2012

Deaf-Hearing Interpreter Teams: A Teamwork Approach

Jessica Bentley-Sassaman
Bloomsburg University, jbentley@bloomu.edu

Christina Dawson
Walden University, christina.dawson@waldenu.edu

Suggested Citation

Introduction

In the field of sign language interpreting in North America, the number of Deaf people working as interpreters is growing (Boudreault, 2005; Forestal, 2005). According to the Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf's (RID) "find an interpreter" function, as of February 2012 there were 129 Deaf interpreters who were Certified Deaf Interpreters (RID, 2012). Over half of those 129 earned certification in 2008-2012.

Traditionally in the field of sign language interpreting, when two hearing interpreters are teamed together one will interpret for approximately 20 minutes and then they switch roles. The *on interpreter* is doing the active interpreting in front of the client. The *off interpreter* monitors the team member who is doing the interpretation providing support when needed (Napier, McKee, & Goswell, 2010). The off interpreter should be attentive to the interpretation to be ready to provide information to the active interpreter and not be distracted by other activities. When a hearing interpreter is teamed with a Deaf interpreter there is no off interpreter; both interpreters are working throughout the interpretation. The process of working in a Deaf-Hearing interpreting team is more complex than in a team of hearing interpreters. For example, the hearing client begins the conversation, speaks, and the hearing interpreter interprets what was said to the Deaf interpreter. The Deaf interpreter takes the message and reformulates it in a form that the deaf client can understand. When the deaf client responds to the hearing client, the deaf client communicates to the Deaf interpreter, who reformulates the message and signs it to the hearing interpreter, who speaks the message to the hearing client (Ressler, 1999). The hearing and the Deaf interpreters have to monitor one another constantly to ensure that both the hearing client and the deaf client understand the interpretations and that the clients' messages are being conveyed clearly and accurately. The hearing interpreter attends to the hearing client and his or

her message while the Deaf interpreter focuses primarily on the deaf client and his or her message (Mathers, 2009b).

During the interpretation process, the ASL-English and English-ASL interpretations are being constructed in a way that both clients will understand the target message clearly. The clients are both active participants in the communication processes, constructing meaning from what each other said (Napier et al., 2010). As the Deaf-hearing interpreter team works to convey the messages, they take into consideration the context of the interpretation, the participants, the culture, the languages used, and the intent of the speakers, and make linguistic decisions to meet the needs of the clients involved for effective communication to occur (Napier et al., 2010). Interpreting is a dynamic process; the interpreters have to make lexical choices that will best convey the message in a culturally appropriate way that the participant will easily understand and that sounds natural, all while preserving the intended meaning (Kelly, 2012). Interpreters are active participants in constructing the message as they may have limited to no background knowledge about the assignment (Napier et al., 2010). While interpreting, the interpreters cannot make assumptions about what the clients are thinking; therefore they are actively constructing meaning in their interpretations (Wilcox & Shaffer, 2005).

The need for Deaf-hearing interpreter teams is growing. In legal settings, more courts are requiring Deaf-hearing interpreter teams when there is a case involving a Deaf person (Forestal, 2005; Shepard-Kegl, McKinley, & Reynold, 2005; Mathers, 2009a). Supplying a Deaf-hearing team provides the Deaf client access to the language of the court (Mathers, 2009b). There is also an increase of Deaf people from other countries who are either visiting or settling down in the United States who are not familiar with ASL (Boudreault, 2005). Hearing interpreters typically learn ASL later in life and do not always possess the proficiency needed (Mathers, 2009a;

Moody, 2007). This is a reason why Deaf interpreters are needed to complement the hearing interpreters' interpretations and provide a higher quality of services (Mathers, 2009a).

There have been studies conducted on the training needs of Deaf interpreters (Bienvenu & Colonomos, 1990; Boudreault, 2005; Forestal, 2005, 2006; Mathers, 2009a, 2009b); however, research on the teamwork process between a Deaf and hearing interpreter is sparse. Much of the literature about Deaf interpreters mentions hearing interpreters briefly, but does not provide an in-depth look at the team functions between a Deaf and a hearing interpreter when they are paired to work as a team. The same can be said about the training of these teams; the opportunities to receive training on working as a team are few (Forestal, 2005, 2006). The lack of training or knowledge of how to work in a Deaf-hearing team may lead to misunderstandings for the clients who are involved in the interpreted event. This article summarizes a study of practitioners' perspectives on what makes Deaf-hearing interpreter teamwork effective and ineffective.

Review of Literature

History of Deaf Interpreters

In 1972, Deaf interpreters were recognized as part of the interpreting profession when the RID offered the Reverse Skills Certification (Bienvenu & Colonomos, 1990; Forestal, 2005). This certification was not intended to be a certification for Deaf interpreters, but instead for Deaf people to rate hearing interpreters who were taking certification tests through RID (Bienvenu & Colonomos, 1990). Prior to this time, Deaf people were sometimes called upon to assist hearing interpreters during an assignment (Forestal, 2005; Humphrey & Alcorn, 2007). This was an informal partnership where the Deaf person helped when the hearing interpreter was struggling to communicate with a client (Forestal, 2005). This use of Deaf people to assist with the

interpretation process engendered the need for Deaf people to become interpreters. RID developed a certification test specifically for Deaf interpreters, the Certified Deaf Interpreter (CDI) exam.

Findings in the Phase I of the Deaf Consumer Needs Assessment for the National Consortium of Interpreter Education Centers (NCIEC) showed that Deaf interpreters were working in a variety of settings, including social service, legal, vocational, professional meetings/trainings, and health care (Cokely & Winston, 2008). In health care (RID, 2007a), legal (RID 2007b), and mental health (RID, 2007c) settings RID acknowledges the need for Deaf-hearing interpreter teams (RID, 2007d). The use of a Deaf interpreter provides the Deaf client with native fluency in ASL that an interpreter who learns ASL as a second language may not have mastered (Shepard-Kegl et al 2005; Stratiy, 2005). Also as a second language learner, hearing interpreters may not be versed in the intricacies and nuances of the Deaf culture (Mindess, 2006).

Interpreting in a Deaf-Hearing Interpreter Team

Working in a Deaf-hearing interpreter team is different from being paired with another hearing interpreter. The hearing interpreter is interpreting what the hearing client says in English to the Deaf interpreter, who then reformulates the message and interprets in a way the Deaf client understands. The Deaf interpreter employs various strategies such as gesturing, using props, miming, or even drawing to communicate with the Deaf client (RID, 1997). If the client does not have a good command of ASL, the Deaf interpreter may have to gesture the message or break it down to clearly communicate the message to the client (Andrews, Vernon & LaVigne, 2007). Native users of ASL know how to incorporate the space in front of their body to set up people or objects that are being discussed in a visual way (Lawrence, 2004). Mathers (2009a) noted that

hearing interpreters often produce ASL interpretations that have English intrusions. Several authors have commented that many hearing interpreters have not mastered ASL fluency (Mathers, 2009a; Moody, 2007; RID, 2007d). Deaf interpreters must be bilingual, having a good command English and ASL (Boudreault, 2005). A Deaf-hearing interpreter team produces a more accurate interpretation (Demers, 2005), since the Deaf interpreter is able to assess the Deaf client's language needs and communicate in a way the client understands (Beldon, Boudreault, & Cogen, 2008). Hoza (2010) commented that team interpreting is one way interpreters can monitor one another to ensure that accuracy is maintained. In addition, both Deaf and hearing interpreters are expected to adhere to the NAD-RID Code of Professional Conduct. A result of these teams is an interpretation that satisfies both the hearing and Deaf clients' needs.

Stone (2007) did not examine Deaf and hearing interpreter teams but did research Deaf translators/interpreters compared to hearing interpreters within the context of a television news broadcast setting. Both the Deaf translators/interpreters and hearing interpreters were working from English to British Sign Language (BSL) in the United Kingdom. In this study, Stone found that Deaf translators/interpreters rehearsed the message to ensure it made sense. The hearing interpreters thought about the reformulation but did not rehearse the message in BSL prior to the taping of the news. Stone found that the Deaf translators/interpreters were consistent with their production in regards to using blinks to mark sentence boundaries. Hearing interpreters also used blinks to mark sentence boundaries but tended to blink more often than the Deaf translators/interpreters did.

Teamwork

The majority of the literature related to Deaf-hearing interpreter teams examines one facet of the team and not how Deaf and hearing interpreters come together to work as a team.

Forestal (2005) conducted a study in which a Deaf interpreter's experiences and needs related to training. This study did not examine the complex nature of pairing a Deaf interpreter with a hearing interpreter or the training needs for a Deaf-hearing interpreter team. In a comparative study, Ressler (1999) examined the hearing interpreter's work while working with a Deaf interpreter. Boudreault (2005) examined the roles and functions of Deaf interpreters and commented on the lack of formal training for Deaf individuals to learn how to become interpreters. Bienvenu and Colonomos (1990) discussed the types of training that Deaf interpreters need, and teamwork was mentioned. They focused on training Deaf interpreters rather than the team, and they did not provide guidelines for a curriculum. In another study, curricula for Deaf interpreters were examined using collaborative learning (Forestal, 2006). Forestal noted the lack of interpreting teachers who are qualified to teach Deaf students due to the sparse literature on training techniques and strategies. This lack of qualified teachers is another reason there are limited training opportunities for Deaf-hearing interpreter teams (Forestal, 2006). Forestal mentioned training strategies such as experiential and collaborative learning methods for instruction of Deaf-hearing interpreter teams.

There have been studies conducted on hearing interpreters working as teams. Hoza (2010) studied hearing interpreters working in teams and examined what makes teams effective. Deaf interpreters were not included in the study, yet the information on working as an interdependent team can be applied to Deaf-hearing interpreter teams. Further exploration detailing the mechanics of and training needs for Deaf-hearing interpreter teams will help the interpretation profession and its clients.

In 2006, Gallaudet University personnel produced a training DVD depicting strategies that Deaf-hearing interpreter team members use when they work together. This video addressed

what working as a team should look like. After an introduction, you could see the hearing and Deaf interpreter meet to discuss the assignment at hand and discuss the communication strategies that would be used; what language the hearing interpreter would use, what the target language of the Deaf client was, how to communicate with one another during the interpretation if something came up, whether or not to interpret simultaneously or consecutively, and how they preferred to work as a team. This DVD showed the teaming process from preconferencing, a segment of the interpretation, and a discussion at the end. This tool served as an effective way to demonstrate the process of working in a Deaf-hearing interpreter team. As the field of Deaf interpreters grows, it is anticipated that more publications related to the topic of Deaf interpreter and Deaf-Hearing interpreter teams will increase. The study explored the experiences of Deaf-Hearing interpreter teams, providing a view of the function of these teams.

Theoretical Framework

Data were examined through the conceptual framework of Kolb's (1984) experiential learning theory and Dean and Pollard's (2001) Demand-Control Schema. The Demand-Control Schema recognizes the demands the job presents and the controls that can be employed in response to those demands. Dean and Pollard's Demand-Control Schema is based on the research of Karasek and on Theorell's Demand-Control Theory (2001). Dean and Pollard (2005) listed four types of demands that are placed on the interpreter: environmental, interpersonal, paralinguistic and intrapersonal. Environmental demands relate to the assignment, such as the roles of the participants involved, terminology that will be used, the physical space, etc. (Dean and Pollard, 2005). Interpersonal demands are the "interaction of the individuals involved" (Dean and Pollard, 2001, p. 4). Paralinguistic demands are those that relate to the "expressive communication of consumers" (Dean & Pollard, 2005, p. 274). Intrapersonal demands are the

"internal physiology or psychological state of the interpreter" (Dean & Pollard, 2005, p. 274). Interpreters can address those demands with controls such as preassignment, assignment, and postassignment controls (Dean & Pollard, 2005). Preassignment controls can be the preparation the interpreter does before the assignment, preconferencing with a teammate, educational background, and language proficiency. Assignment controls are decisions the interpreter makes during the interpretation, and postassignment controls can be postconferencing after an assignment and continuing education (Dean & Pollard, 2005).

Kolb's (1984) experiential learning theory defined learning as "the process whereby knowledge is created through the transformation of experience" (p. 38). As interpreters experience working in a team, they learn what was effective or ineffective about their work and can then modify behaviours for a better teamwork experience the next time they interpret. Kolb (1984) identified four modes where one learns from experience. The four modes are: concrete experience, reflective observation, abstract conceptualization, and active experimentation. When interpreting the assignment, the team is having a concrete experience. After the interpretation is completed, both of the teammates should reflect on the interpretation and their teamwork (reflective observation). When interpreters postconference, they discuss how they did on assignment and where they can improve; this is abstract conceptualization. Incorporating the feedback they have discussed into the next interpreting assignment is active experimentation (Bentley-Sassaman, 2009). Experiencing these learning modes can enhance the team and how the team functions. Learning happens when the modes are followed in a cyclical fashion from concrete experience, to reflective observation, then abstract conceptualization, and finally to active experimentation.

Methodology

In 2010, a phenomenological study was conducted to explore the training needs of Deaf-hearing interpreter teams. This study's goals were to examine how satisfied the Deaf and hearing interpreters were with training they took to learn how to work in Deaf-hearing interpreter teams. The interpreters were asked to reflect on the essence of, and describe their experiences when, working in a Deaf-hearing interpreter team. Also these interpreters were asked to identify gaps in their training and how prepared they felt to work in a Deaf-hearing interpreter team. During the course of the interviews, the participants talked specifically about their experiences related to teamwork. Two questions that guided the study were: (1) What are the experiences of Deaf-hearing interpreter teams in relation to teamwork; and (2) What recommendations do team members have to enhance team experiences and to improve preparation for teamwork?

Participant Selection

Selection criteria set forth for this study included that all hearing interpreters must be nationally certified and must have a minimum experience of working with a Deaf interpreter five times. For the Deaf interpreters, preference was given to those who were nationally certified, then to those who passed only the written test, and then to those who had not taken the RID written or performance test. The interpreters who earned the CDI were found using RID's find-a-member database. From there the snowball approach (Polkinghorne, 2005) was used where one CDI would share the name of a Deaf interpreter who did not hold the CDI. Hearing interpreters were also contacted by email. A total of 25 hearing interpreters and ten Deaf interpreters were contacted.

Twelve interpreters participated in interviews conducted over a period of three weeks. Smaller sample sizes are acceptable in qualitative phenomenological approaches. All participants

in this study were working interpreters. Three of the six Deaf interpreters held the RID's CDI certification. The other three who were not certified had taken the RID mandated 8-hour training on role and function, and the 8-hour training on ethics. They also had to have experience working in a Deaf-hearing interpreter team. One of the Deaf interpreters attended an interpreting program. Four of the Deaf interpreter participants were male and two were female. The work experience of the Deaf participants ranged from slightly less than 1 year to 15 years (see Table 1). All of the hearing participants were certified, had graduated from an interpreting program, and all had experienced a minimum of five occasions or more when they had worked with a Deaf interpreter. All of the hearing interpreter participants were female. The hearing interpreters work experience ranged from slightly less than 1 year to 20 years (see Table 2).

TABLE 1. Characteristics of Deaf Participants

Participant	Diana	Dan	Deb	Dick	Derek	Devin
Gender	Female	Male	Female	Male	Male	Male
CDI	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No
Years working in Deaf-Hearing Team	0-5	0-5	0-5	11-15	6-10	6-10

TABLE 2. Characteristics of Hearing Participants

Participant	Helen	Harriet	Helga	Harper	Hannah	Harmony
Gender	Female	Female	Female	Female	Female	Female
RID certified	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Years working in Deaf-Hearing Team	6-10	11-15	6-10	0-5	6-10	6-10

Interviews

Six interview sessions were conducted and recorded; three interview sessions were conducted with two Deaf interpreters and a Deaf interviewer, and three interview sessions were conducted with two hearing interpreters and a hearing interviewer. The hearing interpreters and Deaf interpreters were interviewed in separate groups so that they could speak candidly when describing their experiences working in a Deaf-hearing interpreter team. The participants did not have to worry about saying something that may offend a potential teammate. Other than the two interpreters who were being interviewed together, the participants did not know who else was involved in the study. The hearing interpreters could have worked with one or more of the Deaf interpreters; the hearing interpreters did not know which Deaf interpreters were being interviewed, and the Deaf interpreters did not know which hearing interpreters were being interviewed. The interviews were set up so that the time between interviews was far enough apart in hours or days that the participants of one group would not be present to see who was coming to be interviewed next. The first author conducted the interviews with the hearing participants in

English. The interviewer for the Deaf interpreters was a CDI who conducted the interview in ASL. The Deaf interviewer was to foster candid comments between peers. All interviews were digitally video-recorded with the consent of the participants involved, and the study was approved through the university's Institutional Review Board. The study took place in the northeast United States and focused on the eastern regions of one state due to the number of Deaf interpreters in that general area.

The interviews were 30-60 minutes in length. They were conducted in conference rooms that provided ample space for the participants, the interviewer, and for the camera. The participants sat next to one another with the interviewer sitting to the side. All three were visible in the camera. Participants were directed to converse with one another and not to include the interviewer in the discussion. The purpose of not including the interviewer was to reduce any bias that the interviewer may have had. Both the hearing interviewer and the Deaf interviewer were practicing interpreters who had experience working in Deaf-hearing interpreter teams. The data were transcribed from the videos. The ASL portions were translated into English. For quality purposes, the Deaf interviewer reviewed portions of the video-recorded data and transcripts to ensure accuracy in the translations. In the transcripts, participants were labelled with a "D" for Deaf or an "H" for hearing followed by a number, i.e. D1 for Deaf interpreter 1 and H1 for hearing interpreter 1. For the purposes of publication, pseudonyms were created to ensure the identities of the interpreters who participated in the study were kept confidential. All participants willingly agreed to participate in the study, signing a confidentiality agreement and consent form, with the understanding that they could withdraw at any time.

Findings and Interpretations

During the interviews, questions asked in relation to the participants' experiences working in a Deaf-hearing team included:

- Think back to the first time you worked in a Deaf-hearing interpreting team. Please reflect on your experience working as a team and also the product of your interpretation. For example, did you feel prepared to work with a hearing/Deaf interpreter?

- What are your experiences in Deaf-hearing interpreter teams in relation to interpreting teamwork, based on either your training or your on-the-job experience?

- What do you feel training should include in order to achieve the most effective interpreting team functioning?

- Please give me one negative and one positive experience that you have had when working in a Deaf-hearing team.

The interview data were transcribed and examined for salient themes. The data were coded, each theme was identified by a specific color, and abbreviations written in the margins indicated the themes and subthemes. The themes emerged based on the participants' descriptions of their experiences. Response data for the question related to the first time the interpreters worked in a Deaf-hearing team yielded the theme of work-readiness. The second question related to teamwork experiences; the themes of positive and negative experiences emerged. These experiences are examined in relation to the conceptual framework of the study.

Work Readiness

When the participants were asked to think back to their first time working in a Deaf-hearing interpreter team and to talk about if they felt prepared, most of them did not feel prepared. Nine of the 12 participants had not taken any training on how to work in a Deaf-

hearing team when they showed up to interpret. Only two of the Deaf interpreters had some type of training. Diana had observed other Deaf interpreters working in the field and had talked to them about their experiences before she began to accept work as a Deaf interpreter. She also observed and worked with a mentor until she felt ready to step out on her own as an interpreter. Deb took training before she tried to interpret but felt it was not enough because there was no hands-on training with a hearing interpreter. She felt she understood her role of matching the language of the client, but was unaware of what the process would be like when working with a hearing teammate. One of the hearing interpreters, Harriet, had taken training before she began to work in a Deaf-hearing interpreter team. When questioned why the participants had not taken any training before they began to work in a Deaf-hearing interpreter team, the answer was the lack of training offered in the areas where they lived.

Most of the participants learned how to work in a Deaf-hearing interpreter team on-the-job. All the participants who had not taken any training prior to showing up for the assignment said their team members had experience and directed them in what to do. This sometimes worked out effectively and other times did not. Dan explained his experience by saying that he did not know what to expect when he showed up, but luckily his team member was able to tell him where to stand and how to work with the Deaf client as well as the hearing interpreter. He gave credit to this team experience for teaching him the right way to process and to behave when working in a Deaf-hearing interpreter team. Derek and Devin both said they felt awkward the first time they worked in a Deaf-hearing team. They took what they learned from this experience and were able to apply it to future experiences in order to improve the interpretation so that the process flowed smoothly. This directly related to Kolb's (1984) experiential learning cycle. Derek and Devin had their concrete experience when they interpreted for the first time and then

they were able to reflect on their work to ascertain through self-analysis how they could improve for the next time they interpreted (active experimentation).

Helga, Harper, Hannah, and Harmony all had similar experiences. Their Deaf teammate had experience working in a Deaf-hearing team and was able to direct the hearing teammate on where to stand and how the process would work. At the time of the study, Harper had never taken any training on how to work with a Deaf interpreter. She noted that she learned it all through on-the-job experience and seeing what effective teamwork looked like and how the team was ineffective. She was able to learn from her mistakes and adjust her approach when working again in a Deaf-hearing interpreter team.

Deb made an important comment; she said that she had training on the role and ethics but no training on how to work with a hearing interpreter. She noted that there needs to be training with Deaf and hearing interpreters so that they can learn in a safe training environment how to work together as a team. Most of the hearing interpreters commented that there was no training in their interpreting program on how to work with Deaf interpreters; they felt that this should be included in the curriculum at interpreting programs. The participants who attended interpreting programs also felt that the programs should have provided training during their course work and during their practica to gain hands-on experience on how to work in a Deaf-hearing interpreter team. Based on the participants' responses and stories of their first experience working in a Deaf-hearing interpreter team, most of them did not feel ready. This lack of preparedness can be attributed to the lack of training opportunities in their area or during their college education.

Positive Experiences

When participants were asked "What are your experiences in Deaf-hearing interpreter teams in relation to interpreting team work, based on either your training or on-the-job

experience?," nearly all of the participants had similar comments on what lead to positive experiences when working in a Deaf-hearing interpreter team. Many comments were comparable when the participants were asked to share positive and negative experiences they had when working in a Deaf-hearing interpreter team.

Preconferencing and postconferencing

Nine of the 12 participants stated that successful interpretations resulted when they had the opportunity to meet with their teammate prior to the interpreted event. This is a prime example of using the Demand-Control Schema. One of the controls that Dean and Pollard discuss is a preassignment control (2005). This is when the interpreters meet prior to the assignment to discuss the logistics of the assignment, such as the clients who are involved, interpreting preferences, teamwork preferences, logistics of where the interpreters will stand, and who will introduce the team to the clients and explain the role and function of a Deaf-hearing interpreter team. The team members could also look at the layout of the interpreted setting and discuss logistics of where the interpreters should be placed in relation to the clients in order to ensure effective communication.

The Deaf interpreters who participated in the study preferred to meet the hearing interpreter teammate prior to the assignment. Diana commented that it is important for the team to "find out where we can meet beforehand, like the lobby, and we can talk about how we are doing, then preconference. That develops good teamwork relations." Dan's comments were aligned with Derek's when Derek said, "It is important to meet beforehand and talk so I can get used to [the hearing interpreter's] style … I will then call that hearing interpreter to see if we can agree to meet 15 minutes before the assignment starts…If we meet beforehand and discuss what we are going to do, it makes the job go smoothly." Derek also felt arriving early was important to

assess the deaf client's language use. Team members would meet the hearing client, too, to explain the interpreting process. This is one way to address interpersonal demands that are placed on the interpreters. The more time they have to get to know each other and their styles of interpreting, the more comfortable they are according to Diana. The interpreters in the study noticed a relationship between preconferencing and an effective interpretation. Dan stated that the interpreting product was more effective when the team met prior to the assignment. Harriet's comments echoed Dan's; she noted that the interpretation went smoothly if there was time to preconference stating, "I always had better experiences when we have had time to meet ahead of time." Hoza's (2010) hearing interpreters' comments reflected the comments of this study's participants that pre and postconferencing made effective teamwork likely.

Another control that was employed was the postassignment discussion (Dean & Pollard, 2005). This control is aligned with the experiential learning theory. After the assignment is completed, if the interpreters take time to reflect on the work they have done, to discuss aspects of the work that were good as well as aspects that could have been better, and to learn from that experience to utilize new strategies for the future, they had positive experiences. When interpreters do this, they have touched on the learning modes of concrete experience, reflective observation, abstract conceptualization, and active experimentation as described by Kolb (1984). Dan noted that discussing the assignment with the hearing teammate helped to improve interpretations for future assignments. Derek noted that talking about mistakes with the teammate afterward helped him grow as an interpreter. Through postconferencing interpreters were able to learn from their successes and areas that could have been improved. These experiences helped to make their interpretation more effective for the next assignment.

Roles. When the interpreters were able to preconference, they could talk about their roles. Harriet talked about the importance of delineating the interpreter's roles beforehand to make sure the interpreted event is effective. Dan said that when working in a medical setting, if the doctor leaves the room, he leaves the room as well. He is not there to talk to the deaf client but to work. This is something that he felt the team should agree on prior to work so they have the same expectations of what to do in that situation. If the teammates can delineate their roles ahead of time, the assignment went smoothly, according to Harriett. Dick commented that the team should meet the clients and explain the Deaf client's right to use an interpreter and explain how to work with a Deaf-hearing team. Harper brought up questions that the team should discuss ahead of time to understand the roles of the teammates such as, "How do we talk to the consumers about our role?" Hannah said that she was happy to allow the Deaf interpreter to take the lead and explain to the hearing client (while she interpreted for the Deaf interpreter) what was going to happen. Dan also preferred the approach where the team meets the hearing client ahead of time to then explain "we are the interpreters." Helen recalled that when the Deaf interpreter told her to explain the role of the team to the hearing client, she felt awkward because she felt like she was leaving her team out of the communication. She said that she felt it worked out best when the team met the clients together and explained their role to both the hearing and the Deaf clients.

Harper noted that it is important to know the goal of the event so that the team can understand the linguistic needs and responsibilities. She said that because every client is different, those goals and linguistic needs should be discussed prior to the Deaf-hearing interpreter team starting the assignment. Some of the Deaf interpreters also discussed the importance of consecutive versus simultaneous interpreting. Once all that is decided within the

team, then the team needs to approach the clients together and explain their roles in the interpreted event.

Negative Experiences

Not all work experiences were positive. Some interpreters did have negative experiences when working in a Deaf-hearing interpreter team. The experiences they had conflicted with the training they had taken.

Preconferencing and postconferencing

Meeting to preconference before an assignment produces an effective interpretation, good teamwork relations, and positive experiences. Not meeting prior to an assignment has the opposite effect. At times interpreters may show up late or right as the assignment is starting and there is no time to preconference. Helen commented that if there was no preparation for the team to meet and they just showed up and started interpreting, they were not working as a team. She said, "I had a vision of what I thought it was going to look like which is not what happened and my Deaf team and I had not talked at that time." Harriet commented that both the team members knew what should be happening with the interpreting process, "but it just did not work correctly." Two of the Deaf participants and two of the hearing participants commented that during their own experiences, they had to take a time-out during the interpretation because the teamwork process was breaking down. Once they had an opportunity to talk with the teammate about the process, things tended to go more smoothly with the interpretation. Diana commented on a specific experience with an interpreter she had not met before. The hearing interpreter did not have experience with the specific setting and content for the interpretation or with a Deaf teammate. During the assignment, Diana noticed there was a breakdown in the communication.

The hearing interpreter did not understand what to do so Diana had to request a break. She and the hearing interpreter went into the hallway so she could clarify what should be happening. After she was able to talk to the interpreter and resolve the issue, the rest of the assignment went well. Based on the comments of the participants, the lack of preassignment controls, led to negative experiences.

Devin commented that during one assignment, when the hearing interpreter arrived, she took control of the situation, but he felt disappointed-he was there to work in a team. The inability to work together as a team also led to some interpreters refusing to work with that particular team member in the future. Dan noted that if the teammate is not willing to provide feedback after an assignment was over, he would prefer not to work with that interpreter in the future. Derek commented that without meeting ahead of time, misunderstandings could occur based on the lack of preparation, which can end up taking more time to produce a correct interpretation, and "it does not look professional." Diana noted that she would call the interpreting agency and let them know if the assignment did not go well. She also said that if a hearing interpreter was not willing to work with her she would specifically request not to be teamed with that interpreter again.

Roles

A second theme pertaining to negative experiences was that of the role of the interpreter. "Roles depend on a reciprocal, understood relationship between two parties" (Napier et al., 2010, p. 63). Napier et al. explained that the role of the interpreter can be better clarified by understanding what is outside of the interpreter's role, such as providing advice or emotional support to the clients, educating the clients during the assignment or resolving issues for them. Several hearing interpreters commented that the Deaf interpreters would step out of their roles as

working interpreters and get involved in the conversation, requesting the hearing interpreters interpret for the Deaf interpreters' comments during assignments. They classified this as a negative experience when working with a Deaf interpreter. Harriet commented that she needed a teammate and when the Deaf interpreter stepped out of the role of the interpreter, she lost her team. Some Deaf interpreters in their interviews did talk about the boundary between interpreter and participant and overstepping. Diana commented that sometimes Deaf interpreters "do little things they are not supposed to do" but she said they do this to make the clients feel at ease and that it is part of Deaf culture.

A few of the hearing interpreters commented that if the Deaf interpreter acted as an advocate and not as the teammate, they preferred not to work with that interpreter. Harriet commented that because the Deaf interpreter she worked with did not have any education on interpreting, that person did not understand the role of an interpreter. The hearing interpreters commented that through more education than just the 16-hour training mandated by RID, there would probably be less stepping out of the role of the interpreter. Helen commented that even one Deaf interpreter she worked with who had taken training consistently stepped out of the role of the interpreter to act as an advocate. Again, this type of behavior on the part of the Deaf interpreter influenced how the hearing interpreter perceived working with a Deaf interpreter, making it a negative experience.

Diana said that when working in a medical setting she prefers to leave the patient's room if the doctor or nurse is not present. She prefers to sit in the hallway or a waiting room. At times, the hearing interpreter will sit down in the patient's room and converse. Diana did not feel comfortable doing this and sat in the hallway or waiting room. This lack of communication before on how the team will handle the situation can strain the team's relationship. The Deaf

interpreters in the study also commented that some hearing interpreters feel threatened by having a Deaf interpreter present. The hearing interpreter may feel that having a Deaf interpreter present will mean that they are not qualified to interpret. Dick commented, "Many hearing interpreters feel threatened by Deaf interpreters. The hearing interpreter feels that they are not good enough. Having a Deaf interpreter there makes the hearing interpreter's job easier." A hearing interpreter asked Diana if she felt that the Deaf client would not understand the hearing interpreter. That interpreter was resistant to having a Deaf interpreter team. Dan commented that when he showed up to an assignment, the hearing interpreter told him she did not need him. Dan decided to just stand back and let the hearing interpreter know that he was there if she needed him. During the assignment, the hearing interpreter realized that she did need him and he then stepped in to finish the job. Unfortunately, there seems to be a stigma to having a Deaf interpreter at an assignment. According to Dick's comments, hearing interpreters may feel threatened. Diana said that Deaf interpreters are not there to steal work from hearing interpreters, but to work with them. Mathers (2009b) pointed out that most interpreters are not native in ASL and therefore lack native like fluency that a Deaf interpreter has. Hearing interpreters need to understand that Deaf interpreters are not there to steal their work, but to enhance it for the goal of effective communication for all the clients involved.

It is important to discuss who will be taking on what responsibilities. Helga had an interesting experience when working with a Deaf interpreter who had residual hearing. Helga commented that it was her first time working with a Deaf interpreter and before she could start interpreting what the doctor had said, the Deaf interpreter was doing the interpreting. The Deaf interpreter could also speak and was interpreting into English what the Deaf client said. Helga felt taken aback and wondered what the doctor was thinking when this happened. Harper had a

similar experience where the Deaf interpreter interpreted from English to ASL and from ASL to English. Harper noted that the hearing client would not see the value in hiring a Deaf-hearing interpreter team when it appeared that only one interpreter was needed. This demonstrates the value in preconferencing to discuss the roles of the interpreters and who is responsible to do what. When the team is not working well together, services to the clients are disrupted.

Training Needs for the Team

The participants noted that often they were trained in isolation; meaning Deaf interpreters took training with other Deaf interpreters and not with hearing interpreters. Deb commented that after the required 16-hour training mandated by RID, she did not feel prepared to work in a Deaf-hearing interpreter team because she had no hands-on experience during a workshop of actually working with a hearing interpreter. She felt this was a missing piece to her training. Beldon et al. (2008) commented that the limited nature of the 16-hour training might contribute to the large failure rate on the CDI test. From the comments of the participants, both hearing and Deaf who had not taken any training on working in a Deaf-hearing interpreter team felt they were lucky on their first assignments; their teammates had experience and told them what to do. The Deaf participants recommended more training by taking college courses or through seminars where both Deaf and hearing interpreters are present.

One barrier to becoming a Deaf interpreter is the sparse opportunities for training. The Deaf interpreters commented that the trainings that are offered typically are not in their area and they have to travel far to attend training. In addition, the opportunities for Deaf interpreter specific training are limited, sometimes only being offered once a year in some areas. Diana noted that hearing interpreters can attend trainings throughout the year, but Deaf interpreters do not have the same opportunity. Diana said that Deaf interpreters could attend the trainings that

the hearing interpreters attend, but they are often focused more on hearing interpreter needs and some workshops are not fully accessible to Deaf interpreters.

Harper recalled that in her interpreting program they learned about teaming but not about working in a Deaf-hearing interpreter team. Harmony remembered a diagram in one of her texts and some discussion during her interpreting program but no hands-on practice with a Deaf interpreter. Several of the hearing interpreters suggested that Deaf people who wish to become interpreters attend an interpreting program. Helen noted that some Deaf interpreters do not understand the thought processes that are involved in interpreting. Harriet added that some Deaf people think because they are Deaf, they can interpret. It is evident from the comments of both the Deaf and hearing participants that there needs to be more opportunities for learning how to work in a Deaf-hearing interpreter team.

Summary and Implications

Based on the comments of the participants in the study, it is evident that Deaf-hearing interpreter teams are more effective when the team has time to preconference and to discuss the assignment. This is aligned with preassignment controls in the Demand-Control Schema. The interpreters can work out the logistics of where they will be standing for the assignment, discuss language preferences as they work together, go over any assignment related details, and set up how to introduce who they are and their role as a team. It is evident from the participants' comments that when there is no preparation ahead of time, problems can come up. The team needs to work together to meet the linguistic needs of the clients who are involved. If the interpreters show up and begin working without preconferencing it can lead to frustrations, misunderstandings, and prolong the interpreted event. As Derek said, "it does not look professional."

Hearing interpreters need to have an open mind when working with Deaf interpreters. Based on comments from several of the Deaf participants, some hearing interpreters refuse to work with Deaf interpreters and perceive teaming as insulting to their interpreting abilities. This may not be the case. The Deaf interpreters are present to enhance the interpretations to ensure that all clients leave the interpreted events with the same understandings. It was interesting to discover that all the hearing interpreters in the study commented that they enjoy working with Deaf interpreters because when the team works together well, it makes the hearing interpreters' jobs easier. It is apparent from the hearing participants' comments that not all hearing interpreters feel there is a negative stigma surrounding Deaf-hearing interpreter teams.

Implications for Further Research

This study was conducted on a small scale, limited to 12 participants from one state in the northeast United States. Further studies are needed to gain more understanding on what Deaf-hearing interpreter teams require in order to function effectively as a team. Quantitative studies could be conducted on a national scale to poll more interpreters for a larger sample. Studies could be conducted in various settings and of various combinations of teams to explore issues more deeply. Combinations of methods could be used to gather and to analyze aspects of teamwork from the perspectives of all participants in team interpretations. Focus groups could be used for both Deaf and hearing interpreters to talk about their needs for future training specifically related to teamwork.

Implications for interpreter educators

Interpreter education programs should include information and hands on practice for students to learn how to work in a Deaf-hearing team. Most of the interpreters in the study had not taking any training prior to working in a Deaf hearing interpreter team. A few hearing

interpreters in the study remembered a diagram they saw in a book, but that was the extent to their knowledge of working in a Deaf-hearing interpreter team. Reviewing the participants' comments, educators can discuss the importance of preconferencing and postconferencing. If there are Deaf students in the interpreting program, mock situations can be set up for students to practice working in a Deaf-hearing team. If there are no Deaf students in the interpreting program, Deaf interpreters from the community could be invited for these mock scenarios. By doing this, students will have greater confidence in how to work in a Deaf-hearing interpreter team in the future. Students can experience going through the learning modes of the experiential learning theory (Kolb, 1984). First, they will have the concrete experience in the class interpreting with a Deaf interpreter in a mock situation. After that interpretation is complete, the students can reflect on their work (reflective observation). If they video record the interpretation, they can review it and self-critique the interpretation (abstract conceptualization), learning from their mistakes. In the future, the students can apply what they have learned to future assignments (active experimentation).

Students should also learn about the Demand-Control Schema. The demands pertain to the job assignment and controls are what interpreters equip themselves with to meet the demands. Students in the mock scenarios can take time to preconference with the Deaf interpreter teammate (preassignment controls) to find out the language preference of their team, learn about the client, assess the room for the best logistical set up for the team members, and discuss the roles and responsibilities. The students should be prepared to work as a team to explain why a Deaf-hearing interpreter team is warranted in this situation. They should use existing literature such as Mathers (2009a, 2009b) and RID's standard practice papers on deaf interpreters (RID, 1997) and teams (RID, 2007d) as justification for the use of Deaf-hearing

interpreter teams. During the assignment, students should use critical thinking to make decisions about the interpretation. After the assignment has ended, the students can have a postassignment conference to talk about what was effective and where improvements can be made in the interpretation.

The role of the interpreter is an area where more training is needed to address the boundary between interpreter and advocate. Every hearing interpreter could recall a time where the Deaf interpreter stepped out of his/her role to advocate on behalf of the Deaf client. Stepping out of the role of the interpreter was a reason hearing interpreters had a negative experience with Deaf interpreters. Diana commented that boundaries could be blurred because, as a Deaf person and a member of the Deaf community, there is a stronger feel of allegiance to the client. Over time as there are more training opportunities for Deaf interpreters and more Deaf interpreters attend interpreting programs at the postsecondary level, this may become less of an issue. The one Deaf participant who attended an interpreting program commented that they were not ready to handle a Deaf student. Interpreting programs need to develop curriculum to allow Deaf students to participate in the classroom and develop courses or tracks specifically for Deaf interpreters (Boudreault, 2005).

Study participants recommended that hearing students in an interpreting program should be exposed to working in a Deaf-hearing team. Harper commented specifically that students should be able to observe a team in the classroom setting, interpreting a mock scenario, and then the students should be able to practice this skill set. Helga commented that working in a Deaf-hearing interpreter team should also be required during the practicum.

The findings from this study and from future studies should be incorporated into interpreting programs at colleges and universities to ensure that upon graduation both hearing

and Deaf interpreters can work together effectively as team members to meet their clients' needs. Seminars should be developed that are targeted to interpreters who are currently working in the field. Through furthering their education, interpreters who work in Deaf-hearing interpreter teams will enhance the services they provide.

References

Andrews, J. F., Vernon, M., & LaVigne, M. (2007). The bill of rights, due process and the Deaf

       suspect/defendant. *Journal of Interpretation, 2007*, 9-38. Retrieved from

       http://rid.org/publications/joi/index.cfm/AID/112

Beldon, Jr., J., Boudreault, P., Cogen, C., et al. for National Consortium of Interpreter Education

       Centers, (2008). *Laying the foundation for Deaf Interpreter education: Deaf Interpreting*

       as a career choice within the realm of the deaf studies curriculum. Deaf Studies Today!

       Conference: Utah Valley University, Orem, Utah

Bentley-Sassaman, J. (2009). The experiential learning theory and interpreter

       education. *International Journal of Interpreter Education, 1*, 62-67. Retrieved from

       http://www.cit-asl.org/journal.html

Bienvenu, M., & Colonomos, B. (1990). *Relay interpreting in the '90s.* Paper presented at the

       Conference of Interpreter Trainers, Pomona, California. Retrieved from

       http://www.citasl.org/ members/proceedings/1990/RelayInterpreting.html

Boudreault, P. (2005). Deaf interpreters. In T. Janzen (Ed.), *Topics in signed language*

       interpreting (pp. 323- 355). Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.

Cogen, C., Forestal, E., Hills, R., & Hollrah, B. (Writers/directors). (2006). *Deaf Interpreting:*

       Team Strategies [DVD]. Washington, DC: Gallaudet University Academic Technology

       TV & Media Production Services, Graduate School and Professional Programs.

Cokely, D., & Winston, E. (2008, September). *NCIEC phase I deaf consumer needs assessment:*

       Final report. Retrieved from http://nciec.org/resource/docs/FinalPhaseIDCReport.pdf

Dean, R. K., & Pollard, R. Q. (2001). Application of demand-control theory to sign language

interpreting: Implications for stress and interpreter training. *Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education, 6*(1), 1-14. doi:10.1093/deafed/6.1.1

Dean, R. K., & Pollard, R. Q. (2005). Consumers and service effectiveness in interpreting work: A practice profession perspective. In M. Marschark, R. Peterson, and E. Winston (Eds.), *Sign language interpreting and interpreter education* (pp. 259-282). England: Oxford University Press. doi:10.1093/acprof/9780195176940.001.0001

Demers, H. (2005). The working interpreter. In T. Janzen (Ed.), *Topics in signed language interpreting* (pp. 203- 230). Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.

Forestal, E. (2005). The emerging professionals: Deaf interpreters and their views and experiences on training. In M. Marschark, R. Peterson, and E. Winston (Eds.), *Sign language interpreting and interpreter education* (pp. 235-258). England: Oxford University Press. doi:10.1093/acprof/9780195176940.001.0001

Forestal, E. (2006). Effective practices for teaching deaf interpreting processes. In E. Maroney (Ed.), *A new chapter in interpreter education: Accreditation, research, & technology,* Proceedings of the 16th National Convention Conference of Interpreter Trainers (pp. 11- 18). San Diego, CA. Retrieved from http://www.cit-asl.org/members/PDF/Proceedings/CIT2006.pdf

Hoza, J. (2010). *Team interpreting as collaboration and interdependence*. Alexandria, VA: RID Press.

Humphrey, J., & Alcorn, B. (2007). *So you want to be an interpreter?* (4th ed.). Seattle, WA: H & H Publishing.

Kelly, J. (2012). *Interactive interpreting: Let's talk*. Alexandria, VA: RID Press.

Kolb, D. A. (1984). *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and*

development. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Lawrence, S. (2004). Interpreter discourse: English to ASL expansion. [CD-ROM]. *Interpreter*

discourse: English to ASL expansion/ASL to English compression. Rochester NY:

National Technical Institute for the Deaf/Rochester Institute of Technology.

Mathers, C. (2009). *Deaf interpreters in court: An accommodation that is more than*

reasonable. (Legal Interpreting Workgroup #H160A&B). The National Consortium of

Interpreter Education Centers. Retrieved from

http://nciec.org/projects/docs/The_Deaf_Interpreter_in_Court62409.pdf

Mathers, C. (2009). The deaf interpreting model. *International Journal of Interpreter*

Education, 1, 68-76. Retrieved from http://www.cit-asl.org/journal.html

Mindess, A. (2006). *Reading between the signs: Intercultural communication for sign language*

interpreters (2nd ed.). Boston, MA: MIT Press.

Moody, B. (2007). Literal vs. liberal: What is a faithful interpretation? *The Sign Language*

Translator and Interpreter, 1, 179 – 220. Retrieved from

https://www.stjerome.co.uk/tsa/journal/3/

Napier, J., McKee, R., & Goswell, D. (2010) *Sign language interpreting: Theory & practice in*

Australia & New Zealand (2nd ed.). Sydney, Australia: The Federation Press.

Polkinghorne, D. (2005). Language and meaning: Data collection in qualitative research. *Journal*

of Counseling Psychology, 52(2), 137-145.

Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf, Inc. (1997). *Standard practice paper: Use of a certified*

 deaf interpreter. Retrieved from

http://rid.org/interpreting/StandardPracticePapers/index.cfm

Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf, Inc. (2007a). *Standard practice paper: Interpreting in health care settings*. Retrieved from http://rid.org/UserFiles/File/pdfs/Standard_Practice_Papers/Drafts_June_2006/Health_Care_Settings_SPP.pdf

Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf, Inc. (2007b). *Standard practice paper: Interpreting in legal settings.* Retrieved from http://rid.org/UserFiles/File/pdfs/Standard_Practice_Papers/Drafts_June_2006/Legal_Interpreting_SPP.pdf

Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf, Inc. (2007c). *Standard practice paper: Interpreting in mental health settings*. Retrieved from http://rid.org/UserFiles/File/pdfs/Standard_Practice_Papers/Mental_Health_SPP. pdf

Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf, Inc. (2007d). *Standard practice paper: Team interpreting.* Retrieved from http://rid.org/UserFiles/File/pdfs/Standard_Practice_Papers/Drafts_June_2006/Team_Interpreting_SPP.pdf

Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf, Inc. (2012). *Find an interpreter/member.* Retrieved from https://www.rid.org/acct-app/index.cfm?action=search.members

Ressler, C. (1999). A comparative analysis of a direct interpretation and an intermediary interpretation in American Sign Language. *Journal of Interpretation*, *1999,* 71-102. Retrieved from http://www.interpnet.com/JIR/

Shepard-Kegl, J., McKinley, F. & Reynold, D. (2005). The role of Deaf interpreters: Lessons from the past and a vision for the future. *Interpres, 18* (4), 16-18.

Stone, C. (2007). Deaf translators/interpreters' rendering process: The translation of oral languages. *The sign language translator and interpreter*, *1*, 53 - 72.

Stratiy, A. (2005). Best practices in interpreting a deaf community perspective. In T. Janzen (Ed.), *Topics in signed language interpreting* (pp. 231- 250). Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.

Wilcox, S., & Shaffer, B. (2005) Towards a cognitive model of interpreting. In T. Janzen (Ed.), *Topics in signed language interpreting* (pp. 27- 50). Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.