Robyn Dean and Robert Pollard first introduced interpreters to the importance of Demand-Control Schema in 2001 with the publication of their article, "Application of demand-control schema to sign language interpreting: Implications for stress and interpreter training." Since this initial article, they have published numerous other articles on the topic which range in topic from descriptions of how to incorporate DC-S into the classroom to how DC-S can assist us with rethinking ethical paradigms.   A complete list of their DC-S publications (along with a brief summary of their theoretical construct) can be found at:

http://www.urmc.rochester.edu/dwc/edu/Control_Schema.htm

Dean and Pollard were not the originators of D-C theory, but rather borrowed it from the work of Robert Karasek (and Torres Theorrell). Their work examined various factors that influence or help determine the level of job satisfaction and work-related stress a worker experiences.   They identified a critical interaction or dynamic relationship between two aspects of any given job as being central to determining the level of satisfaction and/or stress experienced. These two aspects were called demands and controls.

Demands: something required of the worker in order to do the job. In order to be labeled a demand, this "thing" or aspect of the work must rise to a level of significance for the task at hand. Dean and Pollard stress that demands are "about the work, not the interpreter."

Demands do not exist in isolation from one another. Dean and Pollard recognized this and coined the term "**constellation of demands**" to refer to the multiple, related demands occurring in any given moment. Typically a constellation has one, or perhaps two, primary demands, with other secondary demands surrounding it.

Demands can also be described as challenges in the work (which may be related to tasks, people, setting, etc.), but these challenges may NOT feel challenging or demanding to the worker if s/he has resources and options available to her/him with which to address these challenges. This is the dynamic referred to earlier – the dynamic between demands (or the challenges in the work) and controls (resources/options available for dealing with demands).

Controls: The term control is being used as a noun, rather than a verb here – a critical distinction. Controls are also referred to as the decision latitude a worker has available to her/him. They may be either internal or external, either apparent or unapparent to others.

Any job can be categorized according to the interaction of demands and controls present. Karasek and Theorrell suggest that the key to increasing job satisfaction and decreasing work-related stress for any occupation is to ensure that demands and controls are experienced at similar levels. In other words, a job with a high level of demands but very few or limited controls available will be highly stressful. Whereas, this same job can become very satisfying and less stressful if the amount or type of controls available to the worker are increased. The demands do not necessarily need to be decreased because, as was stated earlier, the INTERACTION between demands and controls is the key.

Dean and Pollard were concerned about job satisfaction and levels of work-related stress and burnout within the field of interpreting. Interpreting is a high demand profession, but for many interpreters, it is also one with very limited decision latitude (whether perceived or actual).   In order to create a more balanced demand/control interaction, Dean and Pollard decided that we must first have a better grasp of exactly what types of demands and controls are typically present within our field.

EIPI demands: EIPI (which stands for Environmental, Interpersonal, Paralinguistic and Intrapersonal) is an acronym for the four main demand categories identified by Dean and Pollard as relevant to sign language interpreting. **Environmental** demands are requirements of the job specific to the setting or work environment and may include a range of things from setting-based terminology to odors or other physical distractions. **Interpersonal** demands are requirements of the job specific to the interactions between people – these people may be two (or more) consumers, two (or more) interpreters, or consumer (s) and interpreter(s). **Paralinguistic** demands are requirements of the job specific to the clarity of expression by consumers. This category used to be called Linguistic, but was later changed, as Dean and Pollard realized that this was a misnomer for the concept to which they were referring. Paralinguistic demands are NOT about the content of what is being said, or the fact that an interpreter does or doesn't understand what is being said due to content or familiarity with the language. An interpreter's lack of understanding of a particular statement, **if** made clearly in the source language, is about the interpreter rather than the consumer. If the statement's clarity is somehow impacted by, for example, accent or physical ability, that is a paralinguistic demand. **Intrapersonal** demands are those requirements of the job specific to the interpreter's internal state (either a physical state such as coldness or a psychological state such as irritation). More recently, Dean and Pollard have noted that the first three demand categories, EIP, will tend to have accompanying Intrapersonal demands – thus creating a consistent constellation of related demands.

Controls are categorized in two ways – according to when they occur (temporally) and how much action they involve (liberal to conservative). Controls may be **pre-assignment**, during the **assignment** or **post-assignment**. These are the original categories used to describe control options. Dean and Pollard later noted that controls may also be categorized as more or less liberal and conservative. **Liberal** controls are those which involve more direct action, and **conservative** controls involve less action. In other words, controls may include anything from training on a particular topic to behaviors which directly change what is happening during an interpreting assignment to positive self-talk happening only in the interpreter's head.

Dean and Pollard stress that these categories are not hierarchical in any way. Liberal controls are not necessarily more appropriate, ethical or effective than conservative, or vice versa. Certainly there are control options which fall outside of the realm of ethical and effective on both ends of the spectrum. However, the most important elements in determining how ethical and effective any given control is are the consequences of that control for all people involved in that particular situation, and the resulting demands of those consequences.   Dean and Pollard refer to this sequencing as the **dialogic work analysis** or **D-C-C-RD** (demand, control, consequence, resulting demand).

In the dialogic work analysis framework, consequences may be either positive or negative. In fact, typically both are present regardless of how appropriate or ethical the control option may be. Dean and Pollard stress that consequences are the actual, definite and more immediate effects of any given control. They may include such things as a person receiving information at a slower pace, a consumer repeating themselves, a group of people making note of the interpreter in some way that they weren't previously, etc. The POSSIBLE demands created by these actual, definite and more immediate consequences are the resulting demands. Resulting demands are results of negative, not positive, consequences, but, they do not necessarily happen each time. Sometimes a consequence does not lead to a resulting demand. For example, a negative consequence of a consumer having to repeat themselves may lead to an interpersonal demand between the interpreter and consumer (anger by the consumer), or the consumer may simply repeat and move on with no further impact on the situation.

The above framework is recommended for use when considering which of a list of multiple control options is appropriate at any given moment. Two situations that look alike on the surface may produce very different dialogic work analyses based on the specific demands of each. Therefore, the most appropriate control options in each may be quite different. And there will typically be more than one control option that is appropriate for that particular setting and situation. For this reason, Dean and Pollard are critical of perspectives which suggest that the Code of Professional Conduct is a rule-based system which can be applied equally and similarly to any setting or situation.   Rather, they suggest that application of the dialogic work analysis, in conjunction with the COPC as a set of general guidelines, is a more appropriate way to frame decision-making processes.