's strength and hardness, and to the need to be EYE-HARD in order to relate to each other and to demand respect from hearing people; and AdaSL is linked to code-switching practices and enjoyment by youths, who foreground the experience of doing AdaSL as SWEET and DELIGHTFUL.

The actual language practices in AdaSL, and intergenerational relationships and conflicts have remained central to the language ideological assemblage through 2008-2018. Connecting qualic evaluations related to different (linguistic) practices, events and objects, Harkness (2015, 581) suggests that "styles" of qualia exist: qualia can trace a "semiotic pathway, […] continuous from language and communication, to phaticity and social relations, to encounters with "things out there" in the world, to embodied experiences "in here"" (Harkness 2015, 582). Indeed, the evaluation of AdaSL as well as the moral behaviour of deaf people is either uttered in terms of qualic evaluation (HARD, SWEET etc), or chained to discourses on qualia with regard to linguistic and social behaviour. More specifically, qualic evaluations are an underlying constant in this language ideological assemblage, tying together moral evaluations of language use and behaviour across generations.

References

Adam, Robert. 2016. *Unimodal Bilingualism in the Deaf Community: Contact Between Dialects of BSL and ISL in Australia and the United Kingdom.* Ph.D. dissertation, University College London.

Amoako, Samuel. 2019. "Sixty Years of Deaf Education in Ghana (1957-2017*)." Journal of Communication Disorders, Deaf Studies & Hearing Aids* 7 (1): 1-11.

Braithwaite, Ben. 2019. "Sign Language Endangerment and Linguistic Diversity." *Language* 95 (1): e161–e187.

Calder, Jeremy. 2018. "The Fierceness of Fronted /S/: Linguistic Rhematization Through Visual Transformation." *Language in Society* 48: 31-64.

Calder, Jeremy. 2019. "From Sissy to Sickening: The Indexical Landscape of /s/ in Soma, San Francisco" *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology (advance online publication).*

Chumley, Lily Hope. 2013. "Evaluation Regimes and the Qualia of Quality." *Anthropological Theory* 13 (1/2): 169-183.

De Vos, Connie, and Roland Pfau. 2015. "Sign Language Typology: The Contribution of Rural Sign Languages." *Annual Review of Linguistics* 1 (1): 265-288.

Edward, Mary. (forthcoming). "Signing Out: Linguistic Contact and Possible Endangerment of the Adamorobe Sign Language." In *Developing Languages in Africa: Social and Educational Perspectives*. Cambridge Scholars Publishers.

Edward, Mary. 2018. "Our Signs Matter: Protecting Sign Language in Adamorobe (Ghana*)".* In *Language and Literature for Communication in Human Societies: Papers in Honour of Late Dr. Elisabeth Amageh De Campos.* Nigeria, Benin: Africatex Media.

Edward, Mary and Pamela Perniss. 2019. "Encoding Spatial Information in Two Sign Languages: A Comparison of Ghanaian (GSL) and Adamorobe (AdaSL) Sign Languages". Presentation at the 13th Theoretical Issues in Sign Language Studies conference, University of Hamburg, 26-28 September.

Gal, Susan. 2013. "Tastes of Talk: Qualia and the Moral Flavor of Signs". *Anthropological Theory* 13 (1/2): 31-48.

Green, Mara. 2014. *The Nature of Signs: Nepal's Deaf Society, Local Sign and the Production of Communicative Sociality.* PhD Dissertation, University of California, Berkeley.

Harkness, Nicholas. 2015. "The Pragmatics of Qualia in Practice". *Annual Review of Anthropology* 44: 573-589.

Henne-Ochoa, Richard, & Bauman, Richard. 2015. "Who is Responsible for Saving the Language? Performing Generation in the Face of Language Shift." *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 25 (2): 128-149.

Hill, Jane H. 1991. ""Today There is no Respect": Nostalgia, "Respect" and Oppositional Discourse in Mexicano (Nahuatl) Language Ideology." *Pragmatics* 2 (3): 263-280.

Hoffmann-Dilloway, Erika. 2017. "Feeling Your Own (or Someone Else's) Face: Writing Signs from the Expressive Viewpoint." *Language & Communication* 61: 88-110

Irvine, Judith T. and Susan Gal. 2000. "Language Ideology and Linguistic Differentiation." In *Regimes of Language: Ideologies, Polities, and Identities,* edited by Paul V. Kroskrity*,* 35-84. Santa Fe: School of American Research Press.

Kisch, Shifra. 2008. ""Deaf Discourse": The Social Construction of Deafness in a Bedouin Community." *Medical Anthropology* 27 (3): 283-313.

Kisch, Shifra. 2012. "Demarcating Generations of Signers in the Dynamic Sociolinguistic Landscape of a Shared Sign-Language: The Case of the Al-Sayyid Bedouin." In *Sign Languages in Village Communities: Anthropological and Linguistic Insights*, edited by Ulrike Zeshan and Connie De Vos, 87-126. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter & Ishara Press.

Kroskrity, Paul V. 2018. "On Recognizing Persistence in the Indigenous Language Ideologies of Multilingualism in Two Native American Communities." *Language & Communication* 62 (B): 133-144.

Kusters, Annelies. 2012. ""The Gong Gong Was Beaten" —Adamorobe: A "Deaf Village" in Ghana and its Marriage Prohibition for Deaf Partners." *Sustainability* 4: 2765-2784.

Kusters, Annelies. 2014. "Language Ideologies in the Shared Signing Community of Adamorobe." *Language in Society* 43 (02): 139-158.

Kusters, Annelies. 2015a. *Deaf Space in Adamorobe: An Ethnographic Study in a Village in Ghana*. Washington, D.C.: Gallaudet University Press.

Kusters, Annelies. 2015b. Peasants, Warriors, and the Streams: Language Games and Etiologies of Deafness in Adamorobe, Ghana. *Medical Anthropology Quarterly* 29(3): 418-436.

Lanesman, Sara and Irit Meir. 2012. "The Survival of AJSL Alongside Israeli Sign Language in Israel." In *Sign Languages in Village Communities: Anthropological and Linguistic Insights*, edited by Ulrike Zeshan and Connie De Vos, 153-179. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter & Ishara Press.

Lee, Tiffany S. 2009. "Language, Identity, and Power: Navajo and Pueblo Young Adults' Perspectives and Experiences with Competing Language Ideologies." *Journal of Language, Identity & Education* 8 (5): 307-320.

Meek, Barbra A. 2007. "Respecting the Language of Elders: Ideological Shift and Linguistic Discontinuity in a Northern Athapascan Community." *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 17(1): 23-43.

Nonaka, Angela. 2009. "Estimating Size, Scope, and Membership of the Speech/Sign Communities of Undocumented Indigenous/Village Sign Languages: The Ban Khor Case Study." *Language & Communication* 29: 210-229.

Nonaka, Angela. 2014. "(Almost) Everyone Here Spoke Ban Khor Sign Language—Until they Started Using TSL: Language Shift and Endangerment of a Thai Village Sign Language." *Language & Communication* 38: 54-72.

Nyst, Victoria. 2007. *A Descriptive Analysis of Adamorobe Sign Language (Ghana).* Utrecht: LOT.

Nyst, Victoria. 2012a. "Sign Languages in West Africa." In *Sign Languages*, edited by Diane Brentari, 405–432. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nyst, Victoria. 2012b. "Shared Sign Languages. In *Sign Language: An International Handbook*, edited by Roland Pfau, Markus Steinbach and Bencie Woll, 552-574. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Oteng, Florence Serwaa. 1988. *Give Them a Name.* Kumasi: Kumasi Catholic Press.

Quinto-Pozos, David. 2008. Sign Language Contact and Interference: ASL and LSM. *Language in Society* 37: 161-189.

Suslak, Daniel F. 2009. "The Sociolinguistic Problem of Generations." *Language & Communication* 29(3): 199-209.

van der Geest, Sjaak. 2006. ""Good Morning, Good Morning Does Not Kill the Old Lady." The Beauty and Nuisance of Greetings in Kwahu, Ghana." (Unpublished)

Whyte, Susan Reynolds, Alber, Erdmute, and Sjaak van der Geest. 2008. "Generational Connections and Conflicts in Africa: An Introduction." In *Generations in Africa: Connections and Conflicts*, edited by Erdmute Alber, Sjaak van der Geest and Susan Reynolds Whyte, 1-23. Münster: Lit-Verlag.

Williams, Cara Penry. 2019. "Appeals to Semiotic Registers in Ethno-Metapragmatic Accounts of Variation." *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology (online pre-publication).*

Wyman, Leisy T. 2009. "Youth, Linguistic Ecology, and Language Endangerment: A Yup'ik Example." *Journal of Language, Identity & Education* 8 (5), 335-349.

Zeshan, Ulrike and Connie de Vos. 2012. *Sign Languages in Village Communities: Anthropological and Linguistic Insights*. Mouton de Gruyter & Ishara Press

Zeshan, Ulrike and Sibaji Panda. 2015. "Two Languages at Hand: Code-Switching in Bilingual Deaf Signers." *Sign Language & Linguistics*, *18* (2), 90-131.