Pepperdine University

Graduate School of Education and Psychology

PERCEPTIONS OF INTERPRETER QUALIFICATION BY DEAF CONSUMERS AND HEARING INTERPRETERS

A dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction

of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Education in Organizational Leadership

by

Victoria L. Stuard

March 2008

Cara Garcia, Ph.D. - Dissertation Chairperson

This dissertation, written by

Victoria L. Stuard

under the guidance of a Faculty Committee and approved by its members, has been submitted to and accepted by the Graduate Faculty in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

March 28, 2006

_____
Cara Garcia, Ph.D., Chairperson

_____
Farzin Majidi, Ed.D.

_____
David McIntire, Ed.D.

_____
Robert C. Paull, Ph.D.,
Associate Dean

_____
Margaret J. Weber, Ph.D.,
Dean

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

LIST OF TABLES viii

DEDICATION ixi

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS x

VITA xv

ABSTRACT xviii

Chapter 1. The Problem 1

- Introduction 1
- Problem Statement 6
  - Scenario Regarding Availability of Qualified Interpreters 6
  - Overview of the Problem 13
- Purpose of the Study 16
- Research Questions 17
- Significance of Study 19
- Definition of Operational Terms 19
- Limitations of the Study 24

Chapter 2. Review of the Literature 26

- Historical Overview 26
  - Interpreting Legislation 31
- Deaf Culture 35
  - American Sign Language as a Foreign Language 41
- Rationale for an Interpreter Training Program 46
- Philosophical Construct for Needs Assessment 50
- Curriculum 53
  - Training Methodology 55
- Interpreter Training Programs Overview 60
  - Certificate Program Model 67
  - Associate Degree Model 68
  - Evaluation 68
- Current Interpreting Concerns 70
- Summary 77

Chapter 3. Methodology 80

- Introduction 80
- Purpose of the Study 81
- Design of the Study 83

Page

Survey Development 83
Subjects 84
Respondents 85
Design of the Content Validity Data Survey Instrument 86
Human Subject Clearance 87
Data Collection Procedures 88
Data Collection by Research Question 90
Data Collection for Hearing and Deaf in the Virtual Setting 94
Data Analysis Procedures 99
Data Organization of Qualitative Responses-Research Questions 1-7 103
Independent Coder 105
Analysis Procedure for Quantitative Data 106
Analysis Procedure for Qualitative Data 107

Chapter 4. Analysis of the Findings 108

Introduction 108
Characteristics of Survey Respondents 108
Deaf and Hearing 111
Gender 111
Native and Non-Native Signers 111
Certified and Non-Certified Interpreters 112
Educational Attainment 112
Years of Interpreter Training 113
Signing Experience 113
Summary of Characteristics 113
Quantitative Analysis of Interpreter Qualifications 114
Deaf and Hearing Perceptions 114
Male and Female Perceptions 128
Native and Non-Native Perceptions 141
Certified and Non-Certified Perceptions 154
Qualitative Analysis of Interpreter Skills 166
Interpersonal 167
Sign Language Skills 172
Educational Requirements 176
Children of Deaf Adults 179
Cultural Affiliation 183
Acceptance by the Deaf Community 188
Deaf Consumer Perceptions of a Qualified Interpreter 192
Quality Interpreter Training Programs Recommendations 198
Recruitment Considerations 198
Instructional Preferences 200
Training Outcomes 201
Cultural Connections 203

Page

Chapter 5. Discussion 206

Overview 206
The Findings 209
Interpersonal Skills Research Questions 1 and 2 209
Sign Language Skills 212
Children of Deaf Adults as Interpreters Research Question 3 213
Cultural Affiliations Research Question 4 215
Acceptance by Deaf Community Research Question 5 215
Deaf Consumer Desired Qualities for Interpreters Research Question 6 217
Signing Competencies 217
Interpersonal Skills 217
Educational Requirements 217
Deaf Cultural Competency 218
Deaf Consumers and Quality ITPs Research Question 7 218
Recommendations 219
Interpersonal Skill Development 219
Sign Language Skills Development 220
Educational Attainment and Post-Graduate Training 221
Interpreter Training Programs 223
Recruitment of CODAs as Interpreters 225
Cultural Affiliation Opportunities 225
Collaborative Affiliation with the Deaf Community 226
Building Desired Interpreter Qualities 226
Implications for Further Study 227
Conclusion 228

REFERENCES 230

APPENDIX A: Survey Cover Letter 239

APPENDIX B: Survey Instrument 241

APPENDIX C: Content Validity Rating Instructions 245

APPENDIX D: Panel of Experts 246

APPENDIX E: Instruction Letter to Panel of Experts 247

APPENDIX F: Script for Deaf Consumers 248

LIST OF TABLES

Page

Table 1. Dialogue Translation 42

Table 2. Demographic Characteristics of Participants 109

Table 3. Deaf and Hearing Differences in Agreement 116

Table 4. Female and Male Differences in Agreement 129

Table 5. Native and Non-Native Differences in Agreement 143

Table 6. Certified and Non-Certified Differences in Agreement 155

Table 7. Interpersonal Skills Emerging Themes 171

Table 8. Sign Language Skills Emerging Themes 173

Table 9. Educational Attainment Emerging Themes 177

Table 10. Children of Deaf Adults Emerging Themes 181

Table 11. Cultural Affiliation Emerging Themes 185

Table 12. Acceptance by Deaf Community Emerging Themes 189

Table 13. Deaf Consumer and Interpreter Qualification Emerging Themes 195

Table 14. Deaf Consumer and Training Quality Emerging Themes 199

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated with love to my mother, Lula Palmer Fawcett, who longed to acquire the educational opportunities that I have had, but never had the opportunity to pursue her dreams, and to Nina Ruth Coyer, my sister-in-law, who executes the most beautiful, iconic intricacies of American Sign Language with strength, tenacity, and love.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This acknowledgement recognizes the support of those who have contributed significantly to my academic, personal, and spiritual life development throughout my dissertation and life process. No project, or life story, is complete without the acknowledgement of those who have made my successes possible.

God

First and foremost, I want to express my gratitude to God, who gave me vision, purpose, passion, the great capacity to love others, and the ability to preserve and excel in the most trying circumstances.

Luke and Elizabeth Stuard

Without you, my life would have been incomplete; with you, my life has been filled with joy, love, and prosperity.

My Friends

Christine Hilliard, Carmen Hall, Cynthia Griffith, Dr. Susan Fox, Dr. Frank Frimodig, Ana B. Ochoa, Dr. Nina Ashur, Vicky Goodwin, Maya Merkelbach Feldman, Marilyn Findley, Joanna Quejada, Dr. Robin Steinback, Dr. Helen Huber, Christine Hefley, Barbara and Richard Chenault, Sharron Tyler Bound, and Russell Bound. There are not enough words to express how much your love and support has meant to me and how you all have contributed to my academic, personal, and spiritual life as I have changed through this educational process. As Jesus said, “Greater love has no one than to lay down one’s life for a friend.”

Dr. Richard and Elnora Dresselhaus

Your ministry, at First Assembly of God in San Diego, California has been a demonstration of leadership infused with compassion, love, mercy, and accountability

You provided the best example of servant leadership and personal excellence built upon a secure foundation. Your example strengthened my desire to be all that God wanted me to be and to serve with love, excellence, and due diligence.

Dr. Nina Ashur and Dr. David McIntire-

Your support and belief in my ability to succeed academically was instrumental in my decision to obtain a doctorate. Thank you for your encouragement and confidence in me throughout this endeavor.

Dr. Robin Steinback

Thank you for taking me under your wing and being a beacon of light when I became lost in a labyrinth of uncertainty. Your guidance and clarity brought perspective and hope.

Ms. Joanna Quejada

Thank you, Joanna, for your unfailing belief that I would finish this dissertation. Thank you for providing an unbiased “perspective” when I needed it, your friendship, understanding, a listening ear and believing I could fly. You will always have a place in my heart.

Mr. Robert Salley

Thank you for understanding how to work with my level of “intensity” and “passion”. Your encouragement was always helpful and thanks for teaching me how to “check the box”. Did we finish checking the box?

Dr. Cara Garcia and Dr. Farzin Madjidi

Thank you, Dr. Cara Garcia and Dr. Farzin Madjidi. You brought me through this part of my life process and provided thoughtful leadership, direction, and compassion throughout my Organizational Leadership program. Your positive and insightful influence has helped me on this journey of self-discovery and change. Thanks for your patience.

My Family

Many thanks to my grandmother, Edna Lann King, my mother, Lula Palmer Fawcett, my aunts, Sally Newborn, Hettie Mobley, Linda King, Syble Baker, my great aunt, Nomi Lann Hall, who modeled responsibility, commitment, discipline, perseverance, and due diligence throughout my life. I am grateful for my sister, Carol Fawcett Dennis who prayed for me every day to have the strength to endure and to finish what I started.

The Deaf Community

I am grateful the opportunities that I have had in the past 30-years to serve the Deaf in a variety of capacities. My love and passion for the Deaf and American Sign Language will never fade. The Deaf have enriched my life through personal and professional affiliations and created an opportunity for me to express myself in a way that wasn't possible as a hearing person. Learning American Sign Language and interpreting for the Deaf has been both a joy and privilege.

Thank you, Dr. Francis and Kimie Casale, Pastors of the Intercommunity Church of God in Covina, California for your support and assistance while writing this dissertation. I appreciate Belinda McCleese, whose vision to develop and

strengthen the leadership skills of the Deaf community have inspired me. I also appreciate the efforts of Dr. David H. Smith from California State University Fresno's Department of Communication Disorders & Deaf Studies, Rosemary Diaz, the Executive Director for Deaf and Hard-of-Hearing Services Center, Fresno, California, and Kathy Carlsen, Coordinator of Client Services for Deaf and Hard-of-Hearing in Visalia, California for distributing information about this study to the Deaf in the Central Valley and California to generate interest in completing surveys relative to perceptions of interpreter qualification. Thank you, Sonia Wilson, for your friendship, love, and assistance as I worked on my dissertation.

The Interpreting Community

Thank you, Bob LoParo, of Cincinnati, Ohio, for your efforts to ensure that I had enough interpreter respondents for this study. Heartfelt appreciation goes to Ms. Kathy Rock-Veylit, Manager, Deaf Services, of the Dayle McIntosh Center in Garden Grove, California for her generosity and support during my educational endeavors and keeping me busy with community interpreting so that I could continue to feel the pulse beat of the Deaf community. Many thanks to Phyllis Bullon of the Texas interpreting community for her support and friendship, Paul Atkinson, and Chip Green whose comments throughout the years relative to Deaf culture and interpreting issues have been thought provoking and insightful.

Thank you all for participating in this study to add to the body of knowledge that relates to the profession of interpreting and interpreter qualification.

Student Assistants

Many thanks to the following student assistants who completed a variety of clerical tasks during this study: Nancy Wilson, Sean Crowley, Jennifer Templin, Bobbi Chappell, Amber Wilson, Cari DeJaeger, Todd Kim, Amber Gretsch, Matthew Jimenez, and Cerissa Wood. Your help was invaluable and appreciated.

Dr. Nina Ashur, Cynthia Griffith, and Christine Hilliard

Your assistance in proofing, data entry, APA assistance, and literally praying me through this process has been invaluable. What would I have done without your friendship, love, and technological ability?

The Glen Steinback Family

Thank you for your generous support during the writing of this dissertation.

Pastor Eric Sorian

Thank you, Pastor Eric Sorian, and Calvary Chapel Creekside for your prayers and support during the writing of this dissertation.

Corbin Cole Fawcett

While your passing has left us bereft, you reside within the silent, sacred habitation of my heart where a kaleidoscope of enduring memories of you, as my brother, unfolds and rests in the warmth of my love.

VITA

Victoria L. Stuard

Education

Ed.D. Organizational Leadership, Pepperdine University, Malibu, CA, 2006

M.A. Organizational Management, Azusa Pacific University, Azusa, California, 1998

B.S. Applied Management, Azusa Pacific University, Azusa, California, 1996

A.A. Applied Arts, San Diego Community Colleges, San Diego, California, 1978

Professional Experience

Assistant Professor; Associate Director Learning Enrichment Center Azusa Pacific University, Azusa, CA, 2003-Present

Associate Professor-Adjunct, American Sign Language, Chaffey Community College,
Rancho Cucamonga, CA, 2002-Present

Associated Student Government Advisor, Mt. San Jacinto College District, San Jacinto, CA, 2002- 2003

Associate Professor-Adjunct, Leadership and ASL, Mt. San Jacinto College District, San Jacinto, CA, 2001-2003

Outreach Specialist, Disabled Student Services, Mt. San Jacinto College District, San Jacinto, CA, 2001-2002

Professional Expert – Interpreter for the Deaf, Disabled Student Services, Mt. San Jacinto College District, San Jacinto, CA, 2001-2002

Associate Professor-Adjunct, American Sign Language, Mt. San Jacinto College District, San Jacinto, CA, 2000-2001

Instructor, American Sign Language, British Literature, & English, Western Christian Schools Covina, CA, 1998-2000

Independent Living Skills Instructor for the Deaf, Community Access Center, Riverside, CA, 1997

Support Service Advisor, Azusa Pacific University, Azusa, CA, 1993-1997

Support Service Counselor/Transliterator, California State University Cal Poly, Pomona CA, 1990-1993

Professional Expert-Interpreter for the Deaf, Dayle McIntosh Center, COMMEND Medical Interpreting, Continental Interpreting Services, Inc, Mt. San Jacinto College, LIFESIGNS through Greater Los Angeles Council on Deafness, Covina Unified Schools, Norco Unified School District, Azusa Pacific University, Fuller Theological Seminary, Hacienda La Puente Unified School District, Mt. San Antonio College, California State University Pomona, California State University Dominquez Hills, El Camino College, San Diego State University, San Diego Community Colleges, Southern California Region, 1975-Present

Secretary I, Disabled Student Services, San Diego Community Colleges, San Diego, CA, 1978-1980.

Interpreter for the Deaf, Reader for the Visually Impaired, and Tutor for Deaf, Learning Disabled, and Physically Disabled, Disabled Student Services, San Diego Community Colleges San Diego, CA, 1975-1978

Certifications

National Association of the Deaf, Interpreting Certification, NADIV, Advanced

Associated Student Association of Community Colleges, Certified Advisor

National Conference on Student Services, Certified Student Government Leader

Comprehensive Adult Assessment System, Certified Assessor

California Community Colleges Certificate of Qualifications for Teachers of Classes for Adults Credential, American Sign Language, Lifetime Credential

Memberships

Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf, Silver Springs, MD

National Association of the Deaf, Silver Springs, MD

Southern California Registry of Interpreters of the Deaf, Long Beach, CA

Additional Training

Higher Education Law and Policy Institute, Trends and Strategies for Universities and Community Colleges San Diego, CA

University of Connecticut Center on Postsecondary Education and Disability, Postsecondary Disability Training, Mt. Snow, VT

Midwest Center for Postsecondary Outreach at St. Paul College, Emerging Legal Trends: Impact on Services for Postsecondary Students Who Are Deaf or Hard of Hearing, St. Paul, MN

California State University, Cal Poly Pomona, Cross Cultural Training, Pomona, CA

LIFESIGNS, Greater Los Angeles Council on Deafness, Medical Interpreting Training, Northridge, CA

ABSTRACT

This study sought to meet a need in educational literature for documented perceptions of Deaf consumers and professional hearing interpreters, with or without certification regarding perceptions of interpreter qualification.

This study was exploratory in nature and investigated: a. The similarities and dissimilarities in perceptions of salient qualities that Deaf consumers' and professional hearing interpreters believe a qualified interpreter should possess relative to interpersonal skills, sign language skills, and formal education; b. Whether cultural affiliation, acceptance by the Deaf community, and parentage influences interpreter qualification; c. Measured the salient qualities Deaf consumers' seek in hearing interpreters; and d. Solicited Deaf consumers' opinion on what makes a quality interpreter training program.

The research design for this study included a mixed methodology comprising quantitative and qualitative methods. Perceptions of interpreter qualification with regard to interpersonal skills, sign language skills, formal education, and cultural connections with the Deaf community were obtained from 63 Deaf consumers and 75 professional hearing interpreters through a five-part researcher-designed survey with Likert-scaled and open-ended questions. Qualitative survey methods were used to code responses and identify emergent themes in open-ended survey questions.

Findings included similarities in perceptions between Deaf consumers' and professional hearing interpreters in relation to the importance of interpersonal skills, sign language skills, and formal education with differences noted in the desired length of formal education of interpreters by Deaf consumers. This study found that:

a Socialization with the Deaf is necessary and strongly supported by the Deaf to achieve linguistic and cultural competency in addition to formal education; b. The subjective quality of trust influences the choice of a less qualified interpreter by Deaf consumers; c. Qualification of interpreters should be predicated on evaluation; and d. Deaf involvement in training interpreters in informal and formal educational settings.

The findings imply that proactive leadership in developing, revising, and perpetuating interpreter training within a transformational environment should include increasing cultural, linguistic, and educational competency through building collaborative alliances with the Deaf community to strengthen learning outcomes in training programs.

Chapter 1

The Problem

Introduction

Interpreting service providers in the field of deafness experience difficulties recruiting qualified professional interpreters to provide interpreting services in educational, industrial, legal, medical, social services, and other specialized settings (Colonomous, 1992). Because it is difficult to recruit qualified interpreters for the Deaf, there is a shortage of qualified interpreters to meet the interpreting needs of Deaf consumers (Jones, 1993; Jones, Clark, & Soltz, 1997).

Recruitment efforts by interpreting service providers generally focus on hiring either professional interpreters, who are certified and have many years of interpreting experience or interpreter training program graduates to provide interpreting services. However, experienced professional interpreters are difficult to find and there has been a growing perception that students graduating from interpreting training programs, commonly referred to as an ITP, may not be qualified to interpret in entry-level interpreting assignments. This means that they are unable to demonstrate entry-level job-readiness within secondary, post-secondary, and specialized interpreting venues.

Lewis, Farris, and Green (1994) and Stuckless, Ashmore, Schroedel, and Simon (1997) have indicated that more than 20,000 Deaf and severely hard-of-hearing students attend approximately 2,000 (2 and 4 year) colleges and universities in the United States. It is estimated that approximately 10,000 of these Deaf and hard-of-hearing students utilize an interpreter in the classroom. These figures do not account for interpreting services that are needed within specialized settings, which include medical, legal, industrial, religious, and social services settings. Sorenson

Communication (2005) intimates that training programs produce less than 10% of the number of qualified interpreters who can find jobs in the public and private sector.

Interpreter service providers interacting on interpreter list-serves or at interpreter coordinator meetings have speculated and proposed that the reason interpreter trainees lack fluency in American Sign Language (ASL); that graduates of interpreter training programs may not understand the implications of or experience working in a bicultural setting; and that personal and professional ethical standards as well as interpreting skills are not fully developed at the time of graduation.

Limited exposure of students enrolled in interpreter training programs to the Deaf community may also influence, not only the above factors, but may lessen the opportunity for students to observe the Deaf modeling ASL in reality-based settings. Without exposure and participation in Deaf culture, interpreter training students skills cannot be strengthened solely through in-class observation, and practicing sign language and interpreting skills.

Limited exposure to cross-cultural interaction also lessens the opportunity to promote understanding of Deaf cultural values on an experiential level. These cross-cultural opportunities provide the student with valuable insight and experience with the Deaf community and can assist them in understanding the language, values, and culture of the Deaf. Cross-cultural interaction with the Deaf community provides a valuable foundation for students enrolled in interpreter training programs and interpreters in the field as they are learning to make appropriate professional decisions while learning how to facilitate communication in professional capacities between Deaf and hearing communities.

Less interaction with the Deaf creates fewer opportunities to interpret on a volunteer basis for a variety of situations that would strengthen ties between the Deaf and the interpreting student while developing interpreting skills. The above rationales could possibly support the premise that those interpreting students who want to be qualified need to:

1. Develop stronger ASL language skills;
2. Be prepared to understand and mitigate the challenges of working in a bicultural setting;
3. Develop interpreting skills by experiencing interpreting in both formal and informal settings outside of the classroom setting; and
4. Interact with the Deaf community in a variety of situations to increase their connection to the Deaf (P. Sheets, interview, January 1992).

Experiencing these learning opportunities would assist the student in developing interpreting skills outside of the structured formal setting of classes and workshops and help them analyze and develop sound personal and professional ethics while learning in a more realistic setting. Another perception that must be considered is that less interaction with the Deaf community might influence an interpreter's ability to obtain employment in secondary, post-secondary, industry, legal, medical, social services, and religious venues because they are not considered qualified by certifying agencies, employers, and/or Deaf consumers.

While graduates of interpreter training programs have varying degrees of skill, possession of a degree, and/or certificate from an interpreter training program does not guarantee that an interpreter is qualified to interpret at the post-secondary level (Sanderson, Siple, & Lyons, 1999). Although national standards presently exist for

certifying interpreters through the Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf (RID) and the National Association of the Deaf (NAD), graduates of interpreter training programs were not necessarily required to obtain certification upon completion of an ITP. However, current legislation affecting the qualification of interpreters is now being implemented in California, Utah, Texas, and other states that are examining this issue (Sorenson Communication, 2005).

Graduates of interpreter training programs in California, will be legally required to be certified by the year 2007, but may not be appropriately prepared for certification by RID and NAD at the time of their graduation. This lack of preparation may lead to failure during the certification process. Failure of recent graduates to pass certification evaluations may be inaccurately attributed to a lack of American Sign Language competency and under-developed interpreting skills.

Central to the development of competent sign language interpreters is fluency in ASL. Fluency, coupled with understanding the cultural dynamics of Deaf culture, and the recognition that affiliation and acceptance by the Deaf community may play an important role in developing interpreting and language skills for potential sign language interpreters. Potential interpreters must also realize that the evolving process of certification and professional development of interpreters is a value supported and encouraged by RID and NAD (Jones, 2004) and yet there is a need for interpreters to have sign and interpreting skills beyond the current general interpreting certification (Taylor & Elliott, 1994).

The Registry of the Interpreters for the Deaf and the National Association of the Deaf have merged to become a unified driving force in evaluation, certification, standard practice development, and benchmarking within the field of interpreting.

Their combined efforts will affect state interpreting standards (Jones, 2004). An example of this influence can be found in the recent California Title V Certification of Interpreter Standards (Title V, Section 3051.1) that affects California interpreters who want to interpret in educational venues. Certification will be required for all interpreters who will be working in educational venues in California.

Central to successful program and curricular development is that American Sign Language is recognized by academic institutions as a foreign language (Wilcox, 1992), that enculturation of the interpreting student to Deaf values and what the Deaf call the Deaf Way is respected (Padden & Humphries, 1988; Stokoe, 1980), along with the development of interpreting skills. Understanding the historical background of interpreting is important as it is a measurement of how interpreting became a profession.

Curriculum development, training, and utilizing the principles of adult learning are needed to develop excellent and productive interpreter training programs. It is important to utilize an appropriate teaching methodology to strengthen and produce successful learning outcomes for adult students with periodic evaluations to measure the effectiveness of training outcomes.

Overall, the most important consideration in qualifying interpreters and creating interpreter training programs is the recognition by curriculum developers and interpreter trainers that input from the Deaf community is needed to enhance the programmatic features of an interpreter training program. This ultimate return to the grass roots of learning through extensive mentoring and interaction with the Deaf community would benefit interpreter trainees. Programmatic features that curriculum developers need to review include, but are not limited to, language acquisition and

emerging fluency, cultural experiences, development of interpreting skills, experiential internships, development of ethical structures, and general education.

Problem Statement

Scenario regarding availability of qualified interpreters. This scenario reflects an ongoing dialogue that often occurs between professional interpreter coordinators about the lack of qualified interpreters, the inadequacy of interpreting training programs to produce qualified interpreters, and observations of why training fails. Recruitment and retention of qualified interpreters is necessary to ensure that reasonable accommodations are provided for Deaf students and consumers as legally mandated. However, interpreter coordinators at community colleges, universities, and service providers of community-based interpreting find that it is a challenge to recruit and retain interpreters for Deaf students and consumers.

While there are interpreter training programs housed at some community colleges and/or universities, hiring graduates from these training programs prior to these interpreter's passing certification tends to be problematic. Service providers intimate that, in general, graduates of interpreter training programs are under prepared to meet the challenges of interpreting. These observations are generally supported by the results of in-house evaluations administered before hiring interpreters to determine sign language and interpreting competency. It is also evident that the overall level of signing skill appears to be consistently lacking among interpreter trainees at the completion of an interpreter training program. Administering in-house evaluations for interpreters before employment, at educational and community-based institutions, have been consistent with past practice since many entry-level interpreters apply for employment without certification. Interpreters, who are certified

by the Registry of Interpreters of the Deaf (RID), and/or the National Association of the Deaf (NAD), are not evaluated by perspective employers since minimal signing competencies have already been determined by qualifying agencies.

The evaluation instrument utilized at community colleges, universities, and/or community agencies for those interpreters who are not certified, consists of segments that measure an interpreter's sign language and interpreting skills. Applicants are generally asked to:

1. Interpret a series of short lectures in American Sign Language;
2. Observe a videotape of a Deaf person signing and simultaneously sign-to-voice while utilizing receptive skills rather than production skills; and
3. Answer questions to ascertain the level of ethical development and ascertain the interpreter's knowledge of Deaf culture.

Many graduates from interpreter training programs do not appear to have the degree of fluency in American Sign Language that is needed for higher levels of interpreting. Fluency in ASL appears to be limited; interpreting and sign-to-voice skills are lacking. However, since there is a shortage of qualified interpreters (Sorenson Communications, 2005) and there is a legal mandate to provide services for students with disabilities (ADA, 1990), the college and/or university must hire interpreters in spite of these factors to remain in compliance with existing legislation. Utilization of interpreter training program graduates in basic entry level interpreting positions becomes a stop-gap measure to meet the need for interpreters. Despite misgivings, graduates of interpreter training programs are generally placed and monitored in entry-level classes with Deaf students to build their interpreting skills. If it is possible, interpreter training graduates are also placed with seasoned interpreters

to develop and increase interpreting skills as a part of an internship, practicum, and shadowing a seasoned interpreter. Coordinators hope that this will provide opportunities for newly hired interpreters to eventually achieve signing and interpreting competencies. Eventually, interpreters will gain the skills to interpret history, math, English, and/or other higher-level classes that require stronger signing and interpreting skills.

To offset the lack of interpreting skills demonstrated by entry-level interpreters, potential interpreters, in some employment venues, are required to participate in an in-house mentoring program. The mentoring program utilizes seasoned interpreters to assist newly hired interpreters to encourage interpreting skill development and provide support to mitigate discouragement and burnout. Interpreters can also benefit from an extended mentoring relationship with a culturally Deaf person. There is an expectation that an extended mentoring relationship with a Deaf person could exponentially increase American Sign Language fluency along with cultivating bicultural understanding. Clearly, for many interpreter coordinators, training, mentoring, or helping interpreters to the next level of skill development has moved from the classroom to become an essential and ongoing activity.

Despite best efforts to assist in the professional development of staff interpreters, Deaf students complain about interpreters and their ability to interpret effectively. These complaints often lead to a request for interpreter coordinators to find a different interpreter by next semester or to replace an interpreter immediately because the Deaf student or consumer does not perceive that the interpreter is qualified. These requests arise when the Deaf student believes that the interpreter has

missed key information during the class, or there was a perception that the interpreter couldn't keep up with the instructor's speaking pace, or perhaps the Deaf person did not like or feel comfortable with the interpreter. A Deaf student also might request a particular interpreter despite that interpreter's obvious lack of skill to interpret a class that ultimately should be covered by a more experienced interpreter. Why does this occur? The Deaf student may prefer, or feel comfortable with an interpreter with less requisite skill simply because they inherently trust that interpreter or the interpreter may have Deaf parents. It would seem that interpreter preference is predicated on the premise that a Deaf person may like and prefer an interpreter over the interpreter who has the appropriate skill, qualification, and experience to interpret.

These situations generate both questions and opportunities for reflection for those responsible for supervising interpreters. These reflections ultimately culminate in the belief that exposure to and cultural interaction with the Deaf community are necessary and will strengthen the interpreting skills of potential interpreters. This exposure to the Deaf can ultimately strengthen and solidify ties with the Deaf community as interpreters socialize and learn. Socialization with the Deaf benefits hearing interpreter trainees and/or interpreters by enhancing language and interpreting skills. This is because there is exposure to diversified signing styles and the idiomatic nuances of ASL thus providing the opportunity to increase basic linguistic competency. Socialization could also create an invaluable cross-cultural dialogue for students, interpreter training program developers, interpreter trainers, and interpreters to stay abreast of ASL and the cultural mores that move through evolutionary stages of change over time.

The experiences mentioned in this scenario are not unique, but rather parallel the experiences of many interpreter coordinators who have the responsibility of providing interpreting services within the educational, legal, medical, social services, industrial, and religious interpreting venues. As stated previously, it is difficult to find qualified interpreters and current training programs are not keeping pace with the demand for interpreters (Sorenson Communications, 2005). Sorenson Communication (2005) also contends that the root cause of ASL interpreter shortage is because there is a lack of interpreter training programs. However, the underlying reasons for a shortage of interpreters is more complicated than believing there is a lack of training programs. One colleague expressed the following in a recent online interpreting list-serve discussion group:

> Today, one can graduate from an ITP, enter the field of interpreting and become a decision-maker over Deaf/deaf people without ever having to be 'trained' by the experience of following Deaf leadership. Some of us started on the bottom rung and moved up as the culture validated our leadership, including interpreting. They [the Deaf] dismissed us, blacklisted us, and hated us when we violated some cultural more. They, however, adored us, used us exclusively, gave us tips, and rewarded us when our attitudes, styles and "professionalism" were what they affirmed. We learned, boy, did we learn what Deaf people wanted. We were not always taught, we caught the values and either responded to them or didn't work. Today, the paradigm has changed and Deaf opinion is diminished. Today, one can go to an ITP, pass some state or national test, maybe get licensed and enter each interpreting situation on a rung higher than Deaf/deaf people. One could educate Deaf consumers [sic] by professing to be a professionally trained interpreter who is trained to assess the situation and make choices and, by the way, here is the proper way for you to use me. New interpreters may have no incentive to learn how to interpret from the Deaf people because of a power shift. Some of us had to find a way to be approved by the Deaf community or we didn't work. The source of our income was resident in the Deaf community and our goal was to "pass the test" with them. Power to determine who would interpret belonged to Deaf people. Today the source of the approval is most commonly RID, [sic] comprised of hearing people. It's a new power center. One now feels a need to be approved by RID or he/she will not work. The source of income is resident in certification by

> hearing people and folks bust their butt to pass the test with them. Power to determine who can interpret now belongs to hearing people, and it's easy to bypass the old power source. No need to validate that one, you'll easily get jobs without ever even looking in that direction. If hearing people say you are qualified to work--you work. (C. Green, 2003a, p.1)

This colleague introduces statements that concur with many relative to the training of interpreters and the process of qualification. As this colleague intimated, many of the old guard did not attend interpreter training programs, but learned how to interpret in a variety of formal and informal interpreting settings by passing the test with the Deaf community. Old guard learners of ASL and the interpreting process passed the test when the Deaf decided they knew enough of the language to begin with small interpreting responsibilities. The Deaf taught ASL through modeling its application and production along with sharing deeply embedded cultural mores. As language and interpreting skills developed, some, not all, obtained certification from the Registry of Interpreters of the Deaf (RID) or from the National Association of the Deaf (NAD). This process is diametrically different from what occurs today in training interpreters for the Deaf whereby students attend classes to learn ASL and interpreting. It is significant that there has been a paradigm shift in how interpreters obtain qualification since the advent of interpreter training programs.

While students attend interpreter training programs to learn how to interpret, it does not necessarily make them qualified at the completion of their training. Students seem to graduate from interpreter training programs with mediocre signing and interpreting skills. Lack of skills are generally recognized when the results of evaluations administered before employment at colleges, universities, or community-based agencies are calculated. Unfortunately, after evaluating in-house results, interpreter coordinators must make the decision to either hire and provide extensive

skill building support or refuse to hire one with mediocre skills. This decision making process is especially stressful because of the need for interpreters.

This study seeks to quantify the perceptions of Deaf consumers and hearing interpreters as it relates to interpreter qualification. Does graduating from an interpreter training program, participating in Deaf cultural activities, and being born into Deaf culture create qualified interpreters? Is qualification conferred because the Deaf consumer accepts and likes the interpreter? How do interpreter trainers, through professional development grow a cadre of professional interpreters who are caring, ethical, can demonstrate technical interpreting and sign-to-voice skills on par with what is needed? How do interpreter trainers and coordinators become supportive, collaborative leaders willing to assist their interpreting peers and interpreter trainees in understanding the holistic dynamics of interpreting, Deaf culture, and the development of soft skills to mitigate the challenges of working cross-culturally? How do interpreters internally negotiate the dynamics of being in the middle of two cultures maintaining professionalism and appropriate boundaries, yet demonstrate heart and soul in the execution of interpreting well.

The best way to find the answers to these questions of concern is to ask Deaf consumers and hearing interpreters their perceptions of qualification in relation to interpersonal skills, sign language skills, and educational requirements that interpreters should possess to be effective. Answers to these questions of what predicates interpreter qualification might revolutionize interpreter training programs by maximizing input of the Deaf community, hearing interpreters, and professionals in the field of interpreting. Consequently, this would produce learning outcomes, which would deliver truly qualified interpreters capable of obtaining certification

upon completion of an interpreter training program and who would be accepted by the community they serve.

Overview of the problem. There has been a perception among interpreter coordinators, as outlined in the scenario, that students graduating from interpreting training programs, commonly referred to as an ITP, may not be qualified to interpret or demonstrate job-readiness within the secondary, post-secondary, and specialized interpreting venues. Interpreter coordinators observe and often intimate that ASL fluency is lacking, that the implications of working in a bicultural setting may be misunderstood, personal and professional ethical standards of interpreters entering the work-force may be underdeveloped, and interpreting and interpersonal skills may not be fully developed at the time of graduation (Harvey, personal communication, March 20, 2004; Womack, personal communication, March 19, 2004).

The lack of exposure, of students enrolled in interpreter training programs to the Deaf community may also lessen the opportunity for the Deaf to model American Sign Language. Modeling American Sign Language would help interpreting students acquire stronger language skills including idiomatic competency. This would naturally occur through observation, practice, and interaction within the Deaf community and would also promote understanding of Deaf cultural values on an experiential level. Cross-cultural interaction with the Deaf community can provide a valuable foundation for interpreters as they are learning to become interpreters. Potential interpreters can learn about the intellectual and emotional intricacies involved in making ethical decisions while learning to facilitate communication in professional capacities between Deaf and hearing communities. Inadequate interaction with the Deaf creates fewer opportunities to interpret on a volunteer basis

for a variety of situations. These interpreting opportunities would strengthen ties between the Deaf and the interpreter trainee cross-culturally while developing and honing interpreting skills.

These rationales might possibly support the premise that qualified interpreters must develop strong ASL language skills and be prepared to understand and mitigate the challenges of working in a bicultural setting. Interpreters should develop interpreting skills by experiencing interpreting in both formal and informal settings. Interacting with the Deaf community in a variety of situations will increase their connection to the Deaf and enhance interpreting skills outside of the structured formal setting of classes and workshops, provide an opportunity to analyze and develop sound personal and professional ethics. Conversely, limited exposure to the Deaf community and Deaf culture, lack of American Sign Language fluency, and limited or underdeveloped interpreting skills could also support the perception that less interaction with the Deaf community might influence an interpreter's ability to obtain employment in secondary, post-secondary, industry, legal, medical, social services, and religious venues because of limited interpreting skills. While graduates of interpreter training programs have varying degrees of skill, possession of a degree from an interpreter training program does not guarantee that an interpreter is qualified to interpret at the post-secondary level (Sanderson et al. 1999).

While national standards exist for interpreter certification through the auspices of the Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf and the National Association of the Deaf, graduates of interpreter training programs may not be appropriately prepared for evaluation by these agencies and fail the certification process. This failure to pass a national certification evaluation might be attributed to the lack of Deaf consumer

participation in the initial and ongoing stages of interpreter training program development at the curricular level. Central to the development of sign language interpreters is fluency in American Sign Language, understanding the cultural dynamics of Deaf culture, and the perception by some that access and acceptance by the Deaf community also plays an important role in developing interpreting and language skills for potential sign language interpreters.

Another driving force in relation to interpreter qualification is that many states are implementing laws that outline interpreter qualification. Discussion of these ongoing issues can be found on TERPS_L@ADMIN.HUMBERC.ON.CA an online public discussion forum for interpreters, which is now hosted by http://valenciacc.edu. At this point in time, the California State Board of Education approved qualification standards for educational interpreters (Grozs-Sager, 2002). These standards have become part of the California Code of Regulations under 5 CCR 3051.16-Specialized Services for Low-Incidence Disabilities. However, in response to these qualification standards approved by the California State Board of Education, Marilyn Findley, CSC, in an email transmission to California Assembly Member(s) Correa and Ted Blanchard stated that:

> California has lagged behind most other states in recognizing the value of RID Certification even though we have had true advocates in our midst for many years. As Californians, we have far more requests for qualified interpreters to meet the demands of interpreting services. Even though RID considers certification to be the "bare minimum" skills required to interpret, that is said because they are looking at the paid interpreting professional who is a private practice interpreter. The new regulation for hiring only qualified interpreters in K-12 by 2007 will push the limits of what California can produce currently. In addition, the true value of interpreters is still not reflected in remuneration for their services, so why would people choose this field in which to earn a living. It is premature for the state [California] to implement such a bill, which would discourage those who are exploring interpreting as a viable

> vocation. It would limit choices for the Deaf person, and it would place an unreasonable expectation on those already in the field. This [sic] bill will put California out of compliance with the intent of the ADA, which states a qualified interpreter and the Deaf person is the ultimate judge of who is qualified, in that they meet the Deaf person's communication needs. I can see this bill being more appropriate in about 2010, when the state has gained some experience in enforcing the regulations regarding educational interpreters in its schools. Until the state itself can and will only hire RID certified interpreters, which it does not, then the state should not force others to do so with no hope for success. (M.Findley, personal communication, April 1, 2004).

To maximize the development of interpreter training programs and improve existing programs through improved curricular development, Deaf consumers, and professional interpreters as key stakeholders need to articulate interpreter qualification.

Purpose of Study

The purpose of this study was exploratory in nature; and

1. Investigated the similarities and dissimilarities in perceptions of what characterizes a qualified interpreter as defined by professional interpreters and Deaf consumers in relation to interpersonal skills, sign language skills, and educational requirements;

2. Measured the perceptions of Deaf consumers and hearing interpreters to determine whether cultural affiliation with the Deaf community makes an interpreter more qualified to interpret than an interpreter without cultural affiliation with the Deaf community;

3. Examined the perceptions of Deaf consumers and hearing interpreters that acceptance by the Deaf community means that an interpreter is qualified to interpret for the Deaf;

4. Explored the perception of whether an adult child of Deaf parents is more qualified to interpret than a hearing child of hearing parents because ASL is the first language for hearing children of Deaf parents;

5. Quantified qualities that the Deaf consumers seek out in hearing interpreters; and

6. Solicited the Deaf consumers opinion on what makes a quality interpreter training program.

This study may improve and maximize the curricular decision making component of any college, university, or vocational schools proposed ASL/English Interpreter Training Program. This can be accomplished by understanding what is meant by qualified interpreter as defined by Deaf consumers and professional interpreters as it relates to interpersonal skills, Sign Language skills, and formal education needed by qualified interpreters. Understanding their definition may provide a forum for implementing changes in the philosophical and instructional constructs related to the development of program proposals for future and ongoing development of Interpreter Training Programs.

Research Questions

1. Are there differences in perceptions of what characterizes a qualified interpreter as defined by professional interpreters and the Deaf consumer in relation to interpersonal skills, Sign Language skills, and educational requirements?

2. Do the demographic characteristics of Deaf/hearing, male/female, ASL native/non-native signers, and certified/non-certified interpreters affect perceptions of what characterize a qualified interpreter as defined by

respondents in relation to (a) interpersonal skills; (b) sign language skills; and (c) educational requirements?

2A. Are there differences in perceptions between Deaf/hearing, male/female, ASL native/non-native signers, and certified and non-certified interpreters regarding the interpreter's interpersonal skills?

2B. Are there differences in perceptions between Deaf/hearing, male/female, ASL native/non-native signers, and certified and non-certified interpreters regarding the interpreter's language skills?

2C. Are there differences in perceptions between Deaf/hearing, male/female, ASL native/non-native signers, and certified and non-certified interpreters in relation to the interpreter trainee's level of education?

3. Does the Deaf consumer perceive that an adult child of Deaf parents would be more qualified to interpret than an adult child of hearing parents because of access to American Sign Language from birth?

4. What is the extent of agreement between the Deaf consumer and the hearing interpreter that an interpreter's qualification to interpret requires cultural affiliation with the Deaf community?

5. What is the extent of agreement between the Deaf consumer and the hearing interpreter that an interpreter's qualifications to interpret require acceptance by the Deaf community?

6. What qualities does the Deaf consumer seek out in interpreters?

7. What does the Deaf consumer believe goes into a quality interpreter training program?

Significance of Study

The significance of this study lies in understanding that this study is exploratory in nature and scope and seeks to gauge the perceptions of Deaf consumers and hearing interpreters as those perceptions relate to Deaf cultural affiliation, qualification of interpreters, and how this study might add to:

1. The current body of knowledge;
2. Create an opportunity to understand the cultural dynamics in the Deaf community as it relates to interpreting;
3. Provide a forum for implementing changes in the philosophical and psychological constructs related to program proposals in the development of Interpreter Training Programs and ongoing curriculum development; and
4. Create new research opportunities for exploration and investigation of issues that may or may not affect interpreters and the Deaf consumer within the interpreting environment to improve and maximize the curricular decision making component, training, learning outcomes of an ASL/English interpreter training program, and any other existing interpreter training programs within the community college and university sector.

Definition of Operational Terms

The following operational terms in this study were utilized and are defined as:

American with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA). A landmark civil rights legislation that provides protection and provision for reasonable accommodation for individuals with disabilities in employment (Title I), access to public transportation (Title II), and access to public accommodations and telecommunication (Title III).

CSC. Certification level awarded by the Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf.

Cued speech. A visual picture of the speech sounds and sound patterns that are used in the English language or any of the 50 languages and dialects for which cueing has been adapted.

Cultural affiliation. Membership within the Deaf community based on birth, familial relationships, marriage, or consensus of acceptance by the Deaf Community at large.

Deafness. A lay definition of deafness would be when everyday auditory communication is impossible or very nearly so.

Deaf culture. A subculture of the hearing culture, in which the primary source of communication is ASL, and the importance of Deaf community is exhibited in the way of life expressed by the individual members. The Deaf do not consider themselves to be a subculture, but a separate and distinct culture from the dominant hearing culture.

Deaf intermediary. A Deaf individual who uses ASL as his native language, but has acquired a level of English language proficiency, which enables him to clarify the meaning and/or intent of an English sentence or concept that is not understood by a Deaf individual who may not have the same level of English proficiency.

Disability. Any restriction or lack (resulting from impairment) of ability to perform an activity in the manner or within the range that is considered normal for a an individual in the general population.

Educational interpreters. Interpreters who specifically interpret in educational settings.

Evaluation. A formal appraisal of an interpreter's ability to interpret/transliterate and provide sign-to-voice interpreting with some measure of competency.

Handicap. A disadvantage for a given individual resulting from an impairment or disability that limits or prevents the fulfillment of a role that is normal depending on age, sex, social, and cultural factors for that individual.

Hard-of-hearing. An individual whose hearing ranges between normal and inability to hear (deaf). A hard-of-hearing individual may require another person to speak louder, but may not understand the words. It must be understood that a person who may be audiologically deafened may be able to hear some environmental sounds and might fall into this category as well. In either case, a loss of sensitivity in the ear or its nerve is involved.

Impairment. Any loss or abnormality of psychological, physiological, or anatomical structure or function.

Interpreting. The process of transmitting spoken English into ASL utilizing gestures and signs for communication between deaf and hearing individuals.

Interpreter trainer. An individual who teaches in an interpreting training program. A trainer teaches interpreting skills, sign-to-voice skills, and/or American Sign Language.

Interpreter training program (ITP). Trains students to interpret for Deaf consumers in a variety of settings and transmits spoken English into ASL and voices ASL into English for hearing consumers.

MCE. Manually Coded English

NAD. The National Association of the Deaf is a professional organization that advocates for and certifies interpreters for the Deaf. NAD was established in 1880. It is considered the nation's oldest and largest nonprofit organization safeguarding the accessibility and civil rights of the Deaf and hard-of-hearing.

Non-certified interpreters. Interpreters who have not been certified by any qualifying agency.

PepNet@uwm.edu. An online list-serve for individuals involved in post-secondary educational institutions. This discussion forum was established for members to present questions, seek information, and share experiences in providing services for students who are Deaf or hard-of-hearing.

Personal affiliation with the deaf. A person who has a personal relationship with the Deaf and/or Deaf community by virtue of familial ties and friendship.

Post-lingually deafened. An individual who is born hearing, but lost hearing after acquiring spoken language usually at or after the age of three due to illness.

Pre-lingually deafened. An individual who is born deaf or lost hearing before the acquisition of any language spoken or signed.

Private practice interpreters. These interpreters work as free-lance interpreters in legal, medical, religious, and industrial settings for compensation. They usually work with community agencies that refer them to interpreting assignments within the community, but they can also work in educational environments.

Professional affiliation with the deaf. A person who has a professional relationship with the Deaf and/or Deaf community. This person may be either a certified or non-certified interpreter. These interpreters may interpret in educational, medical, legal, religious, and industrial settings for compensation. These interpreters

may or may not be personally affiliated with the Deaf community. Professional affiliation may occur for those who are legally mandated to provide interpreting services for the Deaf consumer. Family members may interpret for the Deaf in formal and informal situations without compensation. They may also be professional interpreters who are certified and/or non-certified who work for compensation.

PSE. Pidgin Signed English

Public law 94-142. Known as the Education for All Handicapped Children's Act. This law ensured that public schools would provide an appropriate education for students who were handicapped.

RID. The Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf is a professional organization for interpreters and certifies interpreters for the Deaf.

RID code of ethics and NAD code of ethics. An ethical construct that provides parameters for ethical behaviors for professional interpreters.

SCRID. Southern California Registry of Interpreters of the Deaf is affiliated as a chapter member or RID.

Section 504 of the rehabilitation act of 1973. Legislation to prevent discrimination and defines civil rights of the disabled to educational access.

SED. Seriously emotionally disturbed.

Sign-to-voice interpreting. The process of transmitting American Sign Language or gestured communication into spoken English for communication between Deaf and hearing consumers.

Teach ASL@ADMIN.Humeric.on.CA. An online discussion group created for Deaf and hearing instructors of American Sign Language as a forum to discuss specific issues of concerns as it relates to teaching ASL.

Terps. A slang word used by interpreters and/or the Deaf for an interpreter.

Terps-L@ADMIN.Humeric.on.CA. An online discussion group created for interpreters of the deaf to discuss specific issues of concern as it relates to interpreting for the Deaf.

Limitations of the Study

It was not the intention of this study to examine or modify existing interpreter training programs. The scope of this study was exploratory in nature and was limited to:

1. Investigating the similarities and dissimilarities in perceptions of what characterizes a qualified interpreter as defined by Deaf consumers and hearing interpreters related to interpersonal skills, sign language skills, and educational requirements;
2. Analyzing the demographic characteristics of Deaf/hearing, male/female, native/non-native signers of ASL, and certified/non-certified interpreters as it relates to interpreter qualification in relation to interpersonal skills, Sign Language skills, and educational requirements;
3. Exploring the perception that adult children Deaf parents are more qualified to interpret than hearing adult children with hearing parents because ASL is the first language for hearing children of Deaf parents;
4. Measuring the perceptions of Deaf consumers and hearing interpreters to determine whether cultural affiliation with the Deaf community makes an interpreter more qualified to interpret than an interpreter without cultural affiliation with the Deaf community;

5. Examining the perceptions of Deaf consumers and hearing interpreters that acceptance by the Deaf community means that an interpreter is qualified to interpret for the Deaf;

6. Quantifying salient qualities that Deaf consumers desire in hearing interpreters;

7. Soliciting Deaf consumer opinions on what makes a quality interpreter training program;

8. Adding to the current body of literature in relation to understanding the perceptions of professional interpreters and the Deaf consumer of what characteristics quantify a qualified interpreter;

9. Providing an appropriate forum to implement changes in the philosophical and psychological constructs related to program proposals for the development of interpreting training programs that could enhance the quality of ongoing curriculum development; and

10. Create new research opportunities to investigate issues that may or may not affect hearing interpreters and the Deaf consumer within the interpreting environment.

The knowledge gained from these research opportunities could improve and maximize the curricular decision making component at the onset of interpreter training program development. This may affect and improve learning outcomes for students enrolled in an ASL/English Interpreter Training Program and/or any other existing interpreter training programs.

Chapter 2

Review of the Literature

Historical Overview

Interpreting services for the Deaf were provided by children of Deaf parents (CODAs), other family members, individuals who worked with Deaf people in some capacity, or by individuals who learned sign language because they had Deaf friends. These individuals became the precursors to professional interpreting as it is known today. They interpreted for the Deaf as volunteers without compensation and provided a valuable model for interpreting in a variety of situations. They provided the model for interpreting since there were no viable interpreting training programs to educate those who wanted to work with the Deaf in this capacity. Interpreting was either successfully or unsuccessfully accomplished by family members, friends, and coworkers. There was no formal venue for training or an established ethical construct to guide interpreters. Training was hands-on with the Deaf guiding the process. Interpreting was not considered a profession until the advent of interpreting training programs and the recognition that there was a need for qualifying interpreters.

The American with Disabilities Act of 1990 became the landmark civil rights legislation for the disabled providing a broader scope of protection and provision of reasonable accommodation for individuals within the broader context of disabilities, but more specifically for Deaf individuals who needed interpreters. The purpose was to provide legal regulations to remove communication and physical barriers that would impede individuals from functioning in mainstream society.

Within this construct, a qualified interpreter for the Deaf was defined as one who could interpret effectively, accurately, and impartially both receptively and

expressively, utilizing any necessary specialized vocabulary for academic and non-academic settings (Richardson, 1996). It was noted in The National Center for Law and Deafness (Dubow, Greer, & Peltz-Strauss, 1992), however, that an interpreter, who is qualified for one type of interpreting assignment, may not have sufficient skills for interpreting in another situation. With the advent of interpreter training programs, interpreting moved from solely a function of family members and emerged as a profession.

The Registry of the Interpreters for the Deaf was established to provide an evaluation system to certify and quantify the competency of interpreters for the Deaf. The evaluation criteria was based upon quantifying sign-to-voice and interpreting skills. The Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf also proposed and implemented an ethical framework for interpreters to follow when working as interpreters for the Deaf to ensure that interpreting assignments remained confidential. An ethics component was added to the evaluation instrument in order to determine whether interpreters understood the importance of and ensuring ethical decision making. Within the last 25 to 35 years, the advent of legislation, in relation to services for the Deaf, insured equal access to both educational and social services for the Deaf and hard of hearing. Since that time, dynamic changes have occurred in the evolution and development of Interpreter Training Programs in community colleges and universities to educate/train interpreters for the Deaf and hard of hearing consumer. In the past, the Deaf relied on and felt obligated to anyone who facilitated communication for them by signing. Today, the Deaf can utilize certified interpreters and those who are trained to be interpreters through an interpreter training program.

However, while training is available interpreter coordinators question the effectiveness of interpreter training programs to produce qualified interpreters for the Deaf. The perceptions of interpreter coordinators and Deaf consumers of what salient qualities, skills, and education are needed to produce qualified interpreters, in relation to skill and job readiness, appears to be an ongoing discussion among interpreting professionals.

Presently, there are approximately 11 Interpreter Training Programs within the Southern California area including five located within the Northern California area. Interpreter Training Programs have been established at El Camino College, California State University Northridge, Golden West College, Mount San Antonio College, Los Angeles City College, Los Angeles Pierce College, Los Angeles Southwest College Palomar College, Riverside Community College, Saddleback Community College, and San Diego Mesa College, which is part of the San Diego Community College District.

The basic components of an interpreter training program include instruction in American Sign Language, courses in American Deaf Culture, perspectives on Deafness, interpreting classes, an interpreting practicum, and general education classes. Historically, many interpreting training programs, at the community college and adult education levels, evolved from initially offering American Sign Language classes to students. Student interest in both American Sign Language and Deaf culture would often lead the student to the next level of interest, which was learning how to become an interpreter for the Deaf.

To become an interpreter for the Deaf, there should be a clear understanding of and sensitivity to not only the needs of Deaf consumers, but Deaf culture as well.

The interconnectedness between American Sign Language and Deaf culture and the barrier that interconnectedness can create among hearing and Deaf alike, may preclude acceptance of hearing individuals who have learned sign language in classes, graduated from an interpreter training program, but have had no cultural affiliation or limited cultural affiliation with the Deaf community (Higgins, 1979). Although an interpreting student may have taken classes in Deaf culture, true understanding, acceptance, and inclusion by the Deaf community might not be extended to an interpreter training student because Deaf culture is exclusive in its interaction with hearing individuals (Higgins, 1979). Acceptance of hearing people, by the Deaf, is strongly influenced by the strength and commitment a hearing person demonstrates by accepting Deaf cultural values and whether one has a familial connection to the Deaf community. One can observe in the context of introductions that the Deaf will immediately ask if one is Deaf or hearing, and if a person is not Deaf, they will want to know if someone in the family is Deaf. Potential interpreters need to know the extent of mistrust towards hearing people and the importance of Deaf cultural values at the onset of interpreter training and develop strategies to deal with Deaf cultural views that are in direct opposition to culturally held perceptions of hearing people, which are often subconsciously held (Padden & Humphries, 1988).

Consequently, for any educational institution seriously considering the creation of an interpreter training program, it is not unrealistic or unreasonable to analyze the congruencies or lack thereof between professional interpreters and Deaf consumers in relation to philosophical points of view with respect to interpreter

qualification. This examination should occur at the onset of any serious program development. Likewise, it is important for developers of interpreter training programs to understand whether cultural affiliation with the Deaf influences perceptions of acceptance and qualification of interpreters by the Deaf community. Program developers may want to investigate whether or not an interpreter's competency in American Sign Language and enhanced interpreting skills emerge as a direct result of affiliation with the Deaf community. They might also consider whether the amount of time an interpreter or interpreter trainee participates and/or invests time in culturally sponsored activities in the Deaf community has any direct bearing on a interpreter trainee's ability to interpret with a greater degree of fluency in American Sign Language opposed to those who do not participate in Deaf culture. Is there a marked difference between those individuals solely trained in an interpreter training program than those who have closer affiliation with the Deaf community? How is that quantified?

Past experience seems to suggest that a hearing child of Deaf parents who has the advantage of learning American Sign Language as their first language may or may not be qualified to interpret. However, those with American Sign Language as their native language may have greater success in becoming qualified or certified because they know and understand the language and culture of the Deaf. This alone would engender a greater degree of acceptance and qualification of them within the Deaf community. Furthermore, understanding the linguistic, sociological, and psychological dynamics that interpreters will face as professionals can also assist academic personnel in developing appropriate curricular choices for an interpreter training programs. It is important to prepare the interpreter trainee for the psycho-

social dynamics of Deaf culture especially if there has been no cultural affiliation with the Deaf community.

Educators must also pay attention to the relationship of hearing children who have Deaf parents and how this affects the interpreting dynamic. Children of Deaf parents often feel protective of their parents and believe that no one can interpret for their parents or the Deaf better than they can. Equally important is the understanding of what Deaf consumers want from an interpreter, what interpreting service providers need and want from an interpreter, and understanding one's view of what it means to be a professional and qualified interpreter. Documenting the differences between what is and what should be could be utilized to, not only form the basis of curriculum development for an interpreter training program, but add to the present body of knowledge for future reference thus creating new opportunities for research and study.

Interpreting legislation. The development of legislation within the last forty plus years in relation to the educational and civil rights of the disabled has been an evolving process, which gives credence to importance of providing qualified interpreters in educational, medical, judicial, and industry settings. The basic civil rights of the disabled were upheld by legislation that supported the rights of the disabled in relation to education accessibility. The passage of Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act in 1973, followed by Public Law 94-142, known as the Education for All Handicapped Children's Act, were precursors to the Americans with Disabilities Act in 1990, commonly known as the ADA, and more recently, the California State Code of Regulations Title 5, Section 3051.16 regulations, which

defines interpreter qualification standards at both the state and national level. Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act states:

> No otherwise qualified handicapped individual in the United States shall, solely by the reason of his handicap be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving general financial assistance or under any program or activity conducted by any Executive Agency or by the United States Postal Services. (Dubow, Greer, & Peltz-Strauss, 1992, p.48).

Equally important was the enactment of Public Law 94-142, which specified that public schools were required by law to provide an appropriate education for handicapped children. Handicapped children were defined by this law to be those who were mentally retarded, hard of hearing, Deaf, speech-impaired, visually handicapped, seriously emotionally disturbed (SED), physically impaired, deaf-blind, multi-handicapped, learning disabled, and those who have other health impairments (Dubow et al. 1992). The responsibility to provide an appropriate education, as stipulated by these two laws became the basis for the provision of interpreting services for Deaf children and young adults, as they were mainstreamed into a regular classroom setting as well as adults moving into the university or community college setting.

In 1990, the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) became the landmark civil rights legislation for the disabled and provided a broader scope of protection and provision of reasonable accommodation for individuals with disabilities (Dubow et al. 1992). This legislation establishes legal protection in employment (Title1), access to state and local government and public transportation (Title II), public accommodations and telecommunication access (Title III). The Americans with Disabilities Act provided tremendous relief to Deaf and hard of hearing people in

their efforts to gain equal access to society. The Americans with Disabilities Act and its regulations present legal mandates to remove communication barriers. With society built to serve a verbal hearing community, obvious communication barriers for the Deaf and hard of hearing could be found in a Deaf individuals' inability to hear and have access to interpreting services and the use telecommunication devices. Sign Language interpreting grew out of the recognition that the Deaf were prevented from actualizing the full potential as citizens because of communication barriers (Bruck, 1978).

The review of literature documents that:

1. In the 1950s and 1960s, more Deaf and hearing impaired individuals requested interpreters for civic duties;
2. The Vocational Rehabilitation Act Amendment of 1965 (P.L. 89-333) provided an interpreter for Deaf clients receiving vocational rehabilitation services; and
3. As a result of these two factors, the role of an interpreter expanded and became more formalized (Frishberg, 1990).

To offer equal access and reduce communication barriers, the United States Justice Department recognized that qualified interpreters were needed to facilitate communication exchanges in educational, medical, judicial, and industrial settings. Therefore, with the understanding that interpreters need some kind of qualification, the United States Justice Department defined qualified interpreter as one who could interpret effectively, accurately, and impartially both receptively and expressively, using any necessary specialized vocabulary. However, Lane et al. (1996) contends

that an interpreter who is qualified for one type of interpreting assignment may not have sufficient skills for interpreting in another situation.

This is an important distinction to articulate because it implies that interpreters can have different levels of skill competency or qualification. It is also important to note that the 1990 United States Justice Department's definition of what is a qualified interpreter did not delineate that an interpreter must be qualified or certified by an agency approved to evaluate the qualifications of interpreters, but only that a qualified interpreter would be able to interpret effectively, accurately, and impartially both receptively and expressively, using specialized vocabulary as needed. Consequently, there appears to be a marked difference between the United States Justice Department's definition of a qualified interpreter in 1990 and the present definition of a qualified interpreter in the California's Code of Regulations Title 5. The regulations propose State specific interpreter qualification for K-12 Sign Language interpreters. California requirements now mandate that all currently employed Sign Language interpreters must provide proof of completion in an Interpreter Training Program and possess certification by the Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf by the year 2007.

National standards for certification require completion of an Interpreter Training Program and proof of current enrollment to obtain an Associates Degree. The informative digest and policy statement overview of Title 5 (Grozs-Sager, 2002) states that the federal regulation for implementing programs under Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 1997 (IDEA; Title 24, Code of Federal Regulations, Section 300.23), defines qualified personnel as those who have met state education agency approved certification, licensing, registration or other comparable

requirements applicable to special education or related services. Standards for interpreter qualification were also specified, by Section 2065(t) of Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations, for personnel employed by private schools and agencies providing interpreting for Deaf and hard-of-hearing pupils. It should be noted that are no qualifications for school district personnel providing interpreting services since present school districts in California possess autonomy in determining qualifications for interpreters employed at their respective school districts (Grozs-Sager, 2002). Grozs-Sager's (2002) article on the California Code of Regulations Title 5 distinguishes that standards of qualifications for educational interpreters were proposed to provide guidance on certification requirements based upon the belief that existing regulating law did not consider the appropriateness of qualifying interpreters for the deaf in previous mandates.

Deaf Culture

Support for the validity of Deaf culture can be observed in Lane Hoffmeister and Bahan's (1996), *A Journey into the Deaf World*. Lane et al. contends that there are four common characteristics of minorities that support affiliation with a cultural identity. These characteristics include a common physical or cultural characteristic such as: skin color, language or identification with members of the minority; and the tendency to marry within the collective experience of oppression. Lane et al. also asserts that the Deaf community finds affiliation and solidarity in all of these points. Lane et al. asserts that it is not skin color that is the common characteristic utilized in the formation of cultural identity and affiliation for the Deaf. Rather, the Deaf believe that cultural identification and affiliation is built around the shared common physical characteristic of vision. Consequently, vision as opposed to skin color becomes the

greatest identifying and solidifying factor for cultural identification as long as humans engender visual progeny. This creates a constitutional basis for cultural affiliation and the perpetuation of a manual-visual language employed by the Deaf to communicate. This also means that race and ethnicity are not the basis of cultural identification or affiliation with the Deaf Community. Lane et al. (1996) succinctly state and believe that:

> The Deaf-World is the one minority that can never be totally assimilated or eradicated. To a large extent members of the Deaf minority share a common language, (American Sign Language in the United States), and because of their common physical characteristic, [which is vision] (sic), that language will never die out. On the second count, Deaf people do indeed identify themselves as culturally Deaf and, third, they marry Deaf nine times out of ten. Finally, Deaf people do indeed suffer oppression (p. 159).

The importance of this dialogue by Lane et al. lies in the defining of what cultural affiliation and identity for the Deaf means. It is that definition that cements the foundation of the Deaf community's cultural solidarity and its demand for recognition as a culture with a heritage centered on language, residential schools, clubs, athletics, visual and performing arts, and a rich, visual literary tradition.

Lane et al. (1996) assert that while Deaf people marry other Deaf, at least 90% of the time these marriages rarely produce Deaf children. It is estimated that only 5-10% of Deaf children born are born to Deaf parents. Conversely, approximately 90% of Deaf children born are born to hearing parents. Deaf parents strongly desire having a Deaf child since having a Deaf child perpetuates American Sign Language and Deaf culture.

While Deaf parents rejoice in the birth of a Deaf child, hearing parents who have deaf babies may feel that they have produced a genetically defective child. The struggle for language acquisition and cultural identity for a deaf child is particularly

difficult since hearing parents are unable to convey language and cultural heritage to their deaf children. Deaf parents are able to communicate with their Deaf children immediately. Because of this they are able to present a viable model for language acquisition, and the Deaf child is able to attain the milestones essential to effective social interaction. Contrast this with the lack of meaningful communication between deaf children and hearing parents who are often untrained and unaware of American Sign Language and Deaf culture as a viable option for parents with Deaf children (Lane et al. 1996).

Elder (1993) notes that, like residents of a small town, Deaf persons across the United States know each other, or at least know of each other through the residential school connection and social networks. These points of connection provide the means in which the Deaf community maintains contact with and knowledge of each other. Elder (1993) maintains that the Deaf community is close-knit. Deaf culture is central in every aspect of Deaf community life. Deaf children are considered precious and desired by Deaf parents since Deaf children represent the perpetuation of Deaf cultural values.

The opposite value may be present in hearing parents with deaf children. Frequently, deaf children of hearing parents are acculturated to the hearing community and do not experience Deaf acculturation unless they attend and live at a residential school for the Deaf or only if hearing parents seek an affiliation with the Deaf community. As such, Elder contends that residential schools for the Deaf assist in the perpetuation of Deaf core values and cultural identity.

To clarify the cultural distinction between the Deaf and audiologically or adventitiously deafened individuals, Woodward (1972) proposed that the lowercase

deaf refers to those individuals with an audio logical condition of not hearing while the uppercase Deaf specifically relates to a particular group of people who share a language, notably American Sign Language, and a culture. With this in mind, Padden and Humphries (1988) characterized that the Deaf, for the purposes of this definition, residing in America or Canada, have inherited their Sign Language, use it as the primary mode of communication, and maintain a specific set of values and beliefs about themselves and their connection to the larger society. In direct opposition to this, audiologically or adventitiously deafened individuals share no connection to the philosophical values espoused by the Deaf community since their values are hearing-oriented.

Richardson (1996) makes an important distinction between individuals who are considered audiologically deafened and those who consider themselves members of the Deaf community. Richardson maintains that those who are audiologically deafened maintain a cultural affiliation with the oral speaking community. Deafness has been acquired post-lingually due to age, illness, or injury. Generally these individuals have been raised by hearing parents and have not experienced exposure to the Deaf community and cultural values.

Richardson believes that for these deafened individuals emphasis appears to be centered on the importance of hearing aids, cochlear implants, and lip reading. These mechanical implements are utilized to bridge the gap that naturally occurs as a mode utilized to encourage interaction with and preserve ties to the hearing community. Conversely, Richardson submits that while audiologically or adventitiously deafened individuals seek to preserve ties to the hearing community, members of the Deaf community tend to view hearing culture with wariness and

distrust that has evolved from a long-standing history of misunderstandings and cultural oppression by the wider hearing culture (Higgins, 1979). This long standing history of misunderstanding and cultural oppression by the wider hearing culture has been perpetuated by a hearing agenda, which labels the culturally Deaf and individuals with limited hearing as disabled. Lane et al. (1996) have articulated that members of the Deaf community are subjected to a hearing agenda without regard to their Deaf cultural values. It is believed that the hearing agenda is empowered and perpetuated by law and tradition, and yet while the Deaf do not believe that they have a disability, they clearly struggle with conflicting feelings in relation to acceptance of services provided to them based upon their disability. Lane et al. (1996) submit that the Deaf have been presented with a soul-wrenching dilemma. The Deaf are forced to choose to accept services and monetary compensation from a society that discriminates against them, thus affirming they are disabled, or refuse based on the knowledge that these services are not offered to any other members of language minorities.

Higgins (1979) also conceptualizes that hearing people tend to equate oral communication skills with intellectual ability and the only legitimate form of communication. This ethnocentric attitude affects culturally Deaf individuals because their inability to speak English fluently stigmatizes them as either unintelligent or mentally defective by the culturally dominant hearing society. Richardson (1996) also asserts that:

1. Trust is important in the Deaf community;
2. Interpreters are generally perceived as part of hearing culture; and

3. The Deaf must rely on hearing interpreters in sensitive communication venues: i.e., courts, [sic], medical, social services, and medical situations, creating vulnerability, which leads to mistrust.

These overall conclusions parallel Carol Padden's view of Deaf culture. Padden and Humphries (1988) articulate the strength and validity of the Deaf identity and the supposition that hearing individuals cannot become full-fledged members of the Deaf community because they are hearing. Padden and Humphries' rationale is that even if one is born to Deaf parents, acceptance for a hearing child is precluded based on the missed experience of growing up Deaf, including attendance at a residential school. Consequently, residential schools are considered the cradle or center of transmission for Deaf culture to the Deaf.

Therefore, Padden and Humphries ultimately contend that while the Deaf community values Sign Language and the transmission of its cultural values through residential schools, it does not value the transmission of speech and/or thinking like a hearing person within the jurisdiction of the residential school. These characteristics, such as, speech and oralism are negatively valued in Deaf culture. Likewise, Lane (1992) also reflects that a fierce loyalty to Deaf culture is demonstrated by the Deaf community, and that loyalty seeks to preserve Deaf culture by withholding information about the Deaf community and its culture. These factors may create difficulties for hearing individuals who want to learn American Sign Language, participate in Deaf culture, and/or become an interpreter for the Deaf.

Acceptance of an interpreter may be mitigated by whether an interpreter has Deaf parents or Deaf family members. Acceptance may also hinge on culturally held perceptions by the Deaf, i.e., that an interpreter is qualified to interpret based solely

upon the Deaf community collective and/or individual subjective definition of who is qualified.

An example of this difference can be seen in a conversation between a Deaf and hearing person when they first meet (Lentz, Mikos, & Smith, 1988). The purpose of this dialogue in Table 1 is to demonstrate that the introduction ritual between a Deaf and hearing individual typically follows a traditional format that is found among Deaf individuals. While names are exchanged between the Deaf and hearing person, the Deaf individual wants to know and understand how the hearing person is affiliated with the Deaf and/or Deaf community (Lentz et al. 1988). This is very important since the Deaf generally tend to view hearing people negatively and distrust a hearing person's motivations (Higgins, 1979).

American sign language as a foreign language. At the heart of this discussion on American Sign Language as a foreign language lies William Stokoe's research on the efficacy of American Sign Language as a fully-formed human language (Armstrong & Stokoe, 1995). Stokoe has been recognized as the first to devise a descriptive system for ASL that could be utilized in demonstrating the linguistic validity of American Sign Language to linguists and the general public. His work culminated in the first modern linguistic treatment of American Sign Language. Stokoe was also recognized nationally and internationally for his seminal work related to the linguistic explication of American Sign Language and won acceptance in the linguistic community and among Deaf educators. His scholarly work advanced the acceptance and recognition that American Sign Language was an appropriate second language for hearing students in high schools and universities across the United States. Most notably, literature supports Stokoe's contribution to the theory

Table 1

Dialogue Translation

Deaf individual American Sign Language	Hearing individual Spoken English
Hi! You name what?	Hi! What is your name?
I/me name #M-a-r-i-a.	I am Maria
Hi! You name what?	Hi! What is your name?
I/me name #V-i-c-t-o-r-i-a.	I am Victoria.
Nice to meet You. You Deaf you?	It's nice to meet you. Are you Deaf?
No, I/me hearing I.	No, I/me am hearing.
You Deaf family you?	Do you have Deaf family?
Yes, cousin, sister-in-law, brother-in-law, #a-l-l Deaf.	Yes, my cousin, sister-in-law, and brother-in-law are Deaf.

Note. The # sign is a grammar marker denoting finger spelled words.

that human language began as a visible gesture and that syntactic patterns of modern languages may have been derived from the inherently grammatical structures of iconic manual gestures (Armstrong & Stokoe, 1995).

Wilcox (2003b) believes that American Sign Language is a true human language fully distinct from English. ASL has its own documented linguistic structure that utilizes hand shapes, palm orientation occurring within those hand shapes, movements, and places where these hand shapes and movements occur. It is also utilized by over one-half million Deaf Americans and Canadians of all ages and is the foundation and center of Deaf culture. Sherman Wilcox (2003a) also maintains that

there are approximately 137 universities that accept American Sign Language in fulfillment of a foreign language requirement.

Sign language has a structure of comparable complexity to a spoken and written language and performs a similar range of function. There are rules governing the way signs are formed and how they are sequenced-rules that have to be learned either as children from Deaf parents, or as adults when working with Deaf parents (Crystal, 1987). While many colleges and universities recognize American Sign Language as a foreign language, full academic inclusion for credit as a foreign language has not been achieved. Opponents of teaching and accepting ASL as a foreign language express the following concerns:

1. The belief that ASL is just a derivative of English.
2. How can ASL be considered a foreign language when it is principally used by Americans and Canadians?
3. What cultural group uses American Sign Language?
4. Can ASL proponents cite the existence of a body of literature for ASL?
5. Will complete acceptance of teaching ASL create a decline in enrollment for other foreign languages (Wilcox, 2003a)?

These concerns are understandable; however, proponents of full academic inclusion of ASL focus on the following key factors. It is believed that while ASL is indigenous to the Deaf of North America and Canada, this factor alone should not influence whether ASL is excluded from study as a foreign language based on its perceived lack of international scope. Wilcox believes that a language's origin should have little to do with its status as a foreign language at universities or colleges (Wilcox, 1992). Wilcox (1989) also believes that attention should be placed on the:

1. Linguistic verification of the grammatical structure and processes of ASL;

2. Anthropological studies which verify that the Deaf have a language;

3. Culture that sets them apart from the majority culture; and

4. Other bodies of research literature providing an undisputed foundational support of ASL as a foreign language.

Wilcox stresses that ASL is a fully-developed human language. It is not a simplified language, but contains structure and processes that English lacks. Linguistic research demonstrates that ASL grammar is radically different from English, and is one signed language out of many signed languages in the world. While ASL is not universal, Wilcox intimates that ASL plays an important role in Deaf international affairs. It is considered a viable and important language at international meetings conducted by the World Federation of the Deaf (Wilcox, 2003b).

It is believed that ASL students will have the opportunity to learn about Deaf Culture through full inclusion of American Sign Language in foreign language departments. They can be exposed to the values and the world-view of the Deaf Way as well as the beauty and richness of the language of the Deaf community. Students will have an opportunity to understand that the Deaf have a history and language that is reflected through the cultural mores of Deaf community and the Arts. This will expand student understanding of diversity (Gannon, 1981; Padden & Humphries, 1988; Wilcox, 1989).

Rutherford (1988) and Frishberg (1988) both believe that Deaf culture is explicated through the use of American Sign Language to convey a rich body of folk literature through a visual modality. This historical body of folk literature has been

visually recorded in articles, books and film, and in more recent years through video and computer mediums since the beginning of the century. Despite a rich visual body of folk literature by and for Deaf people, American Sign Language has no written body of literature. It is believed that the methodology employed by the Deaf in the development and recording of their body of literature, while diametrically different from foreign languages that have a traditional written body of literature, should not be a major deterrent in determining whether or not ASL has a body of literature. The criteria should recognize that expression of literature occurs through non-traditional mediums as well as the traditional oral and written form. Through the medium of books, film, and video, there is a body of literature within Deaf culture that depicts deaf folklore, culture, storytelling, language and social mores, thus verifying the existence of Deaf culture despite how it is conveyed. The difference in expression lies in a visual presentation rather than in a traditional written form. The Deaf, through a visual medium, possess a foundation that solidifies their determination to be considered a culture in its own right (Frishberg, 1988; Gannon, 1981).

Wilcox (1989) indicates opponents of the full inclusion of ASL, as a foreign language in post-secondary institutions, argues that acceptance of ASL will cause declining student enrollment in other traditional foreign language classes. However, Wilcox believes that the opposite has been true. Wilcox submits that there has been no indication, in universities that offer ASL, that enrollment in other foreign language classes has been negatively affected by student interest in ASL. It would appear that interest in ASL has led to an increased interest in foreign language as a result of studying ASL.

Full academic inclusion of American Sign Language presents an opportunity for students to learn about and experience diversity in a new and challenging way. It also would give strength to the authenticity of ASL as a fully developed human language supported by Deaf culture. Without full acceptance and inclusion of American Sign Language, many students will be unable to participate in the opportunity to learn a language that is both visually and mentally stimulating. If full academic inclusion of ASL is prohibited at the post-secondary level of education, students will be unable to move into interpreting training programs thereby lessening the opportunity to become an interpreter for the Deaf.

Padden (1987) asserts that ASL is the primary language of an estimated 100,000 to 500,000 Americans inclusive of native signers, hearing children of Deaf parents, and fluent signers who have learned from other Deaf individuals. Padden and Humphries (1988), in Deaf in America: Voices from Deaf Culture also articulate that it is a tragic misconception to assume that ASL is primarily a set of simple gestures and that the Deaf community's relationship to Sign Language can be easily severed and replaced. These misconceptions have driven educational policy and essentially compelled generations of school children to speak, forbidding the use of Sign Language or to use artificially modified signs as a replacement for the natural Sign Language of the Deaf.

Rationale for Interpreter Training Programs

The rationale for interpreter training program development at an educational institution can be found in the following factors:

1. Demographic trends (Sorenson Communications, 2005) that indicate a rise in the number of Deaf and hard-of-hearing consumers living within a specific

geographic area and a reasonable assurance that prevailing growth trends will continue to escalate in the ensuing years; and

2. The advent and rise of Deaf and hard-of-hearing individuals will create opportunities for employment in order to provide support services in, not only the educational venue, but medical, legal, social services, religious, industrial, and employment venues (McKenzie & Starwalker, 2002).

Interpreting services will be needed and required to satisfy the legal mandate of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 and recent California Title V certification of interpreter standards (Title V, Section 3051.1). Interpreters will also be required to meet national interpreting standards as delineated by the Registry of Interpreters of the Deaf and the National Association of the Deaf who have merged to strengthen the certification, maintenance, and ethical practice system for certified interpreters (NAD Interpreters, 2003).

The opportunity to collaborate with the Deaf and other interpreter training programs in the development of a viable interpreter training program can enhance any proposed ASL/English Interpreter Training Program at the curricular level. The opportunity to analyze past practices and utilize the best experiences of other interpreter training programs can develop a viable dialogue with identifiable stakeholders, i.e. Deaf consumers, ASL and interpreting faculty, interpreter coordinators, and advisory committees. This collaboration is imperative in order to create an interpreter training program that will be at the forefront of training competent, certified interpreters accessing the best in instruction, curriculum, and technology.

Collaboration would strengthen the learning community's efforts to develop an effective interpreter training program by aligning past practices with present practice and develop innovative methodologies to teach effectively (Hiatt-Michael, in press). Alternate approaches to teaching, and utilizing effective curriculum, while developing a holistic and well-balanced interpreter training program, would be a natural outgrowth of collaboration. Analyzing the best practices of community colleges, universities or vocational schools that have established interpreter training programs could assist in programmatic development.

Benchmarking is a useful tool for learning organizations to expand the capacity to create programs of excellence through measuring quality systems by comparison of work and goal-setting practices (Craig, 1996). The rationale for collaboration and assessment of past or best practices fosters the conception of a learning organization as defined by Peter Senge (1990). Senge asserts that a learning organization perpetuates the opportunity to continually expand the capacity to create desired results by allowing for new patterns of thinking to emerge where individuals can learn how to learn interdependently. All efforts to promote collaboration, assessment, and evaluation of past practice to develop excellent interpreter training programs will be ineffective if interpreter qualification is not quantified through a process of evaluation by both interpreting professionals and Deaf consumers.

The educational purpose of an ASL/English Interpreter Training Program ultimately leads to the completion of a certificate and/or an associate of arts degree in interpreting. Interpreter training program classes can be offered to introduce high school seniors, re-entry students, under-served students from culturally linguistic and diverse populations, senior citizens, international students, traditional and non-

traditional college students to American Sign Language and Deaf culture. The introduction of American Sign Language and Deaf culture could satisfy and convey a strong commitment to providing programs for personal enrichment, cultural diversity, and career opportunities for educational communities that are interested in life-long learning within the context of a student-centered environment thus promoting cultural and ethnic awareness of diversity (Mt. San Jacinto College, 2002).

For a community college, university, or vocational school, the educational purpose of the ASL/English Interpreter Training Program, would be established in the developmental stages of preparing a statement of goals and objectives. These goals and objectives should be determined by a curriculum committee within the initial program proposal. Examples of these goals could include, but are not limited to:

1. Students will learn and participate in the practical application of interpreting for the Deaf and hard of hearing in educational, medical, legal, religious settings, and industry employment settings.
2. Students will be prepared to take the Registry of Interpreters of the Deaf (RID) national certification test for the profession of interpreting for the Deaf and hard-of-hearing, which will include a written examination and an expressive interpreting skill evaluation that measures interpreting competence. Interpreting competency determines whether the student will receive a Certificate in Interpreting (CI) or a Certificate in Transliteration (CT).
3. Students will gain an understanding of the culture of the Deaf and hard-of-hearing to perform interpreting duties and avoid cross-cultural conflicts.

4. After completion of an ASL/English Interpreter Training Program, students will be qualified to pursue employment as American Sign Language interpreters.

5. After completion of the ASL/Interpreter Training Program and earning an associates degree, students will be able to transfer to California State University Northridge to complete a bachelors degree in American Sign Language or Deaf Studies.

Upon completion of an ASL/English Interpreter Training Program, students will:

1. Satisfy the requirements to become sign language interpreters;

2. Provide proof of completion of an Interpreter Training Program; and

3. Prepare students for taking the Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf (RID) written and expressive evaluation for certification.

The completion of an interpreter training program in conjunction with the written and expressive evaluation for certification will prepare students to compete for employment in the job market (McKenzie & Starwalker, 2002) and validate whether student learning outcomes have been achieved.

Philosophical Construct for Needs Assessment

For any community college, university, or vocational school, at the initial stages of a program proposal, documentation of differences between what is and what should be in an interpreter training program can be the foundation of strengthening the curriculum component and the basis for curriculum development of any ASL/English Interpreting Program in its developmental or revision stages.

Ralph Tyler's (1949) philosophical framework for analyzing, interpreting curriculum, and instruction for educational institutions provides a relevant rationale, which can be extrapolated and utilized to provide a basis of measurement for needs assessment within any educational environment interested in program and curriculum development. Tyler's rationale begins with identifying four fundamental questions. Tyler suggests that these questions are appropriate and should be asked. These questions are:

1. What educational purposes should a school seek to attain?
2. What educational experiences can be provided that are likely to attain these purposes?
3. How can these educational experiences be effectively organized?
4. How can we determine whether these purposes are being attained?

One can extrapolate that the basis of these questions, which essentially deal with the development of a needs assessment for educational curriculum, might be clearly understood if explicated by:

1. Defining the philosophical framework, which under girds the purpose that one is trying to achieve;
2. Developing goals and objectives to achieve that purpose;
3. Implementing the goals and objectives to achieve the stated purpose;
4. Including a methodology to determine, through evaluation whether the goals and objectives of any program are successful; and
5. Develop a plan to implement appropriate changes based on the findings of the evaluation.

Tyler (1949) also notes that objectives are a matter of choice, and generally, evolve from value judgments based upon a comprehensive philosophy that under girds the development of goals and objectives. The presupposition that certain kinds of knowledge and/or information provide an intelligent basis for developing goals and objectives based upon a philosophical construct, and that the previously mentioned information is available when making decisions regarding those goals and objectives, lends itself to the probability that the goals and objectives will have greater significance and validity.

Tyler (1949) also asserts that sources of useful information can be found between progressives and essentialists. He defines progressives as those individuals who utilize information based upon observation, which can provide a qualitative or subjective analysis of what is. This is in direct opposition to essentialists, who not only examine, but are impressed with a large body of knowledge that has evolved from a cultural heritage. Essentialists emphasize that conditioning may predispose one to utilize this philosophical platform as a primary means to develop goals and objectives. This might be construed as developing goals based on the construct of what was.

Tyler suggests that between these two parameters, there exists a gap between what is, what was, or what should be. Tyler reasonably submits that there must be a demonstrated need before any curriculum, or in this case, program is developed. One might reasonably surmise that progressives and essentialists can be:

1. Identified as stakeholders in the development of a philosophical construct to guide the development of goals and objectives;

2. Assist in the implementation of goals and objectives and utilize an evaluation to determine whether implementation of stated goals and objectives has been successful; and if not,

3. Determine what changes should be implemented to improve quality of service.

Results of this evaluation can provide information that can foster collaboration among stakeholders in the process. It also promotes alternative approaches to curriculum development that ultimately improves instruction and student success in the program. Progressives, for the purpose of this study, would be interpreters while essentialists, could be defined as Deaf consumers who are members of the Deaf community.

Curriculum

An ASL/English Interpreter Training Program proposal can provide a model for recommended course work needed to complete an interpreter training program. Students can choose to engage in a certificate program or follow the associate degree educational track. Serious consideration of curriculum development is imperative in the development of an interpreter training program that will produce qualified interpreters. Success of interpreter training programs might be evaluated and measured by whether or not an interpreter training student can achieve certification by the Registry of Interpreters of the Deaf or the National Association of the Deaf upon completion and graduation from an interpreter training program.

Tyler (1949) asserts that there must be a demonstrated need for the curriculum before a curriculum is developed. This would suggest the importance of a needs assessment to determine the need and viability of developing an interpreter training

program. Tyler also suggests that curriculum is designed by the utilization of intended learners of the curriculum, the community, the organization, and society coupled with those who have expert knowledge. Goodlad and Richter (1966) and Goodlad (1979) presuppose that there are four levels of curricular decision-making that occur. These levels of curricular decision-making represent the personal, instructional, institutional, and societal settings that are distinguished by their remoteness to the learner. There appears to be some similarity in the conceptualizations of Tyler and Goodlad. Therefore, one might agree that curricular decision-making should be determined by the intended learners, the community, the organization, and society as well as those with expert knowledge to benefit from the concept of benchmarking and best practice.

Collaboration, including consensus building, is key in determining an appropriate curriculum for all stakeholders involved and participating in an interpreter training program. The development of learning experiences for the student must allow for practice of the behavior implied in the educational objective, create student satisfaction in the learning experience, and create learning experiences that are realistic and which students can successfully achieve.

Organization of an interpreter training program curriculum might involve the following elements:

1. Identifying the purpose of the curriculum, intended participants, and time frame for completion of classes;
2. Identifying the macro-organizing elements or strands for an ASL/English Interpreter Program. These include defining what concepts, values, and skills are necessary to serve as organizing threads within the curriculum;

3. Providing continuity, sequence, and integration, which Tyler (1949) believed to be the three major criteria that effectively supported organized learning experiences; and

4. Collaboration in the curriculum decision-making process to produce ownership and buy-in in the development of an ASL/English interpreter training program.

Training methodology. To accomplish effective training, one must carefully choose a training methodology that will fit the needs of the organization. Trainers must determine how to tap into and encourage growth and self-actualization of their students in the learning process. Therefore, Hiatt (1990) expostulates that the development of a self-sustaining training program should reflect a training program/curriculum that incorporate the specific goals of the training, a purposeful selection of learning experiences, organized learning experiences, and evaluation. Curriculum planners or training developers must also consider who the intended learners are, what community is being served, and who the knowledge experts are that can contribute content and methodology to the curriculum planning. Hiatt (1990) also suggests that while the development of a particular curriculum may be carefully planned, the desired goal of the curriculum may not lead to successful implementation. Hiatt argues that the proposed curriculum in practice may not be a faithful representation of the original curriculum and that practice may be influenced by circumstances beyond the control of the planners.

Balon (1998a) recognizes that adult learners need training that is practical, realistic, and related to what they are trying to accomplish within their community of service. The article Training Adults: Experiential Training Models (Anonymous,

2000) submits that adults learn best by doing, recognizes that adults possess learning styles that categorically differ from children, and intimates that learning is likely to be achieved when adults participate and assume responsibility for learning. Houle, according to Knowles, Holton, and Swanson (1998) conceptualizes that adult learners are goal-oriented, activity-oriented, and learning-oriented i.e., adult students in ASL classes want to learn ASL in order to become an interpreter (student buy-in), utilize planned activities by the developers of the curriculum (create situated context), and assume the responsibility for learning (students use self-directed learning). Houle (1961) believes adult learners utilize the process of mental inquiry-the need to know, assume responsibility for learning, focus on real-life problems, and bring to the learning environment a diversity of experience that enriches the learning community. In that respect, adult learners are active participants rather than passive participants in the learning process.

Integrating community into the training process is believed to be the best method of developing community involvement and partnership to achieve successful development, implementation, and evaluation of the training program. Integration of community, in this case the Deaf community, into the training process can occur within the pre-assessment phase of training development as the organization solicits partnerships that would have a stake in the end product and who can provide assistance and knowledge in the process of decision-making (Goodlad, 1979; Goodlad & Richter, 1966). Goodlad asserts that there are four levels of curricular decision-making and that these levels represent the personal, instructional, institution, and societal, which are distinguished by their remoteness to the learner. The purpose

inherent in the development of interpreter training programs would be curricular decision-making at the instructional, institutional, and societal levels.

Kirkpatrick (1993) believes that evaluation is key to the successful implementation of any program to effect change and to measure whether any change has occurred at the level of training implemented. Evaluation determines the level of learning achieved, knowledge and skills learned, and whether the student has realized the stated goals or objectives of training. To strengthen this argument for the need of evaluation, Tyler (1949) proposes that evaluation should occur in four stages. These stages represent:

1. Collection of baseline data;
2. Formative evaluation to address the need for changes as the curriculum is implemented;
3. A summative evaluation at the formal termination of a curriculum; and
4. A follow-up evaluation.

Balon (1998a) conceptualizes that adult learners bring real-life experience and abilities to the learning process. Assessing, addressing, customizing training or instruction to meet students where they are, and evaluation are essential in designing an effective interpreter training program. Training goals and activities should target student needs and weaknesses to strengthen the potential for positive learning outcomes while taking into consideration student strengths and weaknesses. Balon (1998a) clearly supports an initial needs assessment to evaluate student strengths and weakness. This assessment would help articulate what the student needs to realize and achieve the learning outcome. Balon strongly believes that students should be involved with the planning, design, and implementation of training based on the

results of these assessments. This philosophical ideation represents a belief in the participation of administrators, members of the community, and students at the institutional level of curricular decision making. Hiatt (1990) also asserts that the planning and designing training programs can become enriched through the active participation of those who might be involved with the implementation, utilization, and evaluation of the training program. Balon (1998a) also advocates utilizing various modes of training presentation to meet the needs of diverse learning.

Likewise, Smith (1982) suggests three interrelated components to learning how to learn: needs, learning styles, and training. Smith believes that learners need a general understanding about learning, basic skills, and an understanding of strengths, weaknesses, and personal learning styles. Training focuses on the development of skills that the learner lacks. Knowles et al. (1998) suggests utilizing workshops, coaching, self-study, and practice while Bruner (1966; as cited in Knowles et al. 1998) contends that a theory of instruction, as applied to the concept of self-directed learning has four criteria. Instruction should specify:

1. Experiences that will encourage learning;
2. How to structure the body of knowledge to assist the learner in understanding the material;
3. An appropriate sequence in the presentation of material to be learned; and
4. The rewards and punishments in the process of learning and teaching.

Bruner's theory of instruction could answer Tyler's (1949) four normative philosophical questions, i.e., what educational purposes should be attained, what educational experiences can be provided to attain these purposes, how

can the educational experiences be effectively organized, and how do we determine if the educational purposes have been attained.

Despite difficulties in obtaining comprehensive information on perceptions of qualification of interpreters from Deaf consumers and working interpreters, two dissertations from Dissertation Abstracts International considered the concerns and problems of interpreters in relation to education and responsibility of sign language interpreters.

Simon (1994) evaluated the need for interpreters to understand the issues of bilingualism, biculturalism, and second language learning because interpreters work in cross-lingual, cross-cultural settings. Simon believes that interpreters are responsible for ensuring that communication is successfully facilitated among all parties involved within the communication process. Simon utilized a case study approach and evaluated the finds of his study with an ethnographic data collection methodology. The findings of this study concluded that it is not sufficient to merely teach techniques of interpreting and produce large numbers of interpreters who work mechanically.

Hayes (1992) in *Educational Interpreters for Deaf Students: Their Responsibilities, Problems, and Concerns* also determined that educational interpreting is a new and an emerging profession that needed further research to clarify the definition of an educational interpreter and what skills are necessary to become a qualified educational interpreter. According to Hayes, educational interpreters made several recommendations, which focused on the need for public speaking skills, understanding group dynamics, additional training in a variety of communication modes, and classes that would represent a cross-section of

educational and specialized interpreting settings. Likewise, McIntire (1991) discussed the outcomes of interpreter training program's self-study of program standards in Implementation of a National Endorsement System for Interpreter Preparation Programs. The intent of this particular study was to assess current standards and promote higher standards in interpreter preparation programs. Even though a meaningful outcome wasn't achieved, the purpose of the study was appropriate and viable to increase a meaningful dialogue with educators of interpreters.

Interpreter Training Programs Overview

Sanderson, Siple, and Lyons (1999) relate that until the 1960's all interpreting for the Deaf was supplied for the Deaf by family members, teachers of deaf students, members of the clergy, or those hearing individuals who worked with the Deaf. The unifying element was an intimate connection with Deaf culture. These individuals became the precursors to professional interpreting for the Deaf as it is known today. As legislation evolved promoting the rights of the disabled, interpreter training programs began to emerge in an attempt to train interpreters working with Deaf students and clients within the community to elevate the status of interpreting which, up until this point in time, was not considered a profession in its own right. However, by 1964, the creation of the Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf provided a forum for interpreting to emerge as a profession through the development of certification and ethical standards.

Stuckless, Avery, and Hurwitz in *Educational Interpreting for Deaf Students: The National Task Force on Educational Interpreting* (1989) reported that in 1989 there were 67 Interpreter Training Programs in the United States and Canada as opposed to the American Annals of the Deaf figures (Gustason, 1994) of 64 training

programs in 1994. In 1998, there were approximately 68 interpreter training programs, which represented a growth ratio of 1.47% from the 1994 to 1998 interpreter training figures. Shroyer and Compton (1994) in *Educational Interpreting and Teacher Preparation: An Interdisciplinary Model* indicated that educational interpreting remains the fastest growing area in the field of interpreting largely due to the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (PL 94-142) and the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990. The Americans with Disabilities Act (PL101-336) defined disability as any physical or mental impairment that significantly limits an individual's capacity to participate in one or more of life's activities, including education.

Dahl and Wilcox (1990) supported Shroyer and Compton's belief that educational interpreting was the fastest growing area in the field of interpreting. Dahl and Wilcox demonstrated that two-thirds of graduates from Interpreter Training Programs, which they had surveyed across the United States, found initial employment as interpreters in the public school system. Out of the 50 interpreter training programs surveyed, 45 responded. The findings of this survey revealed that only three programs out of the 45 concentrated on educational interpreting. The research of Stuckless et al. (1989) also indicated that there was limited emphasis on educational interpreting in training programs for interpreters.

In 1983, (Gustason, 1985) interpreter training programs were surveyed to ascertain the number of ITP students who would be entering the interpreting field and how many of those would be obtaining employment in elementary and secondary schools. The results indicated approximately 37% of the trainees entered public education employment. It was also noted that there was a need to clarify the roles and

responsibilities of interpreters in the public education setting. According to this survey, it would seem that more than one-third of the graduates of interpreter training programs obtained employment in public elementary and secondary schools as interpreters, interpreter tutors, and interpreter-aides, many with minimal or no training related to child development, educational aide or tutoring skills, or the sign systems used by schools. However, The Tenth Annual Report to Congress on the Implementation of Education of the Handicap Act (State Program Implementation Studies Branch Office of Special Education, 1988) proposed that there was a critical shortage of interpreters for the Deaf and hard-of-hearing in the education environment. This report also included an estimate that 10,000 elementary/secondary level students were receiving educational interpreting services for the Deaf in 1989, and it was believed that 26,000 candidates for interpreting services were underserved in the nation's elementary and secondary schools. Stuckless et al. (1989) stated that based on the enrollment in general education classes of deaf and hard-of-hearing students in 1985-1986 school year, the number of interpreters working with deaf students may exceed 4,000 in the future and demand for educational interpreting services currently exceeds the supply. We can surmise that the need for qualified-interpreters in the academic arena is an existing and growing need, yet as we can see from the existing data, three out of 45 interpreter training programs emphasized educational interpreting in their curriculum.

As professionals in the field of deafness and education labored with the development of interpreter training programs, evaluation of what was imperative in these programs evolved as they learned of the growing and changing needs represented, not only by the Deaf consumers, but of those training to interpret for the

Deaf. Frishberg (1990) determined that there were several broad categories of skills necessary in the evaluation of interpreters' skills and competencies. These included language skills, interpersonal skills, public speaking, cross-cultural communication, and advocacy. It is not surprising that language skills were presented first as a necessary competency. Interpreters need exemplary spoken and written English skills as well as excellent sign language skills. In April of 1989, an educational interpreting seminar was conducted in Atlanta, Georgia to address educational interpreting issues. The focus of this seminar was to identify essential competencies needed by interpreters in educational settings (P. Sheets, interview, January, 1992). Areas of concern included:

1. The lack of interpreters' ability to assess the expressive language level and comprehension ability of the deaf consumer;
2. Interpreter's lack knowledge of subject matter, vocabulary, and learning differences among deaf consumers;
3. The inability of the standards set forth by the RID to assure the competence needed for serving deaf students in diverse educational settings;
4. The potential danger of compromise posed by the shortage of competent sign language interpreters and the lack of standards.

Taylor and Elliott (1994) expressed that a major concern recognized by the educational interpreting seminar was the need for educational interpreters to have skills beyond the current Registry of Interpreting for the Deaf general interpreting certification. The Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf, not only determined qualification of interpreters, but also established a Code of Ethics for interpreting and certification requirements both at the national and state levels.

These guidelines, however, were not specific to educational interpreting, but were inclusive of interpreting in medical, legal, and industrial settings. In July1992, an Alabama State Task Force on general interpreting services for the Deaf and hard-of-hearing was established (P. Sheets, interview, January, 1992). The areas of common concern expressed by this Task Force appeared to be related to educational interpreting. The Task Force recognized that there was a need for specialization in interpreting and interpreter preparation. It also recognized that the use of Deaf individuals and attention to Deaf culture was important in the process of preparing interpreters. The Task Force believed that there needed to be a statewide consensus defining qualified interpreter, that uniform academic and non-academic preparation programs for interpreting should be taught by qualified teachers; and interpreter preparation should consider all communication models (P. Sheets, interview, January, 1992).

The National Task Force on Educational Interpreting (Stuckless et al. 1989) began its mission to discuss questions and issues concerning interpreting for deaf students across a variety of mainstream educational settings and at all educational levels. They described the ongoing development of educational interpreting as a discipline connected to both interpreting and education. The Task Force also accepted the challenge to implicitly suggest what needed to be accomplished in the field of educational interpreting and focused on the academic preparation of educational interpreters by suggesting a curriculum with flexibility to accommodate various areas of specialization. They endorsed certification of educational interpreters, including certification of knowledge and performance. It was also suggested that certification for specialized communication modalities be explored and developed. In 1999, the

National Task Force summarized in the Current Status of Educational Interpreter Certification for Students who are Deaf or Hard of Hearing, (Anderson & Easterbrook, 1999) that educational interpreters needed recognition as members of the educational team, there continues to be a shortage of professional interpreters, students have either no interpreter or an under qualified interpreter, and job descriptions vary from one setting to another.

It would appear that standards of qualification and interpreter shortages remain a key interpreting issue despite the best efforts by the Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf, National Association of the Deaf, and other paraprofessional organizations to qualify interpreters through evaluation and certification.

From this section of the literature review, we can conclude that interpreting training program development began sometime during the 1960s, that interpreting has emerged within the last 45 years as a profession with national standards and certification standards established and implemented by the Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf and the National Association of the Deaf. Interpreting is no longer solely the function of family members (Frishberg, 1990). The introduction of legislation to ensure equal access to education and civil rights of all disabled individuals created opportunities for the Deaf and hard-of-hearing to be mainstreamed into the regular classroom setting where the need and provision for an interpreter to facilitate communication was provided to comply with federal law.

Professionals in the field of deafness, i.e., the Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf, the National Association of the Deaf, various national task forces, and educational experts continue to evaluate and ascertain what is expedient in developing professional and qualified interpreters for the Deaf consumer, not only in

the educational arena, but in the medical and judicial environment as well. They have recognized that the different communication modalities (sign systems) of the Deaf that interpreters are serving may present potential problems in the work environment (Marschark, Sapere, Convertino, Seewagen, & Maltzen, 2004; Sanderson et al. 1999). While there is an extensive amount of literature, which discusses the history of interpreting, the implementation of federal laws to ensure equal access to interpreting services for Deaf consumers, the professional development of organizations that are concerned with qualifying interpreters, ascertaining weaknesses in the interpreting field, and developing effective interpreter training programs, there does not appear to be literature that specifically identifies and defines the perceptions of the Deaf as it relates to qualifications of interpreters.

Interpreting for the Deaf has emerged as a profession propelled by the evolutionary dynamic of the Registry of the Interpreters for the Deaf, followed by the National Association of the Deaf, who provided a forum for certification, developed a code of ethics, conducted conventions, and published magazine periodicals that outlined best practices of professional interpreters. In conjunction with and augmented by the development of college-based interpreter programs on a national level, interpreting came into its own (Sanderson et al. 1999). Current certification by the Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf, which is a national organization with state chapters, is based upon a general interpreting certification. In 1996, the Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf completed a series of Standard Practice Papers to promote best practice and advocacy in the field of interpreting. In addition, the Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf and the National Association of the Deaf are collaborating on a revised Code of Ethics to form one set of ethical standards for the interpreting

profession. Past practice for RID and NAD included a separate Code of Ethics and certification process for interpreters certified by either RID or NAD (Code of Ethics, 2003). This change in practice marks a distinctive change in the relationship between these two organizations. In fact, NAD certified interpreters have joined the RID Certification Maintenance Program and Ethical Practices System (NAD Interpreters, 2003).

Although the National Task Force on Deafness (Stuckless et al. 1989) supported certification for interpreters of the Deaf, they also recognized the importance of equivalent work experience in determining qualification. The National Task Force supported a system that included general studies, pre-professional studies, professional studies, and a practicum to under gird preparation for certification utilizing written examinations coupled with evidence of successful completion of specific college-level courses, and performance based evaluations in American Sign Language (ASL), Pidgin Sign English (PSE), Manually Coded English (MCE), Oral Interpreting, and Cued Speech. The National Task Force's ideological platform for interpreter qualification based on education, written and performance-based evaluations for certification, and successful practicum, has been realized as the interpreting field has progressed from its initial developmental stages to this point in time. These ideological values have been implemented in interpreter training programs.

A certificate program model. Educational experiences needed to attain the educational purpose and complete interpreter training will include taking classes in four levels of American Sign Language, Deaf culture, perspectives of Deafness, interpreting as a profession, two levels of interpreting, two levels of sign-to-voice,

two practicums, two occupational practicums, English, and public speaking (McKenzie & Starwalker, 2002).

An associate degree model. Educational experiences comprise all of the recommended course work for a Certificate Program in addition to the required general education courses necessary to obtain an Associate of Arts Degree in American Sign Language (McKenzie & Starwalker, 2002). This model for a certificate or associate degree relative to interpreter training appears to be in line with the best practices of other community colleges and universities who have established interpreter training programs.

Evaluation. The program review process, for most community colleges, is the methodology engaged to investigate the validity of any established program annually. The evaluation process for one community college in the southern California area is divided into three segments. These segments include a quantitative and qualitative evaluation, followed by a three-year action plan. Quantitative elements comprise analyzing enrollment trends, demographic trends, student contact hours, load trends, and student completion/success trends. Qualitative elements measure and analyze faculty and staff effectiveness, conduct a curriculum course review, evaluate learning resources, assess delivery methodology, and facilities, equipment, and supplies, while the 3-year action plan comprises a review and follow-up of any proposed program with a summarization and implementation of changes based on evaluation.

Evaluation is key to the successful implementation of any training program to effect change and measure whether any change has occurred at the level of training. Evaluation determines the level of learning achieved, knowledge and skills learned, and whether the student or consumer has realized the stated goals or objectives of

training (Kirkpatrick, 1993). To strengthen the argument for the need of evaluation, Tyler (1949) proposes that evaluation occurs in four stages. These stages represent collection of baseline data, a formative evaluation to address the need for changes as a curriculum or program is implemented, a summative evaluation at the formal termination of a curriculum or training program, and a follow-up evaluation. Assessing, addressing, and customizing training to meet students where they are, and evaluating are essential in designing training programs (Balon, 1998a). Training goals and activities should target student needs and weaknesses to strengthen the potential for positive learning outcomes while taking into consideration student strengths and assets. Likewise, Balon (1998b) supports an initial needs assessment to evaluate student strengths and weakness. He strongly believes that students should be involved with the planning, design, and implementation of training based on the results of assessments. This philosophical ideation represents a belief in the participation of administrators and members of the community at the institutional level of curricular, or program decision-making. Planning and designing training programs can become enriched through the active participation of those who might be involved with the implementation, utilization, and evaluation of a training program (Hiatt, 1990). At the initial stage of program development, collection of baseline data is needed to follow Tyler's (1949) model of four stages of evaluation and the formative evaluation. A formative evaluation would naturally occur through any educational program review process utilizing a quantitative and qualitative methodology of investigation while the last stage of evaluation, a summative review, might be considered what community colleges call a 3-year action plan.

Current Interpreting Concerns

The lack of qualified interpreters remains a problem for providers of interpreting services. The demand for qualified educational interpreters has risen dramatically. In *Disability Compliance for High Education* two Deaf graduate students complained to the Office of Civil Rights that Idaho State University did not provide effective interpreters for several of their classes. The students' felt that the interpreters were not properly trained. They expressed concern about the quality of finger spelling, the interpreter's use of American Sign Language, the interpreter's lack of knowledge of the subject matter, the interpreter's lack of advanced degree, and the physical setup of the interpretation in the classroom, ("Deaf Students," 2004). What is interesting to note in this case is that Idaho State University claimed that all of the interpreters were fully trained. They explained that among other qualifications of these interpreters, one had a Bachelor's Degree in Deaf education, and had completed the coursework for a Master's Degree in Deaf education. Another interpreter had earned an Associate Degree in educational interpreting, and the third interpreter had eight years of hands-on experience as an interpreter at the university with interpreter certification. However, despite interpreter qualification, there was a perception of non-qualification by the Deaf consumers. In order to improve services for students who are Deaf and hard-of-hearing at Idaho State University, the university decided to do five things to improve interpreting services. Idaho State determined that they must:

1. Allow the interpreters extra time to prepare for classes;
2. Work with the interpreters to improve finger spelling;
3. Change the physical setup of the classroom;

4. Provide course information through various methods; and

5. Provide additional voicing or interpreting.

Interpreting accommodations for Deaf and hard-of-hearing students improved because Idaho State University made a concentrated effort to improve academic accommodations.

Likewise, the San Diego Community College District was also compelled to improve interpreter services following complaints filed with the Office of Civil Rights. According to the *Disability Compliance for Higher Education*, in a complaint was filed because there was an extreme shortage of interpreters. This shortage of qualified interpreters affected interpreting accommodations for students enrolled in classes at the San Diego Community Colleges ("Costly or Not," 2004). Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 is clear in its intent to require public institutions to provide communication access for Deaf students that is as effective as communication provided to hearing students. The San Diego Community College District made every effort to implement change by utilizing best practices and implementing changes by procuring the assistance of the Western Region Outreach Center & Consortia, located at California State University Northridge. Western Region Outreach Center reviewed and evaluated San Diego Community College's accommodation services as indicated in *Disability Compliance for Higher Education.* ("College District," 2003). The lack of qualified interpreters continues to present a problem for interpreter service providers in the United States. The problem of interpreter shortages have also been addressed by Jones (1993); and Jones, Clark, and Soltz (1997) who clearly indicated that there was an increase in demand for educational interpreters.

Colonomos (1992) and Schein, Mallory, & Greaves (1991) agree that far too many interpreters' lack adequate skills for the positions in which they were hired. While having a lack of qualified interpreters is seen as a problematic, interpreter shortages will continue to increase as the pressure to utilize interpreters who are certified by RID and NAD. In the past, qualification of interpreters for the Deaf was solely defined by RID and NAD. The State of California has joined RID and NAD by legally defining a qualified interpreter as: (f) …a person who is certified by the National Registry of the Deaf, the National Association of the Deaf, or the joint test currently being developed by the RID/NAD Task Force, and who has met the requirements of continuing education as an interpreter or transliterator as required by RID's continuing education program.

SA2912 commonly referred to as AB 2912 states in Section 8910 that effective January 1, 2006, a person must be certified as a qualified interpreter, as defined in subdivision (e) of Section 8902, in order to do any of the following:

1. Engage in the practice of, or offer to engage in the practice of, interpreting or transliterating for a consumer.
2. Use the title interpreter, transliterator, or a similar title in connection with his or her name.
3. Assume the identity of an interpreter or transliterator.
4. Use the title interpreter or transliterator in advertisements or descriptions.
5. Perform the function of, or convey the impression that he or she is an interpreter or transliterator (SA2912 - Interpreters and Transliterators, 2004).

California is not the only state that is evaluating, defining, and legally mandating interpreter qualification. According to list-serve members of the TERPS-

l@ADMIN.HUMBERC.ON.CA, Iowa, Texas, and Missouri are three states that are also seeking to legislate interpreter qualification. According to J. Pollock (2004), a member of the public online interpreter list-serve, Utah enforces their law that limits non-certified interpreters from interpreting. It is considered a Class B Misdemeanor in Utah, with a fine of $1,850, and jail time not to exceed 6-months for interpreting without certification. The Greater Los Angeles Agency on Deafness, also known as GLAD, opposes legislation that makes it a crime for interpreters to work without RID/NAD certification (Anonymous, 2004). While GLAD supports the utilization of qualified interpreters, they believe that the passage of SA2912, also known as Assembly Bill 2912 would seriously limit the rights of the Deaf to choose their own service providers. GLAD also feels that AB 2912 would reduce an already limited supply of interpreters, waste millions of dollars that have been expended to establish certification standards, and create a new level of bureaucracy for interpreter requests. Violation of the newly drafted AB 2912 would be considered a misdemeanor for interpreters working without RID/NAD certification. The fine for this violation is $1,000, 6-months in jail, or both.

While list members appear to support legislation that qualifies interpreters, they also express concern about interpreter training programs inability to produce qualified interpreters. For example H. B. Harvey (2004) expresses:

> I agree that there needs to be a higher standard, but I also know that 'The Program' (ITP) produces a sadly low number of qualified interpreters. It seems to me that we need to work on the teaching methods used, in order to be able to produce more candidates that would than qualify for the RID. As a student who dropped out of the ITP program, and someone who has taken many other college classes, I know that ITP is the hardest series of classes I ever encountered, with the least chance of future credit. If the classes are that hard, either they are being compressed into too short a time-frame, or the teachers are not teaching them correctly. Either way it makes them into horrific classes. People

who drop-out and take other classes suddenly discover that they are not morons, in fact, they're A+ students. It was just the program that made them think they were idiots. Therefore, we have intelligent students that are being made to feel that they are morons, for what??? To make them better interpreters?? Clue: It doesn't work like that (p.1).

James Womack (2004a) voices:

Instructors who desire to graduate quality graduates who will effectively fulfill their roles so the Deaf and others are not perpetually stuck with mediocre personnel are [sic] hard-pressed to do so. Students who aren't prepared feel they are being targeted as or considered stupid. While some teachers are guilty of doing just that, I do not believe most are. Oh yes, some teachers pass students who are clearly not ready for the next level of ASL or *terp* class. I have seen some higher-level students sign so badly I question if they even understand themselves let alone why are they enrolled in [sic] this class. Is this what you want? Feel-good teachers who don't really teach, but have a happy party each class day and everybody gets an *A* no matter what? Barney doesn't belong in the college classroom.

Chip Green (2003a) states:

My opinion is that there is not enough input from Deaf culture on what makes a good interpreter. I wrote things a few years ago, perhaps before you joined [sic L-Terps List-Serve] regarding the "Power to Define." Who owns the definition of "good" when it applies to interpreters? Most of the list [sic-L-Terps List-Serve] agreed that, since Deaf people cannot hear, they are not able to determine if the interpreter on the block has "high fidelity between source and target. In other words, RID, et al. defines what is good. My point was this: if you're maintaining that there is a singular value in the word "good" meaning technically sound in processing between two languages, then the word may apply. But what happens if the Deaf person uses the word "good" to apply to an interpreter he/she trusts, and the Deaf person feels safe to self-reveal in a therapist's office. The interpreter may not be so good in the act of interpreting, but the Deaf person and the therapist are willing to shy away from the potholes. The interpreter, though highly certified, who is a stranger, or who is a colleague in the Deaf community makes the Deaf person feel insecure or unsafe, may not be good. Who decides? I believe it should be left with the Deaf person in most instances even if he or she make poor choices at first until the learning curve begins, or once in awhile based on faulty judgment like all of us exhibit. (C. Green personal communication, March 31, 2004).

Carissa Huffman (2004) writes:

Our educational interpreters are sadly under-qualified, and the schools would be scrambling (they would have to pay a more realistic salary as well…). The ITP/IPP programs in my neck of the woods are not graduating many students who will be able to become certified within five years of graduation--this would force them to step up to the plate. They would finally have to pay qualified instructors what they are worth, give them more ability to weed out those students who are not suited for this work, and (maybe????) require exit exams to graduate. I do think it is about time states wake up and see the need to know people in our line of work have some minimum standard of qualification (p.1).

Dan Parvaz (2004) questions:

Could it be that part of the problem here is that ITP's try to teach the language and interpreting all in the same two-year program that leaves precious little time for all the other things that an education requires? True, some students thrive in this environment--they are gifted language-learners, and either read voraciously on the outside or already have a BA before coming to the community college ITP--but they probably aren't all or even most of the potentially good interpreters out there. Having BA programs in Deaf/ASL studies combined with graduate certificate programs or M.A.'s may have the effect of giving enough time for the language (and more of it!) to be assimilated, along with rounding the rest of the person's education (p.1).

Dan also states:

ITP's need to be located in colleges/universities who at some point or points in the process have some gate-keeping. And I'm not talking about attitudinal requirements that amount to (mostly hearing) faculty determining whether or not someone is "nice" enough to represent the profession. Competency-based admission and exit requirements come to mind (and of course some community colleges have these). It's not political-but we will have ill-prepared students as long as (a) institutions allow them to be, and (b) interpreting is seen as one of the fields where a 2-year degree gets you $30 or more an hour or less upon graduation (D. Parvaz, 2004, p.1).

James Womack (2004b) expresses:

With ITP's several things must occur. They must push for programs to upgrade the English proficiency of all students, but especially ITP students. It is appalling to see "college" students spelling "which" as "witch," unable to distinguish between "your" and "you're," and (yes, just last week) unable to spell "bathroom." Overly lenient teachers who let too much slide… such as allowing excuses for late or undone

> assignments, tolerating attitudes and conduct that disrupts the learning process, and a host of other things that in my mind shows exactly what type of "terp" that particular student will be. Teachers who are so focused on being "popular" and "liked" as opposed to insisting students actually learn the material and comply with syllabus requirements hurt serious students and mis-train many. Teachers whose own dismissive attitude towards both the language and the Deaf need to be weeded out. I literally saw one teacher make the statement, "I hate Deaf people." Yet this teacher is teaching our language to others and consciously or subconsciously transplanting detrimental attitudes in future "terps." As with "terps" who resist certification, there are ASL and ITP teachers who resist certification by ASLTA, who do not attend workshops and basically do little more than collect a paycheck. Little wonder then is that we got "terps" with very similar attitudes. If the teacher's guilty of this and imparting the perspective on students, what else should be expected? ITP's need to implement some type of step screening tool that dictates whether a student has the ASL readiness to proceed to the next level of ASL course and eventually enter the ITP itself. Believe it or not, some programs have instructor personnel who work against this concept. Quality cannot be achieved if prohibited by the people vested with providing it (p.1).
>
> Chip Green also reflects:
> Is anyone doing anything to train interpreters with people skills and tell them not to posture as a teacher or advocate? To wait, for the teachable moment, if it ever comes? In my opinion, we should be. (C. Green personal communication, March 31, 2004).

While the members of the TERPS-L@ADMIN.HUMBERC.ON.CA express concern about the lack of qualified interpreters, and intimate that problems of qualification arise from lack of teaching standards, attitudinal problems, readiness issues, and screening issues, none seem to evaluate the lack of success from purely a curricular viewpoint. It would seem that stakeholders in the implementation of curriculum for interpreter training programs should consider how the curriculum is failing to meet the learning outcomes necessary to achieve interpreter readiness for certification. This is especially crucial for California interpreters who will be legally constrained to obtain certification in order to work as an interpreter for the Deaf.

Summary

This literature review reflects a serious evaluation of information that is currently available relative to:

1. Perceptions of professional interpreters and Deaf consumers regarding the qualifications of interpreters;
2. An examination of interconnected variables, which include understanding Deaf culture, the importance of full inclusion of American Sign Language at the post-secondary level;
3. A rationale supported by literature for that inclusion, and the historical evolution of interpreter training programs; and
4. Quantitative and qualitative research design.

The problem of interpreter qualification and serious shortages of qualified interpreters is closely aligned to language acquisition, bilingualism, cross-cultural interactions, and perceptions of interpreter qualification by the Deaf and working interpreter. This literature review demonstrates that there is a gap in the body of knowledge in relation to perceptions of interpreter qualification by Deaf consumers and the professional interpreter.

To understand the historical significance of interpreting for the Deaf and the emergence of Interpreter Training Programs, literature with any connection to interpreting and deafness was examined from the past 22 years (1977-1997). Literature included in this search emphasized the importance of Deaf culture and a rationale for the inclusion of American Sign Language as a foreign language in post-secondary educational institutions. Full academic inclusion of teaching American Sign Language as a foreign language is relevant to this discussion since learning

American Sign Language would be an integral part of the curriculum for an interpreter training program. Students would be unable to participate in an interpreting training program without learning American Sign Language.

Furthermore, the literature chosen for this review demonstrates the inter-connectedness of the cultural dynamic inherent within the Deaf community, the importance of the Deaf cultural identity and how American Sign Language is a demonstration of expression and cultural solidarity, the historical evolution of interpreter training programs, and legislation that influenced the development of interpreter training programs.

It would appear that the literature findings support a natural progression in the development of interpreter training programs. The literature accessed by the investigator supports the understanding that in the beginning interpreting was solely a function of family members or volunteers, legislation appeared, which mandated equal access to education and services for individuals with disabilities, gradually post-secondary educational institutions began to offer American Sign Language even though full inclusion for accepting American Sign Language as a foreign language has not been achieved, and interpreter training programs began to develop and emerge as students became interested in Deaf culture and sign language. While the literature suggests the need for qualified interpreters and defined either by the Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf, the National Association of the Deaf, and more recently the legislative definition of qualification, the literature does not seem to provide a historical evaluation of the overall effectiveness of interpreter training programs and how quality and qualification can be assured. The literature does not address:

1. An examination of American Sign Language acquisition deficiencies;

2. Whether or not the lack of student involvement with the Deaf seriously impacts the ability to attain ASL fluency thus attaining qualification by the Deaf consumer; or

3. Perceptions of qualification of interpreters by the Deaf consumer.

Chapter 3

Methodology

Introduction

This study sought to meet a need in educational literature for documented perceptions of professional interpreters, with or without certification, and Deaf consumers regarding perceptions of qualification of interpreters for the Deaf. There has been some speculation that interpreter training students do not spend any significant time with the Deaf thus lessening the opportunity for students to observe the Deaf modeling American Sign Language in a reality-based setting. This lack of cultural affiliation also reduces the opportunity to practice, not only sign language skills, but to experience many practical interpreting experiences in formal and informal settings, thus potentially strengthening an interpreter training student's language and interpreting skills.

These issues present an opportunity for dialogue between stakeholders, including interpreter training students, instructors, professional interpreters, and Deaf consumers with educational institutions, more specifically, those who actively engage in educating potential interpreters and are considering implementing an evaluation to determine whether present practice in interpreting training are not only effective, but successful in producing qualified interpreters for the Deaf upon graduation. It might be appropriate to consider that the Deaf voice should be given the greatest attention in the process of developing training programs for interpreters since without the Deaf, there would be no need to train interpreters.

Purpose of the Study

This study, exploratory in nature, was guided by the following research questions:

1. Are there differences in perceptions of what characterizes a qualified interpreter as defined by professional interpreters and Deaf consumers in relation to interpersonal skills, Sign Language Skills, and educational requirements? Section 1-4: Survey Questions 1-39.

2. Do demographic characteristics of Deaf/hearing, male/female, ASL native/non-native signers, and certified interpreters/non-certified interpreters affect perceptions of what characterizes a qualified interpreter as defined by professional interpreters and Deaf consumers in relation to interpersonal skills, sign language skills, and educational requirements?

    (a) Are there differences in perceptions between Deaf/hearing, male/female, ASL native/non-native signers, and certified interpreters/non-certified interpreters regarding the interpreter's interpersonal skills?

    (b) Are there differences in perceptions between Deaf/hearing, male/female, ASL native/non-native signers, and certified interpreters/non-certified interpreters regarding the interpreter's Sign Language skills? Section 1-4: Survey Questions 1-39.

    (c) Are there differences in perceptions between Deaf/hearing, male/female, ASL native/non-native signers, and certified interpreters/non-certified interpreters in relation to the interpreter trainee's level of education?

3. Does the Deaf consumer perceive that an adult child of Deaf parents would be more qualified to interpret than an adult child of hearing parents because of access to American Sign Language from birth? Section 5: Survey Question 40.

4. What is the extent of agreement between the Deaf consumer and the hearing interpreter that an interpreter's qualification to interpret requires cultural affiliation with the Deaf community? Section 5: Survey Question 41.

5. What is the extent of agreement between the Deaf consumer and hearing interpreter that an interpreter's qualifications to interpret require acceptance by the Deaf community? Section 5: Survey Question 42.

6. What qualities does the Deaf consumer seek out in qualified hearing interpreters? Section 5: Survey Question 43; and

7. What does the Deaf consumer believe goes into a quality interpreter training program? Section 5: Survey Question 44.

This study is expected to improve and maximize the curricular decision-making components of any ASL/English Interpreter Training Program offered, or proposed, for vocational schools, colleges, or universities. Improvement in curricular design will occur with a more thorough understanding of what is meant by qualified interpreter as defined by Deaf consumers and professional interpreters. Understanding their definition may provide a forum for implementing changes in the philosophical and instructional constructs related to the development of program proposals for future and ongoing development of Interpreter Training Programs. While the goal of this study is to improve and maximize interpreter training and provide an understanding of the perceptions related to interpreter qualification, the investigator

makes no claim of the representative nature of findings and results of this student constitute a careful generalization of data.

Design of the Study

A descriptive research design using a survey instrument was used to measure the opinions of two categories of informants thought to be relevant to identifying salient qualities of interpreters and interpreter training programs: Deaf consumers of interpreting services and professional hearing interpreters. Respondents were characterized, through self-identification, on a variety of demographic characteristics including: Deaf/hearing, female/male, native ASL/non-native ASL users of sign language, and certified/non-certified interpreters. Perceptions of interpreter qualification relative to interpersonal skills, sign language skills, formal education, and cultural connections to the Deaf community were obtained through a researcher designed survey using Likert-scaled and open-ended questions.

Qualitative survey methods were used to code responses and identify emergent themes in open-ended survey questions that measured the importance of cultural affiliation, acceptance by the Deaf community, whether perceptions of interpreter qualification are enhanced by having Deaf parents, and other skills and qualities not identified in the structured questions of the survey.

Survey Development

The survey, called the Questionnaire of Characteristics of Qualified Interpreters, was researcher designed and closely aligned with the literature and the research questions. This five-part survey consisted of 35 Likert scale response questions and eight open-ended questions. It included demographic information (Section 1), interpersonal skills (Section 2), sign language skill levels as a result of

interpreter training programs (Section 3), education requirements for qualified interpreters (Section 4), and cultural connections and qualified interpreter (Section 5). Instructions on how to complete the survey were included at the beginning of each section. Response categories for the Likert-scaled questions ranged from strongly agree to strongly disagree. The category neither agree nor disagree was eliminated in order to force an opinion. For the open-ended questions, respondents were asked to write their response in the spaces provided.

Subjects

The method of selection for this research study was purposive in nature. All subjects involved in this research study self-selected based upon their professional and/or personal affiliation with the Deaf community, their interest in interpreting, and Deaf community issues as it relates to interpreting and qualification of interpreters. Deaf consumers and professional interpreters were selected from two pools of volunteers with participation in this study limited to survey respondents who were either:

1.Certified or non-certified interpreters, who had professional interpreting experience in educational, legal, medical, industrial, and any other specialized settings; and,

2. Deaf consumers, 18 years or older who utilized interpreting services in those specialized settings.

All subjects self-selected based upon initial interest and response to the cover letter (Appendix A) that was included with the data survey instrument (Appendix B).

The setting for this study comprised a physical and virtual online environment. Deaf consumers and professional interpreters for the Deaf were

surveyed personally in Southern California at two locations in Los Angeles and Orange counties respectively. These locations included a popular coffee shop located in Orange, California and a Deaf church located in Covina, California.

Survey respondents were also surveyed through online list-serves related to interpreting, ASL instruction, and post-secondary service providers for Deaf and hard-of-hearing students with a generalized membership through the United States.

Respondents

One-hundred thirty-eight (N = 138) respondents participated in this study, which included 63 Deaf (n = 63), and 75 professional interpreters (n = 75). The respondents self-selected from three distinct groups:

1. Online list-serve members of professional discussion forums with a generalized membership throughout the United States and included:

    (a) An online discussion forum created for interpreters of the Deaf to discuss specific issues of concerns as it relates to interpreting for the Deaf.Participants were either Deaf or hearing;

    (b) An online discussion group created for American Sign Language instructors to discuss specific issues of concern as it relates to teaching American Sign Language. Instructors were either Deaf or hearing interpreters who have moved from interpreting to teaching American Sign Language.

    (c) An online discussion forum for post-secondary educational professionals who ask questions and share their post-secondary experiences as service providers for Deaf or hard of hearing students. Participants in this list-serve forum were either Deaf or hearing.

2. Deaf consumers and hearing interpreters meeting at a popular coffee shop located in Orange, California; and

3. Deaf consumers attending a Deaf church located in Covina, California.

Design of the Content Validity Rating Sheet

The content validity rating process (Appendix C) listed Sections 1 through 5 with questions numbered 1 through 43 on the survey instrument. For each survey question corresponding Likert-scale response indicated whether the questions on the survey were not relevant (NR), somewhat relative (SR), and/or relevant (R). The panel of experts read each question as it appeared on the survey instrument and determined that the questions were (1) not relevant, (2) somewhat relevant, or (3) relevant.

Content validity of the data instrument was established by a panel of five experts (Appendix D) who represented a cross-section of members belonging to hearing and Deaf communities. These experts were chosen because of their professional experience as interpreting educators, their certification status as professional interpreters of the Deaf, their personal knowledge of Deaf culture through familial affiliation, their deafness, and/or their need for and utilization of interpreting services as Deaf consumers. Furthermore, they all had the requisite ability to represent both hearing and Deaf communities. Panel members read Chapter 1 of this study and received verbal and written instructions on how to complete the content validity rating sheet for all of the survey questions on the data survey instrument. The panel of experts considered survey questions 1-37 to be relevant and/or somewhat relevant. There was consensus by survey questions was either very relevant/relevant at 80% agreement level. Panel members also provided comments

regarding the qualitative questions 13, 25, and 38-43; and agreed that 80% of these open-ended questions were relevant to assess perceptions of interpreter qualification based upon interpersonal and sign language skills, education, familial relationships, i.e., having Deaf parents, cultural affiliation, socialization with the Deaf community, and acceptance by the Deaf community respectively.

Based on the content validity study of the survey instrument no changes were made on the survey. The panel of experts determined that:

1. The questions presented on the survey were effective;
2. The questionnaire could measure perceptions of interpreter qualification for Research Questions 1-7; and,
3. The questions were clear, comprehensible, and relevant.

Human Subject Clearance

The Institutional Review Board of Pepperdine University, in conjunction with established Federal guidelines for human subject research, requires investigators utilizing human subjects to complete an online tutorial designed to ensure adherence to appropriate research standards and protocols. At the completion of the required online tutorial and the preliminary oral examination, a certificate of completion of the online tutorial was submitted to the Institutional Review Board and permission was granted by the Institutional Review Board of Pepperdine University to proceed with this study.

This study was designed to be an ethical and serious study. Participation in this study was voluntary, based upon self-selection, limited to survey respondents 18 years or older, who were either professional hearing interpreters for the Deaf and/or Deaf consumers who have utilized interpreting services. Respondents read, signed,

and returned an informed consent. The signed, informed consent indicated that respondents understood the intent of this study. Respondents that they acknowledged that there was no physical or emotional risk involved in participating in this study, and that they were willing participants.

To ensure confidentiality, respondents were informed that results would be reported in aggregate, their names would remain confidential, and by no means would their identity be revealed. To further ensure confidentiality and protection of individual identities in the data coding and analysis, a number was assigned in the lower right-hand corner of the survey questionnaire. As an incentive to participate in this study, each survey respondent received either a California Lottery ticket or a Snickers® candy bar. Respondents were also informed that the results of this study would be made available as PDF file through an online forum, which respondents would be able to access.

Data Collection Procedures

A pilot study was conducted to ascertain whether the research protocol was realistic, reliable, to identify, and correct any potential problems that could arise during the implementation phase of a small scale study that would affect the approved study. The pilot study confirmed that:

1. The research protocol was realistic;
2. The questionnaire was reliable;
3. Deaf and hearing respondents understood the survey questions, and that there was no evidence to suggest that the questions were difficult to answer;

4. The sequence and wording of the questions were appropriate although it was suggested that the Demographic Section should be moved from Section 5 to Section 1 on the survey questionnaire;

5. The questions measured perceptions of interpreter qualification;

6. Having an imposed schema i.e., sections identified as demographics, interpersonal skills, sign language skills, education requirements, and cultural connections did not appear to affect the quality of responses;

7. Open-ended questions provided a benchmark of potential themes that might be found in the full-scale study;

8. Deaf and hearing respondents were receptive to completing surveys online and generally demonstrated a quicker return rate than those who returned surveys through the mail or face-to-face surveying; and,

9. Respondents indicated a strong interest in participating in a study related to perceptions of interpreter qualification.

Overall, implementation of the pilot study was useful in confirming that the research protocol was realistic and that Deaf and hearing respondents wanted to participate in a study designed to gauge perceptions of interpreter qualification.

Data were collected online and in-person utilizing survey packets. Potential survey respondents received a survey packet through an email online attachment or in person. The survey packet included a cover letter, an informed consent, a survey questionnaire, and a self-addressed return envelope with postage. A self-addressed envelope with postage was included with survey packets that were personally distributed to potential respondents to ensure that the respondent did not incur any

expense in returning the survey packet if they chose to return the completed survey by mail.

The cover letter outlined the purpose of the survey, with an explanation that participation in this study was voluntary, and assured the survey respondents that safeguards were employed to ensure confidentiality in relation to personal information connected to or about the survey respondent.

The survey packet was disseminated to list-serve members of interpreting, ASL instruction, and post-secondary service providers for Deaf and hard-of-hearing students. Surveys were also distributed in person at two southern California locations where the Deaf and professional interpreters met for social gatherings.

In addition to disseminating online surveys through an email attachment, copies of the survey were distributed at a coffee shop, and a local congregation serving the Deaf community. Completed surveys were submitted through an email attachment, mailed, or personally delivered while surveys were also collected, at the Deaf church, upon completion by the Deaf consumer.

Data Collection by Research Question

Research Question 1. Are there differences in perceptions of what characterizes a qualified interpreter as defined by professional interpreters and the Deaf consumer in relation to interpersonal skills, Sign Language skills, and educational requirements? This research question addressed the overall similarities and dissimilarities in perceptions of interpreter qualification by Deaf consumers and professional interpreters. In general, Research Question 1 identified where similarities and dissimilarities occurred between Deaf and hearing respondents and provided a forum for discussion that could be utilized to identify specific perceptions that exist

between Deaf consumers and hearing interpreters as it relates to interpreter qualification. Research question one was answered by survey responses for Survey Questions 1-38.

Research Question 2. Do the demographic characteristics of Deaf/hearing, male/female, ASL native/non-native signers, and certified/non-certified interpreters affect perceptions of what characterize a qualified interpreter as defined by the respondents in relation to (a) interpersonal skills, (b) sign language skills, and (c) educational requirements? These additional questions followed: (a) Are there differences in perceptions between Deaf/hearing, male/female, ASL native/non-native signers, and certified/non-certified interpreters regarding the interpreter's interpersonal skills; (b) Are there differences in perceptions between Deaf/hearing, male/female, ASL native/non-native signers, and certified/non-certified interpreters regarding the interpreter's sign language skill; (c) Are there differences in perceptions between the Deaf/hearing, male/female, ASL native/non-native signers, and certified/non-certified interpreter's interpreters in relation to the interpreter trainee's level of education?

In attempting to ascertain differences in perceptions between Deaf consumers and hearing interpreters, Research Question 2(a) addressed interpreter's interpersonal or soft skills, in relation to an interpreter's understanding of Deaf culture, patience for diverse Deaf clients, respect towards Deaf consumers, timeliness, support of Deaf values, acceptance of feedback, collaborative attitude, flexibility in accommodating Deaf requests, and ethical standards. Research Question 2(a) was answered by survey responses for Survey Questions 1-13 by Deaf consumers and hearing interpreters who

were grouped into categories identified as Deaf/hearing, male/female, native/non-native, and certified/non-certified.

In attempting to ascertain differences in perceptions between the Deaf consumer and hearing interpreters, research question 2(b) examined perceptions of sign language skills that are needed as an interpreter as it relates to linguistic and language competency, utilization of different communication modalities for differences in signing styles, the need for public speaking skills, certification, being comfortable with non-manual behaviors, facial expressions, and appropriate use of space. Research Question 2(b) was answered by survey responses for Survey Questions 14-25 by Deaf consumers and hearing interpreters who were grouped into categories identified as Deaf/hearing, male/female, native/non-native, and certified/non-certified.

In attempting to ascertain differences in perceptions between Deaf consumers and hearing interpreters, research question 2(c) examined the perceptions about education requirements that Deaf consumers and hearing interpreters believed to indicate interpreter qualification. Research Question 2(c) was answered by survey responses for survey questions 26-38 by Deaf consumers and hearing interpreters who were grouped into categories identified as Deaf/hearing, male/female, native/non-native, and certified/non-certified.

Research Question 3. Does the Deaf consumer perceive that an adult child of Deaf parents would be more qualified to interpret than an adult child of hearing parents because of access to American Sign Language from birth?

In attempting to ascertain differences in perceptions between Deaf consumers and hearing interpreters, Research Question 3 addressed perceptions that having Deaf

parents qualified an interpreter because a child of Deaf parents had access to American Sign Language from birth and grew up among the Deaf community. Research Question 3 was answered by survey responses for Survey Question 40 by Deaf consumers and hearing interpreters.

Research Question 4. What is the extent of agreement between the Deaf consumer and the hearing interpreter in that an interpreter's qualification to interpret requires cultural affiliation with the Deaf Community?

In attempting to ascertain differences in perceptions between Deaf consumers and hearing interpreters, Research Question 4 addressed whether interpreter qualification required cultural affiliation with the Deaf. The investigator sought to determine the importance of socialization with the Deaf community and whether socialization affected perceptions of qualification. In addition to disseminating online surveys, hard copies of the survey were distributed by the investigator at a coffee shop and a local congregation serving the Deaf community. Research Question 4 was answered by survey responses for Survey Question 41 by Deaf consumers and hearing interpreters.

Research Question 5. What was the extent of agreement between the Deaf consumer and the hearing interpreter that an interpreter's qualifications to interpret requires acceptance by the Deaf community?

In attempting to ascertain differences in perceptions between Deaf consumers and hearing interpreters, Research Question 5 addressed perceptions related to acceptance by the Deaf community. Research Question 5 was answered by survey responses for Survey Question 42 by Deaf consumers and hearing interpreters.

Research Question 6. What qualities does the Deaf consumer seek in interpreters? The investigator sought to discover qualities that Deaf consumers seek out in interpreters in Research Question 6. This question was designed to ascertain the skills and qualities Deaf consumers' desire in interpreters. Research Question 6 was answered by survey responses for Survey Question 43 by Deaf consumers.

Research Question 7. What does the Deaf consumer believe goes into a quality interpreter training program?

In attempting to ascertain the perceptions of Deaf consumers, Research Question 7 addressed what Deaf consumers believe goes into making a quality interpreter training program. Deaf consumer feedback on what constitutes a quality interpreter training program was desired to provide a forum for discussion among Deaf and interpreting training programs to improve present quality of instruction. Research Question 7 was answered by survey responses for Survey Question 44 by Deaf consumers.

Data Collection for Hearing and Deaf in the Virtual Setting

Survey packets were disseminated through a virtual online setting early November, 2004, after receiving permission from the Institutional Review Board, at Pepperdine University, to proceed with this research study. These virtual online settings were discussion forums related to interpreting, ASL instruction, and list-serves for post-secondary service providers for Deaf students and related disabilities. These discussion forums, which were specifically established for interpreting professionals, ASL instructors, and for those working in Deaf and disability-related capacities have a generalized membership throughout the United States across a wide demographic area.

Surveys completed by Deaf consumers and professional interpreters were returned through an email attachment sent to a specified email account. However, respondents also printed a copy of the survey from the email attachment, completed it, and returned the survey and informed consent form by U.S. mail. Hearing respondents completed and returned questionnaires quicker than their Deaf counterparts. Seventy-five surveys from hearing respondents were collected in a relatively short time, but Deaf survey respondents did not return completed surveys as rapidly.

To offset the concern that there would not be enough Deaf survey respondents for this study, attempts were made to increase the numbers of survey questionnaires completed by Deaf consumers. Reminder emails were sent to Deaf survey respondents who had not returned their surveys via email. Advertisements were placed in newspaper magazines published by Trader Publishing Company and Recycler Magazine. These advertisements targeted Southern California counties in Los Angeles, Orange, San Bernardino, and Riverside. The advertisement indicated that Deaf consumers were needed for a research study related to perceptions of interpreter qualification. Advertisements were also placed in online publications specifically created for Deaf professionals in Deaf related venues.

Additional support and encouragement for this study came from Dr. David H. Smith of California State University Fresno's Department of Communication Disorders & Deaf Studies. Dr. Smith and several others in professional capacities related to providing services to Deaf consumers utilized their influence by networking and emailing information about this research study to potential Deaf survey respondents on their mailing lists. Subsequently, potential Deaf survey respondents

requested survey packets, and the number of Deaf survey respondents increased substantially form 38 to 63. While the rate of return initially lagged within the virtual online setting, the data collection in this venue was considered the most successful and generated a far greater rate of return than conducting person-person survey sessions.

All survey respondents who completed the survey questionnaire, with the exception of online survey participants, who requested that results of this research study be made available for review upon completion of this research study, were mailed or given a California Lottery® ticket for participating in the study. This research study with accompanying findings will also be available to all respondents who completed a survey questionnaire. At the completion of this study, a PDF file will be created and all online discussion forums will be notified that the results of this study are available with directions on how to access the study.

Initially, it was hoped that all items on the questionnaire would be fully completed by survey respondents. However, many online survey questionnaires were returned with incomplete items. It was noted that it was difficult to control the completion of all of the survey questions. While the number of respondents appeared to reach a wide demographic area and large enough to obtain 75 completed surveys by professional interpreters and Deaf consumers without any difficulty, there were actually more hearing respondents than Deaf respondents who participated in this study. After the surveys were completed, collected, and counted, the number of respondents equaled 75 hearing survey respondents and 63 Deaf respondents. While there were fewer Deaf consumers than hearing interpreters participating in this study, 138 respondents provided a rich database for analyzing perceptions of interpreter

qualifications. Differences between the number of hearing and Deaf survey respondents were statistically insignificant by a margin of seven percent.

A Deaf intermediary assisted during the collection of data to ensure that Deaf respondents understood the data survey instrument and to diminish the potentiality for bias to occur in the research process. The Deaf intermediary was fluent in American Sign Language, with above average to excellent English skills, and graduated with a Master's degree in education from an accredited university. The Deaf intermediary was instructed, in a meeting prior to the survey session, to withhold personal opinions or perceptions during the survey session, related to interpreter qualification, but was asked to clarify any misunderstandings between English and American Sign Language for the survey respondent if clarification was needed.

The Deaf intermediary had the option to utilize a script (Appendix F) explaining the purpose of the research study during the person-to-person survey sessions as a guide to explain the purpose of this study. The script was outlined in English and *glossed* in American Sign Language. Each section of the survey instrument, with corresponding survey questions, was explained when clarification was needed in American Sign Language and requested by the Deaf consumer.

A Deaf intermediary was not utilized for the survey session conducted at a popular coffee shop located in Orange, California, but an intermediary was utilized for the survey session located at the Deaf church in Covina, California.

Survey sessions for Deaf consumers in person were conducted in December 2004 at a popular coffee shop in Orange, California and in January 2005 at a Deaf church located in Covina, California. Data collection at the coffee shop located in Orange, California was not as successful as the data collection session the Deaf

church located in Covina, California since Deaf consumers at the coffee shop indicated through American Sign Language that they preferred to socialize rather than complete surveys. Differences in success patterns related to these two venues might have been predicated given the advantage of a formal environment, i.e. conducting a survey session at the completion of a church service where the research study was introduced and explained in American Sign Language at the request of the Deaf pastor.

The challenges faced in collecting data during this research study became opportunities for learning that during the data collection process unforeseen challenges may occur. These challenges that occurred during the data collection process with Deaf respondents were addressed with flexibility, ingenuity, and sensitivity to the cultural concerns and mores of the respondents surveyed.

It was anticipated that it would not be difficult to obtain at least 75 completed surveys at the coffee shop in Orange, California because the number of Deaf consumers at this event generally exceeded more than 100 on the second Friday of every month. However, when the Deaf expressed interest in socializing rather than completing surveys, those sentiments were respected. Subsequently, when a Deaf consumer at the coffee shop casually indicated interest in participating in the study by completing a survey, the Deaf consumer was given a survey packet with a California Lottery® ticket. They were introduced to the purpose of the study and instructed to return the survey by mail. The rate of return for this survey session was disappointing with only two completed survey questionnaires returned by Deaf respondents from the coffee shop through the mail.

A second survey session was subsequently conducted at the Deaf church located in Covina, California in order to maximize opportunities to obtain data from Deaf consumers. This Deaf church has members residing in San Bernardino, Riverside, Orange, and Los Angeles counties within Southern California.

At the completion of the Sunday church service, the Deaf pastor invited the congregation to participate in a study that was designed to measure interpreter qualification. The purpose of the study was explained to the Deaf congregation in American Sign Language and then survey packets were disseminated, which included the cover letter with informed consent, survey questionnaire, pens, and pencils. The Deaf pastor fully supported this study. Deaf respondents were also advised that there was no physical danger or emotional risk involved in completing the survey and were also assured that all personal information would remain confidential.

After the surveys were completed and collected, Deaf respondents were given a Snickers® candy bar. California Lottery® tickets were not disseminated to these respondents since it did not appear to be appropriate to disseminate lottery tickets in a church setting.

Data Analysis Procedures

Surveys were read, ordered numerically, and date-stamped as each were submitted by email attachment or returned through the U.S. Postal Service. A data organization sheet was designed to organize the data collected for Research Question 1 and 2. The data from the multi-response survey questions from Sections 2 through 4 of the survey instrument were organized and then transferred onto an Excel spreadsheet. Survey questions with no responses were noted during the organization of the data on the data organization sheet.

The data organization sheet was divided into four sections. Sections 2 through 4 corresponded to the quantitative multi-response survey questions on the survey instrument. Each section was identified as:

1. Section 1-Demographics
2. Section 2-Interpersonal Skills
3. Section 3-Sign Language Skills as a Result of ITP Training Programs
4. Section 4-Education Requirements of Qualified Interpreters.

The demographic data in Section 1 was organized by whether one was Deaf/hearing, male/female, native/non-native, and certified non-certified interpreter. Respondents were coded on the Excel spreadsheet as:

1. Deaf (D)
2. Hearing (H)
3. Male (M)
4. Female (F)
5. Native (N)
6. Certified Interpreter (C)
7. Non-Certified Interpreter (NC).

Section 1. All demographic data in these categories were transferred consecutively from the survey instrument to the Excel spreadsheet beginning and ending with hearing respondent 1 through 75; continuing with Deaf respondent 76 through Deaf respondent 138.

Section 2. Interpersonal skills included the responses from the Likert-scale multi-response survey questions 1-12. Deaf consumers and hearing interpreters were

identified consecutively beginning and ending with hearing respondent 1 through 75; continuing with Deaf respondent 76 through Deaf respondent 138.

Section 3. Sign language skills as a result of ITP training programs included the responses from the Likert-scale multi-response Survey Questions 14-24. Deaf consumers and hearing interpreters were identified consecutively beginning and ending with hearing respondent 1 through 75; continuing with Deaf respondent 76 through Deaf respondent 138.

Section 4. Education requirements included the responses from the Likert-scale multi-response survey questions 26-37. Deaf consumers and hearing interpreters were identified consecutively beginning and ending with hearing respondent 1 through 75; continuing with Deaf respondent 76 through Deaf respondent 138.

After all survey responses for Survey Questions 1-12, 14-24, and 30-37 were transferred from the survey instrument onto the Excel data organization spreadsheet, the responses were then transferred into the Number Cruncher Statistical System to obtain a cross-tabulation report, which would indicate extent of agreement in perceptions of Deaf consumers and hearing interpreters as it related to interpreter qualification. The Likert-scaled multi-response survey questions listed as strongly agreed/agreed and strongly disagree/disagree were collapsed into two categories representing strongly agreed or strongly disagree for analysis in the cross-tabulation report. After the cross-tabulation report was generated, the results were organized into data tables for Research Questions one and two. These cross-group data tables reflected the percentages and differences in perceptions between Deaf/Hearing, Male/Female, Native ASL/Non-Native ASL users of Sign Language, and

Certified/Non-Certified interpreters for survey questions 1-12, 14-24, and 26-37. These data tables were called:

1. Quantitative Calculations Derived from Cross-Tabulation Reports Related to Deaf and Hearing Signers;
2. Quantitative Calculations Derived from Cross Tabulation Reports Related to Female and Male Signers;
3. Quantitative Calculations Derived from Cross Tabulation Reports Related to Native and Non-Native Signers; and,
4. Quantitative Calculations Derived from Cross Tabulation Reports Related to Certified and Non-Certified Interpreters.

These statistics provided a basis for summarizing the attributes and variables contained in the data (McCall, 2000). Data related to educational achievement and ranges of signing years were reported to indicate the breadth of educational and signing experience represented by the subjects in this study. This data is discussed in Chapter 4.

After organizing data tables that reflected the percentage of difference in responses, a degree of difference table was developed as a visual means to demonstrate positive attitudes in perceptions between respondents for Research Questions 1 and 2 related to survey questions on interpersonal skills (SQ 1-12), sign language skills needed by qualified interpreters (SQ 14-24), and educational competencies a qualified interpreter should possess (SQ 26-37). were organized by demographic grouping:

1. Deaf and hearing;
2. Males and females;

3. Native and non-native; and

4. Certified and non-certified interpreters.

Perceptual differences on this table were then delineated within a specified range identified as no difference in perception, less than 5% difference in perception, 6-9% difference in perception, a 10-19% difference in perception, and a difference of perception greater than 20%. A no difference in perception indicates that respondents reported held perceptions without any difference in opinion. Differences of less than 5% were considered minor or minimal differences in perceptions. These differences tended to be more closely aligned with perceptions that were more similar than dissimilar. Therefore, these perceptions were considered perceptions with a slight gap and demonstrated a minimal difference in perception. Differences in perceptions of 5-10% represented a slightly larger difference in perceptions and demonstrated that the differences in perceptions between respondents were transitioning from a minimal gap to a slightly larger gap in perception between respondents. A difference in perception was noted in differences in perceptions of 10-19%. A difference in these perceptions reflected that a larger gap in perceptions between respondents were occurring while differences in perceptions of greater than 20% indicated the largest and strongest difference in perception reported by survey respondents. Differences in perception greater than 20% represented the most meaningful distinction and the widest gap in perception between survey respondents in this study relative to responses to survey questions.

Data Organization-Qualitative Responses-Research Questions 1-7

The data organization sheet for the qualitative responses recorded the subjective responses of Deaf consumers and hearing interpreters for Survey Questions

13, 25, 39, 40, 41, 42, and 43. Hearing interpreters did not answer Survey Question 42 and 43 since those survey questions were specifically designed for the Deaf consumer to answer.

Written responses of Deaf consumers and hearing interpreters were organized into two separate documents identified as Qualitative Survey Responses-Hearing Interpreters and Qualitative Survey Responses-Deaf Consumers. Qualitative Survey Responses for Hearing Interpreters included Survey Questions 13, 25, 39, 40, 41, while Qualitative Survey Responses for Deaf Consumers included 13, 25, 39, 40, 41, 42, and 43. Written responses were read and compiled under each survey question beginning with survey respondents 1-75 for hearing interpreters and survey respondents 76-138 for Deaf consumers. For example, hearing survey respondent's 1's written response to Survey Question 13 asked if there were any other interpersonal skills an interpreter should have stated: "Strong personal work ethic, ability to adapt to new situations, ability to effectively communicate with team, ability to effectively communicate with and educate others about the interpreting profession (what we need as interpreters, our role as interpreters, etc)." This response was then followed by the next written response submitted by the respondent 2-138 in this study.

After the qualitative data was compiled, the data was examined to determine patterns, emerging themes, and whether there were any linkages between the perceptions of the respondents in relation to interpersonal skills, sign language skills, educational requirements of a qualified interpreter, interpreter qualification based upon familial relationships, i.e. having Deaf parents, socialization with the Deaf, and acceptance by the Deaf.

An open-ended list of emergent themes, derived from the pilot study, was utilized as a starting point to determine similar themes and patterns within the data. The first ten responses to each question were read, key words and potential emerging themes were compared, emerging themes were decided by 100% agreement, and this process continued throughout until all of the survey responses were coded. Themes were then analyzed for triangulation of collective agreement or disagreement in perception among survey respondents (F. Madjidi, personal communication, January 12, 2002). Key words were organized into broader categories that reflected emerging themes in the perceptions of the survey respondents. Themes were clustered, organized by data reduction, and then collapsed into categories. This process of coding continued until all responses were coded and the data was transferred to a chart that listed Deaf and hearing survey respondents themes that visually demonstrated agreement or disagreement in perceptions. All results from the qualitative data are reported and discussed in Chapter 4.

Independent Coder

The independent coder graduated with a Master's Degree in Organizational Management from an accredited university in Southern California and possessed previous knowledge of Deaf culture, interpreting, interpreters, American Sign Language, and legislation that mandates provision of interpreting services for Deaf consumers.

The independent coder was trained to review organized qualitative data to determine emerging themes, key words, and patterns inherent in the responses to survey questions relative to interpersonal, sign language skills, educational competency, and cultural connections and the qualified interpreters with regards to

familial relationships, participation in Deaf cultural activities, acceptance by the Deaf community, qualities Deaf consumers seek out in interpreters, and what the Deaf believe to be a quality interpreting training program. The independent coder was instructed how to determine emerging themes, key words, and patterns. For example, if Survey Question 13 had 75 responses, the investigator and independent coder would read the first ten responses, compare key words and potential emerging themes related to Survey Question 13, caucus to 100% agreement, and continue the process until all of the survey responses were coded.

If consensus could not reached by either investigator or independent coder, it was agreed that the investigator would defer to recommendations of the Dissertation Committee Chairperson to determine emerging themes. The decision to utilize an independent coder to review and determine emerging themes in this research study provided additional credibility and diminished investigator bias in the research design as described by McMillan and Schumacher's (1997) *Research in Education: A Conceptual Introduction.*

Analysis Procedure for Quantitative Data

Data were analyzed using the Number Cruncher Statistical System (NCSS). Data were summarized using descriptive statistics with frequencies and percentages utilized to describe findings. A cross-tabulation report presented all of the data organized by survey question and categories, which included: Deaf/hearing, male/female, native/non-native, and certified/non-certified respectively. The cross-tabulation of data provided the frequencies for each category and appropriate percentages or proportions (McCall, 2000) for Sections 2, 3, and 4 of this study.

Analysis Procedure for Qualitative Data

Qualitative data collected for this study were analyzed by noting patterns and themes, comparing and contrasting, clustering similarities, and dissimilarities in perceptions of interpreter qualification by respondents (Miles & Huberman, 1994). Emerging themes were analyzed and marked by keywords that identified themes and/or triangulation of collective agreement or disagreement in perception among survey respondents (F. Madjidi, personal communication, January 1, 2002). The themes were organized through data reduction and collapsing categories. Synthesis of themes occurred through discussion of what appeared to be naturally occurring relationships among themes and continued until all responses were coded.

Chapter 4

Analysis of the Findings

Introduction

This chapter includes a comprehensive data analysis to ascertain perceptions of interpreter qualification by hearing interpreters for the Deaf and Deaf consumers who utilize interpreters in the educational, industrial, legal, medical, social services, and other specialized settings. Raw data was systematically organized from survey responses listed on the Questionnaire of Characteristics of Qualified Interpreters to gage the perceptions of interpreter qualification. Respondents consisted of Deaf consumers and hearing interpreters inclusive of male/female, native/non-native signers, certified/non-certified interpreters. Education and range of signing experience were included to provide a comprehensive understanding of the survey respondents participating in this study across demographic parameters.

Demographic Characteristics of Participants

The demographic characteristics of the study participants are delineated in Table 2. Survey respondents were asked to report whether they were Deaf or hearing, male or female, native or non-native signers, and if they were certified or non-certified interpreters. Survey respondents were also asked to indicate their level of education and number of years signing, which was then organized into a range of 1 to 5 years, 6 to 10 years, 11 to 15 years 16 to 20 years, and 20 years plus respectively. Approximately 180 survey questionnaires, with an informed consent describing the nature of the study, were disseminated to potential survey respondents. Rate of return for hearing and Deaf respondents through data collection sessions and/or U.S. Postal Service delivery was approximately 41%.

Table 2

Demographic Characteristics of Participants (N = 138)

Characteristic	Deaf		Hearing		No response	
	n	%	*n*	%	*n*	%
All survey respondents	63	46	75	54		
Gender						
Female	31	22	62	45		
Male	32	23	13	10		
Status of ASL signer						
Native signer	25	18	8	6		
Non-native signer	24	17	61	44		
No response					20	14
Certification through RID or NAD						
Certified	10	7	55	40		
Non-certified	24	17	20	15		
No response					29	21
Educational attainment						
Associate (2-year)	11	8	20	14		
Bachelor (four-year)	19	14	25	18		
Masters	16	12	17	12		
Doctorate	3	2	1	1		
No degree or response	14	10	12	9		

(table continues)

Characteristic	Deaf		Hearing		No response	
	n	%	*n*	%	*n*	%
Interpreter training (years)						
2	6	4	39	28		
4	3	2	6	4		
No response or no training					84	60
Signing experience (years)						
1 – 5	3	2	3	2		
6 – 10	3	2	13	9		
11 – 15	8	5	12	9		
16 – 19	1	7	7	5		
20 or more	35	25	36	26		
No response					17	12

Note. RID = Registry of Interpreters of the Deaf. NAD = National Association of the Deaf.

There were approximately 138 survey respondents who completed and returned the survey questionnaire by mail, email, or during the data collection process at a popular coffee house and a Deaf church. Rate of return for online survey respondents was more difficult to predict since survey questionnaires were sent to list-serves with a generalized membership throughout the United States across a wide demographic area. Sixty-three survey respondents replied to an initial contact regarding this study and returned completed surveys with an informed consent. Total overall rate of return was approximately 77%. This figure represented over half of those returned by mail or by online responses.

Deaf and hearing. The distribution of respondents by their self-identified status as a Deaf consumer of interpreting services or a hearing interpreting professional is a fundamental element of this study. The data shows that of the 138 respondents, 46% identified themselves as Deaf (n = 63) and 54% as hearing (n = 75).

Gender. The distribution of Deaf and hearing respondents by gender shows that of the 138 respondents, 67% were female (n = 93) and 33% were male (n = 45). The gender of Deaf consumers was distributed equivalently between females (n = 31) and males (n = 32) and respectively represented 22% and 23% of the total sample. By comparison, hearing respondents were over-represented in the sample. Hearing females represented 45% (n = 62) of the total sample, while hearing males represented 10% (n = 13). This representation is symbolic of the prevalence of female interpreters in general.

Native and non-native signers. The distribution of Deaf and hearing respondents by their self-identified status as native or non-native signers of ASL indicate that of the 138 respondents, 24% identified themselves as native signers of ASL (n = 33), while 61% were non-native signers of ASL (n = 85). Twenty of the respondents, or 14% of the sample did not answer the question. Deaf consumers were equivalently distributed between native signers (n = 25) and non-native signers (n = 24), respectively representing 18% and 17% of the total sample. Hearing interpreters predominately identified themselves as non-native signers of ASL, representing 44% of the total sample (n = 61). Only 6% of the hearing interpreters identified themselves as native signers (n = 8). This may suggest that signers choose to learn American Sign Language for the express purpose of interfacing through cultural and professional affiliation with the Deaf community. It may also suggest that a greater

number of Deaf respondents were children of hearing parents and learned sign language at a later time rather than hearing children of Deaf parents who learned sign language from birth.

Certified and non-certified interpreters. The distribution of Deaf and hearing respondents by their self-identified status as certified or non-certified ASL interpreters shows that of the 138 respondents, 47% identified themselves as certified interpreters (n = 65), while 32% were non-certified interpreters (n = 44). Twenty-nine of the respondents or 21% did not answer this question.

These figures comprise both hearing and Deaf respondents who obtained certification as defined by the Registry of Interpreters of the Deaf, the National Association of the Deaf, and any other category inclusive of state agencies certifying interpreters who have not been exclusively certified by RID or NAD. It should be noted that certified Deaf interpreters generally assist hearing interpreters who are working with minimal language skilled Deaf individuals in an intermediary capacity. Non-certified interpreters continue to interpret in education, medical, legal, and other specialized settings within community venues, but as the demand for certification increases, non-certified interpreters will be compelled to become certified or will be unable to interpret in a professional capacity.

Educational attainment. The distribution of Deaf and hearing respondents by level of educational attainment indicates that the respondents in this study are highly educated. Of the 138 respondents, approximately one-third or 32% had attained baccalaureate degrees and 27% had attained post-graduate degrees. One-third of the respondents (19%) did not identify their level of educational attainment or did not

respond. There are no significant differences in the level of educational attainment between Deaf and hearing respondents.

Years of interpreter training. The distribution of respondents in the sample who completed formal interpreter training programs indicated that of the 138 respondents, 32% (n = 45) completed a two-year interpreting training program, while 18% (n = 9) completed a four-year interpreting training program. The prevalence of two-year training is also apparent in the comparison of Deaf and hearing respondents attending interpreting training programs. The figures that represent the number of years of interpreter training suggests that while hearing respondents quantify the highest completion rates for interpreter training, it is not unlikely for a Deaf consumer to attend and complete an interpreter training program as well. No response or no training equaled 60% (n = 84) of the survey respondents.

Signing experience. Data for the number of years signing was aggregated into specified ranges: 1 to 5 years, 6 to 10 years, 11 to 15 years, 16 to 19 years, and 20 or more years. The data reveal these respondents are experienced signers with fully 51% of 138 respondents reporting 20 or more years of signing experience.

Summary of Characteristics

Overall, the demographic data reveals that the respondents are primarily female, highly educated with college degrees, and have 20 or more years experience signing ASL. The majority of survey respondents are certified interpreters, are non-native signers of ASL, and have attended two-year interpreter training programs.

There are no significant differences in perceptions between Deaf and hearing respondents relative to educational attainment. This may indicate a level of theoretical knowledge achieved by both Deaf and hearing respondents, who have earned

academic degrees, but could also be a clear indicator that Deaf and hearing respondents understood the survey data instrument and were able to complete it based upon their understanding and experience either as an interpreter or consumer of interpreting services.

Quantitative Analysis for of Interpreter Qualifications

Research Question 1 explored the differences between professional interpreters and Deaf consumers in their perceptions of what characterizes a qualified interpreter in relation to interpersonal skills, sign language skills, and educational requirements. Research Question 2 explored the effects of the demographic characteristics such as Deaf/hearing, gender, native/non-native users of ASL, interpreter certification status, and educational attainment in relation to interpersonal skills, sign language skills, and educational requirements relative to interpreter qualification. The data were analyzed using cross-tabulation and degree of difference analyses in both the strongly agree and strongly disagree response categories.

Deaf and hearing perception of interpreter qualification. There is unanimity among Deaf and hearing respondent about specific qualities, skills, and education that every interpreter should possess to be effective. Confidentiality, being understood when interpreting, and an interpreter's ability to be comfortable when using facial and body language while utilizing American Sign Language are perceived qualities that are valued by both Deaf consumers and hearing interpreters. There was no difference in these perceptions as it relates to interpersonal skills, and sign language skills a qualified interpreter should demonstrate by Deaf consumers and hearing interpreters.

Table 3 details differences in the perceptions between Deaf and hearing respondents about specific qualities, skills, and education that every interpreter should

possess to be effective. Survey questions in which hearing interpreters reported a more positive attitude with a difference of perception of less than 5% included survey questions 1-9 in the section of the survey seeking information regarding the characteristics of qualified interpreters. Survey Questions 1-9 represented interpersonal skills that interpreters should possess.

Survey Question 1 asked whether interpreters should show that they understand Deaf culture. Hearing respondents indicated that interpreters should be able to show that they understand Deaf culture. These differences in perception are considered more similar than dissimilar between Deaf and hearing respondents with a slight gap in perceptions indicating minimal differences for this survey question.

Survey Question 2 gauges the perception about an interpreter's ability to be flexible and willing to change according to the needs of the Deaf when interpreting. Hearing respondents once again reported a positive attitude with a perceptual difference less than 5%, which indicates a slight gap in perception between respondents. These perceptions are more similar than dissimilar. An interpreter should be flexible and willing to change to meet the needs of the Deaf consumer.

Survey Question 3 gauges whether Deaf and hearing respondents perceive that interpreters should be able to work cooperatively while team interpreting. Once again hearing interpreters reported a more positive attitude than Deaf consumers although perceptual differences between the two groups are minor and closely aligned with more similarity than dissimilarity in perception.

Survey Question 4 measures whether Deaf consumers and hearing interpreters perceive that interpreters should be able to work cooperatively with Deaf client(s).

Table 3

Deaf and Hearing Differences in Agreement

Survey Item	Deaf	Hearing	Difference
Differences 1% to 5%			
1. Understand Deaf Culture	98	100	2
2. Flexibility	98	100	2
3. Teamwork	97	100	3
4. Work cooperatively with the Deaf	98	100	2
5. Patience	98	99	1
6. Respect for the Deaf	98	100	2
7. Accept criticism	95	100	5
8. Accept criticism from supervisor	95	100	5
9. Be on time	98	97	1
11. Adhere to Code of Ethics	98	100	2
15. Be comfortable interpreting	98	100	2
17. Able to use Manually Coded English	86	89	3
19. Be conceptually accurate	97	99	3
21. Presentation skills	93	96	3
23. Convey intent of message	97	99	2
32. Bachelor degree in any subject	63	64	1
34. One-year internship	85	81	4
35. Participate in Deaf mentoring	98	96	2
36. Mentored by the Deaf	83	79	4

(table continues)

Survey Item	Deaf	Hearing	Difference
Differences 6% to 20%			
16. Able to use Pidgin-Signed English (PSE)	90	99	9
18. Able to use slang	72	82	10
20. Sign with conceptual accuracy (CASE)	90	99	9
24. Certified by RID or NAD	89	79	10
27. Four-year interpreter training program	72	56	16
28. Attend sign language workshops	94	100	7
33. Masters degree in any subject	46	33	13
Differences greater than 20%			
10. Agree with Deaf values	95	73	22
26. Two-year interpreter training program	57	31	26
29. Have certification to be considered qualified	87	65	22
30. Bachelors in Deaf Studies	62	20	42
31. Masters in Communication	56	14	42
37. No formal training. ASL knowledge is sufficient.	27	1	26

Note. Degree of differences were cross tabulated using the *strongly agree* response choice on the survey. Numbers represent reported positive outcomes and absolute values.

Hearing interpreters reported a more positive attitude than Deaf consumers. There is a slight gap in perception with more similarity than dissimilarity and indicates that hearing interpreters perceive that interpreters should be able to work cooperatively with the Deaf client. The ability to work cooperatively with the Deaf

client is a soft skill that is needed by interpreters who are working with Deaf clients cross culturally.

Survey Question 5 seeks to measure whether interpreters should have the ability to show patience while interpreting for diverse Deaf clients. Hearing interpreters reported a more positive attitude than Deaf consumers with less than 5% difference in perception between Deaf and hearing respondents about specific interpersonal skills every interpreter should possess to be effective. Consequently, these differences are minimal with perceptions between Deaf and hearing respondents closely aligned. Implications are that an interpreter should demonstrate patience in working with diverse Deaf clients.

Survey Question 6 examines the perception that interpreters should be able to show respect toward the Deaf consumer. While hearing interpreters reported a more positive attitude than Deaf consumers in this category, perceptual differences are minor between respondents and reflect more similarity than dissimilarity in perception. These figures indicate that interpreters should demonstrate respect towards the Deaf consumer and that the ability to show respect for the individual as a consumer is a necessary soft skill for interpreters to possess.

Survey Question 7 measures whether interpreters should be able to accept constructive criticism from Deaf consumers. Hearing interpreters reported a more positive attitude than Deaf consumers relative to interpreters accepting constructive criticism from Deaf consumers. Differences in perception between Deaf and hearing respondents are minor and could be considered closely aligned with more similarity than dissimilarity with hearing interpreters possessing a more positive attitude with respect to interpreters demonstrating the ability to accept constructive criticism.

Survey Question 8 asks whether an interpreter should be able to accept constructive criticism from supervisors. This survey question expands on the perception that, in general, interpreters should be able to accept constructive criticism from Deaf consumers and supervisors. Hearing interpreters reported a more positive attitude than Deaf consumers' category. Differences in perception between Deaf and hearing respondents are minor and could be considered closely aligned with more similarity than dissimilarity with hearing interpreters possessing perceptions more closely aligned to an interpreter having the capacity to accept constructive criticism from supervisors.

Survey Question 9 gauges whether survey respondents believe that interpreters should be on time for all assignments. Hearing interpreters reported a more positive attitude than Deaf consumers in this category. Differences in perception between Deaf and hearing respondents are minor and closely aligned with more similarity than dissimilarity in perceptions between respondents. Being on time for interpreting assignments is considered a professional conduct skill that hearing interpreters believe interpreters should demonstrate.

Survey Question 11 measures survey respondent's perceptions as it relates to interpreters adhering to a code of ethics. Hearing interpreters reported a more positive attitude than Deaf consumers in this category. Differences in these perceptions between Deaf and hearing respondents are minor and could be considered closely aligned with more similarity than dissimilarity. Both hearing interpreters and Deaf consumers perceive that interpreters should adhere to a code of ethics which regulates personal, professional conduct, and ethical decision making.

Survey Question 15 addresses whether an interpreter graduating from an interpreter training program should be able to interpret a conversation comfortably. Hearing interpreters reported a more positive attitude than Deaf consumers in this category. Differences in perception between Deaf and hearing respondents are minor and considered closely aligned with more similarity than dissimilarity. Deaf and hearing respondents perceive an interpreter should have the ability to interpret a conversation comfortably at the completion of an interpreter training program.

Survey Question 17 sought to measure whether an interpreter graduating from an interpreter training program should be able to use Manually Coded English (MCE) if the Deaf consumer requests that sign system. Hearing interpreters reported a more positive attitude than Deaf consumers in this category. Differences in perception between hearing interpreters and Deaf consumers are minor in this category and closely aligned with more similarity than dissimilarity in perception. Hearing interpreters and Deaf consumers perceive that an interpreter should have the ability to utilize Manually Coded English at the completion of interpreter training. It appears that utilization of Manually Coded English is valued as a perception of sign language skill and qualification by both hearing interpreters and Deaf consumers.

Survey Question 19 sought to measure whether an interpreter graduating from interpreter training program should be able to interpret with conceptual accuracy. Hearing interpreters reported a more positive attitude than Deaf consumers in this category. Differences in perception between Deaf and hearing respondents are minor and closely aligned with more similarity than dissimilarity in perceptions. Hearing interpreters and Deaf consumers perceive that interpreters graduating from an interpreter training program should be able to interpret with conceptual accuracy.

Survey Question 21 asked whether an interpreter graduating from an interpreter training program should feel comfortable using public speaking skills during sign-to-voice translations. Hearing interpreters reported a more positive attitude than Deaf consumers in this category. Differences in perceptions between Deaf and hearing respondents are minor and are considered closely aligned with more similarity than dissimilarity in perception. Hearing interpreters and Deaf consumers perceive that interpreters graduating from an interpreter training program should feel comfortable using public speaking skills during sign-to-voice translation. Hearing interpreters also reported a more positive attitude in their responses to Survey Question 23 and 32 respectively.

Survey Question 23 sought to measure if an interpreter graduating from an interpreter training program should accurately convey the spirit and intent of a Deaf consumer's conversation while utilizing sign-to-voice. There was less than 5% difference in the perceptions between Deaf and hearing respondents about specific sign language skills every interpreter should possess to be effective in this category.

Survey Question 32 sought to determine whether an interpreter should have a Bachelors degree in any subject. Hearing interpreters and Deaf consumers also perceive that interpreters should have a Bachelors degree in any subject. Hearing interpreters reported a more positive attitude than Deaf consumers in these categories. Differences in perceptions between Deaf and hearing respondents are minor and are closely aligned with more similarity than dissimilarity in perception. Clearly, hearing interpreters and Deaf consumers perceive that interpreters should accurately convey the spirit and intent of a Deaf consumers' conversation while sign-to-voicing and strive for educational attainment by completing a bachelors degree.

Survey Question 34 asked if an interpreter should participate in a one-year internship program in addition to training in an interpreter training program. Survey Question 35 sought to ascertain whether an interpreter should have access to a mentoring program designed to develop understanding of Deaf cultural values, and Survey Question 36 asked if an interpreter should be mentored by a culturally Deaf person. Deaf respondents reported a more positive attitude toward the perception that interpreters should participate in a 1-year internship program, in addition to training in an interpreter training program, where interpreters could have access to a mentoring program designed to develop Deaf cultural values, and that interpreters should be mentored by a culturally Deaf person. Differences in perception between Deaf and hearing respondents in this category are considered minor differences in perceptions with more similarity than dissimilarity. However, Deaf consumers report a more positive attitude towards 1-year internships for interpreters, mentoring programs designed to develop understanding of Deaf cultural values, and that interpreters should be mentored by a culturally Deaf person.

The following results include those for those survey questions in which the difference in perception between Deaf and hearing respondents ranged 6% to 20% on specific qualities, skills, and education that every interpreter should possess to be effective. While these data show more similarity than dissimilarity in perceptions between hearing interpreters and Deaf consumers, these figures also indicate that respondents' perceptions are transitioning to a slightly larger gap in perception as opposed to respondents holding no difference and/or minor differences in perception.

Survey Question 16 sought to measure whether an interpreter graduating from an interpreter training program should use Pidgin Signed English (PSE) if the Deaf

consumers requests that sign system. Deaf and hearing respondents report that interpreters should use Pidgin Signed English if requested and that it is a necessary sign language skill that should be demonstrated by interpreters upon completion of an interpreting training program. However, hearing interpreters reported a more positive attitude about interpreters possessing this skill than their Deaf counterparts.

Survey Question 18 sought to measure whether an interpreter graduating from an interpreter training program should be able to use slang. Hearing interpreters reported a more positive attitude about interpreters possessing this skill than reported by Deaf consumers. This finding demonstrates larger differences in respondent's perceptions related to an interpreter's ability to utilize slang if requested. A distinct difference in perceptions that an interpreter should know ASL slang at the completion of an interpreter training program may be attributed to the conscious realization by interpreters that they are moving from a native language (English) into a target language (ASL), and the emphasis and utilization of slang would be minimal in a formal language environment. Learning ASL slang would require that an interpreter or interpreter trainee participate consistently in Deaf community activities to become aware of the linguistic and emotional nuances inherent in ASL within these settings so as to gain exposure to a wide variety of diversified signing within informal settings. ASL slang is best modeled by the Deaf consumer's usage.

Survey Question 20 sought to measure whether an interpreter graduating from an interpreter training program should sign from spoken English with conceptual accuracy (CASE). Deaf and hearing respondents report that interpreters should be able to demonstrate conceptual accuracy when translating from spoken English to

sign. However, hearing interpreters reported a more positive attitude towards this skill.

Survey Question 24 sought to measure whether an interpreter should be certified by Registry Interpreters for the Deaf (RID) or the National Association for the Deaf (NAD). Deaf respondents highly valued formal certification more than hearing interpreters according to the data in this study.

Survey Question 27 explored the value respondents place on four-year interpreter training program as an indicator of interpreter qualification. Deaf consumers highly valued four-year programs more than hearing interpreters. Larger differences in Deaf consumers perceptions relative to educational competency may be attributed to the educational attainment of Deaf respondents represented in this study.

Survey Question 28 sought to measure respondents' opinions about whether interpreters should continue professional development activities to improve language and interpreting skills. Deaf and hearing respondents report that interpreters should continue to improve language and interpreting skills through educational venues that support improved performance of language and sign language skills. Hearing interpreters reported a more positive attitude toward the perception that an interpreter should attend sign language workshops to improve language and interpreting skills.

Survey questions in which the difference in perception between Deaf and hearing respondents ranged from 6% to 20% on specific qualities, skills, and education that every interpreter should possess to be effective indicates that respondents' perceptions are transitioning to a slightly larger gap in perception as opposed to respondents holding no difference in perception and/or minor differences reflecting more similarity than dissimilarity in the data.

Survey Question 33 measured whether an interpreter should have a Masters degree in any subject. Deaf consumers reported a more positive attitude than hearing interpreters in relation to whether an interpreter should have graduate degrees. Differences in these perceptions between Deaf consumers and hearing interpreters demonstrate larger differences in Deaf consumer attitudes relative to an interpreter's ability to demonstrate educational competency through completion of a Masters degree. Formal measures of educational competency appear to be more highly valued by Deaf consumers than hearing professional interpreters in this study.

The following findings are results for those survey questions in which the difference in perception between Deaf and hearing respondents was greater than 20%. These results demonstrate the largest and strongest difference in perceptions between Deaf consumers and hearing interpreters.

Survey Question 10 sought to assess whether an interpreter should agree with Deaf values. Deaf consumers reported a more positive attitude than hearing interpreters in relation to whether interpreters should agree with Deaf values. The difference in these perceptions between Deaf and hearing respondents demonstrate the largest and strongest difference in that interpreter qualification is predicated on agreeing with Deaf values. These differences in perceptions may reflect and underscore the importance Deaf consumers place on cultural identification and solidarity for the Deaf way which is explicated the literature review of this study. Thus the largest and strongest difference in this perception would most likely occur as a natural progression and/or extension of protecting the cultural values inherent within Deaf culture pertaining to language, education of the Deaf, and intercultural relationships. Agreement with Deaf values would be important to the members of the

Deaf community and acceptance of those values is a cultural expectation which seems to be consistent and substantiated by this difference in perception within the data.

Survey Question 26 sought to assess whether an interpreter should be considered qualified if they have graduated from a two-year interpreting training program. Deaf consumers reported a more positive attitude than hearing interpreters in relation to qualification predicated by graduation from a two-year interpreting training program. Differences in these perceptions between Deaf consumers and hearing interpreters demonstrate the largest and strongest differences in perceptions related to levels of education that predicate interpreter qualification. These differences may be attributed to the recognition that overall educational competency is valued significantly by the Deaf and is demonstrated here by this difference in perception indicated in this study.

Survey Question 29 sought to assess if an interpreter should have certification to be considered qualified. Deaf consumers reported a more positive attitude than hearing interpreters in relation to qualification predicated by certification. Differences in these perceptions demonstrate the largest and strongest differences in perception related to qualification by certification. Significant differences in perception may be attributed to the recognition that certification of an interpreter quantifies one's level of ability and requisite fitness to interpret by competent evaluators thus ensuring that the Deaf consumer is appropriately served in an interpreting assignment.

Survey Question 30 sought to assess whether an interpreter should have a Bachelors degree in Deaf Studies. Deaf consumers reported a more positive attitude than hearing interpreters on this item. Differences in these perceptions demonstrate the largest and strongest differences in perceptions related to qualification by

educational achievement. Deaf consumers appear to highly value educational competency. Deaf consumer's perceptions related to completing a degree in Deaf Studies may be stronger because of the linguistic, historical, and cultural emphasis under-girding a Deaf Studies curriculum as opposed to majors without these considerations.

Survey Question 31 sought to answer whether an interpreter should have a Masters degree in communication. Deaf consumers reported a more positive attitude than hearing interpreters in relation to qualification predicated by an interpreter possessing a Master's Degree in communication. Differences in these perceptions between Deaf consumers and hearing interpreters demonstrate the largest and strongest differences in perceptions related to qualification by educational achievement. Deaf consumers value educational competency demonstrated by completion of a Masters degree in communication over completion of a Masters degree in any subject. Deaf consumers perceptions related to completing a Masters degree in communication might be stronger because of the emphasis on interpersonal, intercultural, and applied communication theory under-girding a communication curriculum as opposed to majors without these considerations.

Survey Question 37 sought to answer whether an interpreter should not be required to participate in any formal training for interpreting because learning American Sign Language would be enough to interpret in any situation. While it appears that Deaf consumers reported a more positive attitude than hearing interpreters on this question, it is important to note that 73% of the Deaf consumers and 99% of hearing interpreters responded strongly disagree to this question. It is reasonable to conclude that formal training is significantly valued by both Deaf

consumers and hearing interpreters. Differences in these perceptions between Deaf and hearing respondents demonstrate the largest and strongest difference in perceptions related to levels of formal education that predicate educational competency through completion of formal training. There appears to be the recognition that, in general, formal training/educational competency is important as demonstrated by this difference in perception.

Male and female perception of interpreter qualification. Male and female respondents reported no difference in perception as it relates to maintaining confidentiality, providing interpreting that is easily understood, being comfortable when using non-manual markers, and demonstrating conceptual accuracy. See Table 4 for delineation of survey items in which there were differences in perception between male and female respondents.

Survey Question 12 measures the importance of maintaining confidentiality, Survey Question 14 measures whether an interpreter graduating from an interpreter training program should be clearly understood when signing, and Survey Question 22 sought to assess if an interpreter should feel comfortable using facial and body language while utilizing American Sign Language. Respondents, whether males or female, support the perception that interpreters should maintain confidentiality, be clearly understood when interpreting, and comfortable when using facial and body language when utilizing American Sign Language.

The following results include those survey questions in which there was less than 5% difference in the perceptions between female and male respondents about specific qualities, skills, and education that every interpreter should possess to be effective.

Table 4

Female and Male Differences in Agreement

Survey Item	Female	Male	Difference
Differences 1% to 5%			
1. Understand deaf culture	100	98	2
2. Flexibility	100	98	2
3. Teamwork	100	96	5
4. Work cooperatively with the Deaf	99	100	1
5. Patience	99	98	1
6. Respect for the Deaf	100	98	2
7. Accept criticism	99	96	3
8. Accept criticism from supervisor	99	96	3
9. Be on time	97	100	3
11. Adhere to Code of Ethics	99	100	1
15. Be comfortable interpreting	99	100	1
16. Able to use Pidgin-Signed English (PSE)	96	93	3
17. Able to use Manually Coded English (MCE)	87	91	4
18. Use of slang	79	75	4
20. Sign with conceptual accuracy (CASE)	62	66	4
21. Presentation skills	96	93	3
23. Convey intent of message	97	100	3
24. Certified RID or NAD	83	84	1
27. Four-year interpreter training program	62	66	4

(table continues)

Survey Item	Female	Male	Difference
Differences 1% to 5%			
35. Participate in Deaf mentoring	96	100	4
Differences 6% to 20%			
26. Two-year interpreter training program	36	56	19
28. Attend workshops	79	85	6
29. Have certification	73	80	7
33. Masters degree in any subject	33	51	18
34. One-year internship	81	88	7
36. Mentored by Deaf	79	85	6
37. No formal training	9	21	12
Differences greater than 20%			
10. Agree with Deaf values	78	93	22
30. Bachelors degree in Deaf Studies	32	55	23
31. Masters degree in Communication	24	51	27

Note. Degree of differences were cross tabulated using the *strongly agree* response choice on the survey. Numbers represent reported positive outcomes and absolute values.

Males reported more positive attitudes than females in the areas that are educationally and technically oriented. These areas include cooperative work relationships, being on time for interpreting assignments, adherence to a formalized code of ethics, the technical aspects of interpreting a conversation comfortably, the ability to use Manually Coded English, which would be a skill-based consideration, graduation

from a four-year interpreter training program, and participation in mentoring programs to develop cross-cultural understanding.

Survey Question 1 asked whether interpreters should show that they understand Deaf culture. Female respondents reported a more positive attitude and indicated that interpreters should be able to show that they understand Deaf culture. Differences in perceptions between males and females are minor in these categories and are more similar than dissimilar with only a slight gap in perception.

Survey Question 2 gauges the perception of an interpreter's ability to be flexible and willing to change according to the needs of the Deaf when interpreting. Female respondents indicated that flexibility and willingness to change to meet the needs of the Deaf consumer were qualities that interpreters should possess. Female respondents reported a more positive attitude than male respondents in this category. Differences in perception on this question are closely aligned with more similarity than dissimilarity with females indicating that interpreters should demonstrate flexibility and willingness to change according to the needs of the Deaf.

Survey Question 3 gauges whether females and males perceive that interpreters should be able to work cooperatively while team interpreting. Female respondents reported a more positive attitude than male respondents although perceptual differences between the two groups are minor and closely aligned. Differences in perception between females and males are more similar than dissimilar with females indicating an interpreter should have the ability to work cooperatively while team interpreting with only a slight gap in perception between respondents.

Survey Question 4 measures whether male and female respondents in this study perceive that interpreters should be able to work cooperatively with the Deaf

client. Male respondents reported a more positive attitude than female respondents in this category. These differences in perceptions are minor, but indicate that males perceive that interpreters should be able to work cooperatively with the Deaf client. The ability to work cooperatively with the Deaf client is a soft skill needed by interpreters who are working with Deaf clients cross culturally. There appears to be greater similarity than dissimilarity in perceptions with only a slight gap in perception between males and females.

Survey Question 5 seeks to measure whether interpreters should have the ability to show patience while interpreting for diverse Deaf clients. Female respondents reported a more positive attitude than male respondents. Differences in perception between females and males are minor and closely aligned with more similarity than dissimilarity within this category.

Survey Question 6 examines the perception that interpreters should be able to show respect when working with the Deaf consumer. While female respondents reported a more positive attitude than males in this category, perceptual differences are minor between both groups and these perceptions are closely aligned with more similarity than dissimilarity. These figures indicate that interpreters should demonstrate respect when working with Deaf consumers and that respect is a necessary soft skill for interpreters to possess.

Survey Question 7 measures whether interpreters should be able to accept constructive criticism from Deaf consumers. Female respondents reported a more positive attitude than male respondents. Differences in perception between female and male respondents are minor and are closely aligned with more similarity than dissimilarity within this category with female respondents demonstrating a slight gap

in the perception that interpreters should demonstrate the ability to accept constructive criticism.

Survey Question 8 asks whether an interpreter should be able to accept constructive criticism from supervisors and expands on the perception that interpreters should be able to accept constructive criticism from Deaf consumers. Female respondents reported a more positive attitude than male respondents in this category. Differences in perception between females and male respondents are minor and are considered closely aligned with more similarity than dissimilarity with female respondents indicating that an interpreter's should demonstrate the ability to accept constructive criticism from supervisors.

Survey Question 9 gauges whether male and female respondents believe that interpreters should be on time for all assignments. Male respondents reported a more positive attitude than female respondents in this category. Differences in perception between males and females are minor and are closely aligned with more similarity than dissimilarity with males reporting a slight gap in the perception that an interpreter should have the ability to be on time for interpreting assignments. Being on time is considered a professional conduct skill that is valued by males.

Survey Question 11 measures survey respondent's perceptions as it relates to interpreters adhering to a code of ethics. Male respondents reported a more positive attitude than female respondents in this category. Differences in perception between males and females are minor and are considered closely aligned with more similarity than dissimilarity with males presenting a slight gap in the perception from female respondents that interpreters should adhere to a code of ethics.

Survey Question 15 addresses whether an interpreter graduating from an interpreter training program should be able to interpret a conversation comfortably. Male respondents reported a more positive attitude than female respondents in this category. Differences in perception between male and female respondents are minor and considered closely aligned with more similarity than dissimilarity in that an interpreter should be able to interpret a conversation comfortably at the completion of interpreter training program. This suggests that there should be a level of comfort when communicating in ASL predicated by educational attainment.

Survey Question 16 sought to measure whether an interpreter graduating from an interpreter training program should be able to use Pidgin Signed English (PSE) if the Deaf consumer requests that sign system. Female respondents reported a more positive attitude than male respondents in this category. Differences in perception between females and male respondents are minor and closely aligned with more similarity than dissimilarity with respect to an interpreter's technical ability to use Pidgin Signed English if requested by the Deaf consumer. It appears that utilization of Pidgin Signed English upon completion of interpreter training is valued as a sign language skill and a perception of qualification by both males and females.

Survey Question 17 sought to measure whether an interpreter graduating from an interpreter training program should be able to use Manually Coded English (MCE) if the Deaf consumers requests that sign system. Male respondents reported a more positive attitude than female respondents in this category. Differences in perception between males and females are minor and are considered closely aligned with more similarity than dissimilarity in that an interpreter's should have the ability to utilize Manually Coded English (MCE). It appears that utilization of Manually Coded

English is valued as a sign language skill and perception of qualification by both males and females.

Survey Question 18 sought to measure whether an interpreter graduating from an interpreter training program should be able to use slang that is popular among Deaf consumers. Female respondents reported a more positive attitude than male respondents in this category. Differences in perception between females and male respondents are minor and considered closely aligned with more similarity than dissimilarity indicating that an interpreter's should demonstrate the ability to utilize slang if requested.

Survey Question 19 sought to measure whether an interpreter graduating from an interpreting program should be able to interpret from American Sign Language (ASL) with conceptual accuracy. Males and females believe that an interpreter should be able to interpret from American Sign Language (ASL) with conceptual accuracy at the completion of an interpreter training program.

Survey Question 20 sought to measure whether an interpreter graduating from an interpreting training program should sign from spoken English with conceptual accuracy. Male respondents reported a more positive attitude than female respondents in this category. Differences in perception between female and male respondents are minor and are closely aligned with more similarity than dissimilarity. Male respondents reported a slight gap in perceptions from female respondents in that an interpreter should demonstrate the ability to sign from spoken English and demonstrate conceptual accuracy while interpreting.

Survey Question 21 asked whether an interpreter graduating from an interpreting training program should feel comfortable using public speaking skills

during sign-to-voice translations. Female respondents reported a more positive attitude than male respondents in this category. Differences in perceptions between female and male respondents are minor and closely aligned with more similarity than dissimilarity with females demonstrating a slight gap in the perception that interpreters graduating from an interpreter training program should feel comfortable using public speaking skills during sign-to-voice translation.

Survey Question 23 sought to measure whether an interpreter graduating from an interpreting training program should accurately convey the spirit and intent of a Deaf consumer's conversation while sign-to-voicing. Male respondents reported a more positive attitude than female respondents in this category. Differences in perceptions between female and male respondents are minor and are closely aligned with more similarity than dissimilarity relative to the perception that interpreters graduating from an interpreter training program should accurately convey the spirit and intent of a Deaf consumers conversation when sign-to-voice interpreting.

Survey Question 24 sought to measure whether an interpreter graduating from an interpreting training program should pass RID or NAD certification standards. Male respondents reported a more positive attitude than female respondents in this category. Differences in perceptions between female and male respondents are minor and closely aligned with more similarity than dissimilarity in the perception that interpreters should be able to obtain RID or NAD certification at the completion of an interpreter training program.

Survey Question 27 sought to measure whether an interpreter should be considered qualified if they have graduated from a four-year interpreting training program. Male respondents reported a more positive attitude than female respondents

in this category. Differences in perception between males and females are minor and closely aligned with more similarity than dissimilarity with respect to qualification of an interpreter being predicated by graduation from a four-year interpreter training program.

Survey Question 35 sought to measure whether an interpreter should have access to a mentoring program designed to develop understanding of Deaf cultural values. Male respondents reported a more positive attitude than female respondents in this category. Differences in perception between males and females are minor and are closely aligned in the perception that interpreters should access mentoring programs to develop cross-cultural understanding of Deaf values.

The following findings are for those survey questions in which the differences in perception between female and male respondents are 6% to 20% for specific qualities, skills, and education that every interpreter should possess to be effective. The data indicates that respondents' perceptions are transitioning to a slightly larger gap in perception as opposed to respondents holding no difference in perception and/or minor differences reflecting more similarity than dissimilarity in perception.

Survey Question 26 sought to answer whether an interpreter should be considered qualified if they have graduated from a two-year interpreter training program. Males reported a more positive attitude than females in relation to qualification predicated by graduation from a two-year interpreter training program within this category. There is a difference in perception between males and females as it relates to levels of education that predicate interpreter qualification. An interpreter's ability to demonstrate educational competency through completion of a two-year interpreting training program is valued by male respondents. Perceptions relative to

educational attainment between male and female respondents are moving further apart.

Survey Question 28 sought to measure whether an interpreter should make every effort to attend sign language workshops to improve language and interpreting skills. Differences in perception between females and males within this category indicate a slightly larger difference in perception between respondents. Males appear to value attending sign language interpreting workshop to improve language and interpreting skills over their female counterparts.

Survey Question 29 sought to measure whether an interpreter should have certification to be considered qualified. Males and females within this category indicate a slightly larger difference in perception. These figures indicate a transition from a slight gap in perception to a slightly larger gap in perception between respondents relative to certification. Males appear to value certification as an indicator of qualification over their female counterparts.

Survey Question 33 sought to assess whether an interpreter should have a Master's degree in any subject. Males reported a more positive attitude than females in relation to interpreter qualification predicated by an interpreting possessing a Master's degree in any subject within this category. Males in general appear to value educational competency and perceive that interpreters should obtain a Master's degree in any subject. Overall, males appear to value education at the undergraduate and graduate level with a preference for Deaf Studies at the bachelors level and a Communications major for graduate students.

Survey Question 34 sought to measure whether an interpreter should participate in a one-year internship in addition to training in an interpreter training

program. Differences in perception between females and males within this category indicate transition to a slightly larger difference in perception between respondents with males valuing participation in a one-year internship to supplement interpreter training over their female counterparts.

Survey Question 36 measures whether an interpreter should be mentored by a culturally Deaf person. Males reported a more positive attitude towards the perception that an interpreter should be mentored by a culturally Deaf person with a slightly larger difference in perception from female responses. These figures indicate that perceptions are transitioning indicating that males appear to support interpreters interacting with a culturally Deaf mentor.

Survey Question 37 sought to answer whether an interpreter should not be required to participate in any formal training for interpreting because learning American Sign Language would be enough to interpret in any situation. Males reported a more positive attitude than females in relation whether an interpreter should be required to obtain formal training for interpreting within this category. The table reports the difference between Deaf consumers and hearing interpreters on their response of strongly agree to the statement. While it appears that male respondents reported a more positive attitude than female respondents on this question, it is important to note that 80% of the male respondents and 91% of female respondents responded strongly disagree to this question. It is reasonable to conclude that formal training for interpreters is significantly valued by both the male and female respondents that participated in this study.

The following data are for those survey questions in which the differences in perception between female and male respondents are greater than 20% on specific

qualities, skills, and education that every interpreter should possess to be effective. This data show a distinct difference in the perceptions and indicates that perceptions of the respondents are transitioning to a larger difference in perception.

Survey Question 10 sought to assess whether an interpreter should agree with Deaf values. Males reported a more positive attitude than females in relation to whether interpreters should agree with Deaf values within this category. This indicates that males perceive that an interpreter should agree with Deaf values. These differences in perceptions between males and females may reflect and underscore the importance and value males place on cultural identification and solidarity for Deaf Way which is explicated in the literature review of this study. The desire for interpreter agreement with Deaf values would most likely occur, for the Deaf, as a natural progression and/or extension of an interpreter protecting and respecting the values inherent of the Deaf within Deaf culture. These values pertain to language, education, and how intercultural relationships are managed between Deaf and hearing.

Survey Question 30 sought to assess whether an interpreter should have a bachelors degree in Deaf Studies. Males reported a more positive attitude than females in relation to qualification predicated by an interpreter possessing a bachelors degree in Deaf Studies within this category. Differences in these perceptions between males and females in this category reflect the largest and strongest difference in gender perceptions not only in agreement with Deaf values but also in interpreter qualification by educational achievement. Overall, males appear to value educational competency and report that interpreters should have a degree in Deaf Studies over a bachelor's degree in any subject.

Survey Question 31 sought to answer whether an interpreter should have a Master's degree in communication. Males also reported a more positive attitude than females in relation to interpreter qualification predicated by possession of a Master's degree in communication within this category. Differences in these perceptions between male and female respondents, relative to education, demonstrate the largest and strongest differences in perceptions related to qualification by educational achievement. Males value educational competency and perceive that interpreters should obtain a Master's degree in communication over a Master's degree in any subject. Male perceptions related to completing a Master's degree in Communication might be stronger because there is an emphasis on interpersonal, intercultural, and applied communication theory under girding a communications curriculum as opposed to majors without these considerations.

Native and non-native perceptions. The following findings are for those survey questions in which there is no difference in perception between native and non-native respondents for survey questions about specific qualities, skills, and education that every interpreter should possess to be effective. Native and non-native users of American Sign Language indicated no difference in perception as it relates to Survey Questions 2 and 4. See Table 5 for delineation of survey items for which there were differences in perception between native and non-native interpreter respondents. Survey Question 1 asked if interpreters should show that they understand Deaf culture. Non-native users of ASL indicated that interpreters should be able to show that they understand Deaf culture and reported a more positive attitude than native users of ASL within this category. Differences in perceptions of non-native and native users of ASL are minor in this category and considered closely aligned with

more similarity than dissimilarity in the perception that interpreters should be able to demonstrate that they understand Deaf culture. Native users of ASL comprise both hearing and Deaf constituents.

Survey Question 2 asked if interpreters should be flexible and willing to change according to the needs of the Deaf when interpreter while Survey Question 4 asked if interpreters should be able to work cooperatively with a Deaf client. Both native and non-native users of American Sign Language agreed that flexibility and working cooperatively with the Deaf consumer was a perceptual value commonly held.

Survey Question 11 asked if an interpreter should adhere to a code of ethics. Overall, native and non-native users of American Sign Language perceive that interpreters should adhere to a code of ethics.

Survey Question 12 measured the importance of maintaining confidentiality, Survey Question 14 measured whether an interpreter graduating from an interpreting training program should be clearly understood, and Survey Question 22 measured if an interpreter should feel comfortable using facial and body language (non-manual markers) while utilizing American Sign Language. Native and non-native users of ASL report that the quality of being able to keep information confidential, coupled with the technical skills needed to be clearly understood when interpreting, and the ability to utilize facial and body language are competencies that should be demonstrated by a qualified interpreter. The following reflects a less than 5% difference in perception between native and non-native respondents regarding specific qualities, skills, and education that every interpreter should possess to be effective.

Table 5

Native and Non-Native Signers Differences in Agreement

Survey Item	Native	Non-Native	Difference
Differences 1% to 5%			
1. Understand Deaf culture	97	100	3
3. Teamwork	97	100	3
5. Patience	100	99	1
6. Respect for Deaf	97	100	3
7. Accept criticism	97	98	1
9. Be on time	97	99	2
15. Be comfortable interpreting	100	99	1
18. Use of slang	76	78	2
19. Be conceptually accurate	100	99	1
21. Presentation skills	94	95	1
23. Convey intent of message	97	98	1
28. Attend workshops	94	99	5
29. Obtain certification	76	74	2
35. Participate in deaf mentoring	100	95	5
Differences 6% to 20%			
8. Accept supervisor criticism	94	100	6
10. Agree with Deaf values	93	76	18
16. Able to use Pidgin-Signed English (PSE)	88	99	11
17. Able to use Manually Coded English (MCE)	81	93	11

(table continues)

Survey Item	Native	Non-Native	Difference
Differences 6% to 20%			
20. Sign with conceptual accuracy	90	82	8
24. Certified RID/NAD	90	83	7
26. Two-year interpreter training program	52	35	17
33. Bachelors degree	47	34	13
36. Participate in Deaf mentoring	91	80	11
37. Attend workshops for formal training	23	4	20
Differences greater than 20%			
27. Four-year interpreter training program	85	54	31
29. Certification	59	27	32
30. Bachelors degree in Deaf studies	60	19	41

Note. Degree of differences were cross tabulated using the *strongly agree* response choice on the survey. Numbers represent reported positive outcomes and absolute values.

Survey Question 3 gauges whether interpreters should be able to work cooperatively while team interpreting. Non-native users of ASL reported a more positive attitude than native users of ASL although perceptual differences in this category are minor and closely aligned with more similarity than dissimilarity in the perception that an interpreter should demonstrate the ability to work cooperatively while team interpreting.

Survey Question 5 measured if interpreters should have the ability to show patience while interpreting for diverse Deaf clients. Native users of ASL reported a more positive attitude than non-native users of ASL within this category. Differences

in perception between native and non-native users of ASL are minor and closely aligned with more similarity than dissimilarity.

Survey Question 6 examines the perception that interpreters should be able to show respect towards the Deaf consumer. While non-native users of ASL reported a more positive attitude than native users of ASL within this category, perceptual differences are minor between both groups. These figures indicate that interpreters should demonstrate respect towards the Deaf consumer and that respect is a necessary soft skill for qualified interpreters to possess. Differences in perception between non-native and native users of ASL are minor and considered closely aligned with more similarity than dissimilarity in the perception that interpreters should demonstrate respect for diverse Deaf consumers.

Survey Question 7 measures whether interpreters should be able to accept constructive criticism from Deaf consumers. Non-native users of ASL reported a more positive attitude than native users of ASL within this category. Differences in perception between non-native and native users of ASL are minor and considered closely aligned with more similarity than dissimilarity in the perception that an interpreter should be able to accept constructive criticism. Survey Question 9 gauges if survey respondents believe that interpreters should be on time for all assignments. Non-native users of ASL reported a more positive attitude than native users of ASL. Differences in perception between non-native and native-users of ASL are minor in this category and considered closely aligned with more similarity than dissimilarity in the perception that an interpreter should be on time.

Survey Question 15 addresses if an interpreter graduating from an interpreter training program should be able to interpret a conversation comfortably. Native users

of ASL reported a more positive attitude than non-native users of ASL within this category. Differences in perception between native and non-native users of ASL are minor and are closely aligned with more similarity than dissimilarity in perception with native users of ASL reporting a slight gap in the perception that interpreters who have graduated from an interpreter training program should be able to interpret a conversation comfortably.

Survey Question 18 sought to measure whether an interpreter graduating from an interpreter training program should be able to use slang that is popular among Deaf consumers. Non-native users of ASL reported a more positive attitude than native users of ASL within this category. Differences in perception between non-native and native users of ASL are minor and considered closely aligned with more similarity than dissimilarity in the perception that an interpreter should demonstrate the ability to utilize slang if requested or needed.

Survey Question 19 sought to measure whether an interpreter graduating from an interpreting program should be able to interpret from American Sign Language with conceptual accuracy. Native users of ASL reported a more positive attitude than non-native users of ASL within this category. Differences in perceptions of native and non-native users of ASL are minor and considered closely aligned with more similarity than dissimilarity in the perception that an interpreter's should demonstrate the ability to be conceptually accurate while interpreting.

Survey Question 21 asked whether an interpreter graduating from an interpreting training program should feel comfortable using public speaking skills during sign-to-voice translations. Non-native users of ASL reported a more positive attitude than native users of ASL within this category. Differences in perceptions

between non-native and native users of ASL are minor and considered closely aligned with more similarity than dissimilarity in the perception that interpreters graduating from an interpreter training program should feel comfortable using public speaking skills during sign-to-voice translation.

Survey Question 23 sought to measure whether an interpreter graduating from an interpreter training program should accurately convey the spirit and intent of a Deaf consumer's conversation while sign-to-voicing. Non-native users of ASL reported a more positive attitude than native users of ASL within this category. Differences in perceptions between non-native and native users of ASL are minor and considered closely aligned with more similarity than dissimilarity in the perception that interpreters graduating from an interpreter training program should accurately convey the spirit and intent of a Deaf consumers conversation when sign-to-voice interpreting.

Survey Question 28 sought to measure whether an interpreter should make every effort to attend sign language workshops to improve language and interpreting skills. Non-native users of ASL reported a more positive attitude towards the perception that interpreters should attend sign language workshops to improve language and interpreting skills. Differences in perceptions between native and non-native users of ASL are minor in this category and closely aligned with more similarity than dissimilarity in perception. Interpreters should attend sign language workshops to improve sign and interpreting skills.

Survey Question 29 sought to access if an interpreter should have certification to be considered qualified. Native users of ASL reported a more positive attitude than non-native users of ASL in relation to interpreter qualification predicated by

certification within this category. Differences in perceptions between native and non-native users of ASL are minor and closely aligned with more similarity than dissimilarity in perception. Certification of interpreters is valued and a predictor of qualification.

Survey Question 35 sought to measure whether an interpreter should have access to a mentoring program designed to develop understanding of Deaf cultural values. Native users of ASL reported a more positive attitude than non-native users of ASL within this category. Differences in perceptions between native and non-native users of ASL are minor in this category and are closely aligned with more similarity than dissimilarity in the perception that interpreters should participate in mentoring programs designed to develop cross-cultural understanding.

The following findings are for those survey questions in which the differences in perception between native and non-native respondents are 6% to 20% on specific qualities, skills, and education that every interpreter should possess to be effective. These figures indicate that respondents' perceptions are transitioning to a slightly larger gap in perception as opposed to respondents holding no difference in perception and/or minor differences reflecting more similarity than dissimilarity in perception.

Survey Question 8 sought to measure whether an interpreter should accept constructive criticism from Deaf consumers. Non-native users of ASL reported a more positive attitude than native users of ASL in support of interpreters being able to accept constructive criticism. Differences in perception between non-native and native users of ASL within this category indicate a slightly larger difference in perception between the respondents. While there still tends to be more similarity than

dissimilarity in perceptions, these figures indicate that perceptions are transitioning from a slight gap in perception to a slightly larger gap in perceptions. Non-native users of ASL appear to value an interpreter's capacity to accept constructive criticism from Deaf consumers over native users of ASL.

Survey Question 10 sought to assess whether an interpreter should agree with Deaf values. Native users of ASL reported a more positive attitude than non-natives in relation to whether interpreters should agree with Deaf values within this category. A difference in these perceptions between native and non-native users of ASL demonstrates that agreement with Deaf values is important to native users of ASL within Deaf culture and substantiated in this study by the larger difference in perception by native users of ASL. Native users of ASL perceive that agreement with Deaf values pre-disposes an interpreter's qualification.

Survey Question 16 sought to measure whether an interpreter graduating from an interpreter training program should use Pidgin Signed English (PSE) if the Deaf consumer requests that sign system. Non-native users of ASL reported a more positive attitude than native users of ASL in the interpreter's ability to use Pidgin Signed English at the completion of a training program if requested by the Deaf consumer.

Survey Question 17 sought to measure whether an interpreter graduating from an interpreter training program should use Manually Coded English (MCE) if a Deaf consumer requested that sign system. Non-native users of ASL reported a more positive attitude than native users of ASL in relation to interpreter's capacity to utilize Manually Coded English (MCE) at the completion of a training program if requested by the Deaf consumer. Non-native users of ASL value an interpreter's capacity to

utilize Manually Coded English (MCE) if requested by Deaf consumers over native users of ASL.

Survey Question 20 sought to answer whether an interpreter graduating from an interpreter training program should be able to sign from spoken English with conceptually accuracy. Native users of ASL reported a more positive attitude than non-native users of ASL in relation to an interpreter's capacity to demonstrate conceptual accuracy from spoken English into sign. Differences in perception between non-native and native users of ASL within this category indicate a slightly larger difference in perception. While there still tends to be more similarity than dissimilarity in perceptions, these figures indicate that perceptions are transitioning from a slight gap in perception to a slightly larger gap in perception. Native users of ASL appear to value an interpreter's capacity to sign from spoken English with conceptual accuracy over non-native users of ASL.

Survey Question 24 sought to measure whether an interpreter graduating from an interpreter training program should pass evaluation standards from RID or NAD to obtain certification. Native users of ASL reported a more positive attitude towards the perception that an interpreter graduating from an interpreter training program should have the skills to obtain certification from RID or NAD. Differences in perception between native and non-native users of ASL in this category indicate a slightly larger difference in perception. While there still tends to be more similarity than dissimilarity in perception between native and non-native users of ASL, these figures indicate perceptions that native users of ASL value interpreters who are able to obtain certification upon completion of interpreter training.

Survey Question 26 sought to assess whether an interpreter should be considered qualified if they have graduated from a two-year interpreting training program. Native users of ASL reported a more positive attitude than non-native users in ASL in relation to qualification predicated by graduation from a two-year interpreter training program within this category. Differences in these perceptions demonstrate larger differences in native users of ASL attitude towards an interpreter's ability to demonstrate educational and skill-based competency through completion of a two-year interpreter training program. Perceptual differences in this category relative to educational competency may be attributed to the recognition by native users of ASL that educational competency and the development of technical skills are not only valued but necessary considering the current technological developments and emphasis on educational attainment.

Survey Question 34 sought to measure whether an interpreter should participate in a one-year internship in addition to training in an interpreter training program. Native users of ASL reported a more positive attitude than non-native users of ASL and indicate that an interpreter should also participate in a one-year internship in addition to interpreter training. Differences in perception between native and non-native users of ASL within this category indicate that while there still tends to be more similarity than dissimilarity in perceptions, these figures indicate that perceptions are transitioning from a slight gap in perception to a slightly larger gap in perception. Native users of ASL appear to value participation in a one-year internship to supplement interpreter training over non-native users of ASL.

Survey Question 33 sought to assess whether an interpreter should have a Master's degree in any subject. Native users of ASL reported a more positive attitude

than non-native users of ASL in relation to interpreter qualification predicated by educational achievement at the Masters level in any subject within this category. Differences in these perceptions demonstrate larger differences in respondent's attitude towards an interpreter's ability to demonstrate educational competency through completion of a Master's degree in any subject. These reported differences in native and non-native users of ASL perceptions of what is appropriate for a qualified interpreter to educational competency could be attributed to the educational achievement of native users of ASL represented in this study. Based on the data presented, educational competency is valued by native users of ASL

Survey Question 36 sought to assess whether an interpreter should be mentored by a culturally Deaf person. Native users of ASL reported a more positive attitude than non-native users of ASL in relation to whether an interpreter should be mentored by a culturally Deaf person within this category. Native users of ASL place a greater value in interpreters being mentored by a culturally Deaf person than non-natives in this category.

Survey Question 37 sought to answer whether an interpreter should not be required to participate in any formal training for interpreting because learning American Sign Language would be enough to interpret in any situation. While it appears that native users of ASL reported a more positive attitude than non-native users of ASL on this question, it is important to note that 77% of the native and 97% of non-natives responded strongly disagree to this question. It is reasonable to conclude that formal training is significantly valued by both native and non-native users of ASL in this study as a predictor of interpreter qualification. Learning and knowing sign language does not imply that an interpreter is qualified.

The following findings are for those survey questions in which the differences in perceptions between native and non-native users of ASL or greater than 20% Differences in perceptions between native and non-native users of ASL that were noted over 20% on specific qualities, skills, and education that every interpreter should possess to be effective.

Survey Question 27 sought to assess whether an interpreter should be considered qualified if they have graduated from a four-year interpreting training program. Native users of ASL reported a more positive attitude than non-native users of ASL in relation to qualification predicated by interpreters completing a four-year interpreting training program. This demonstrates the largest and strongest difference relative to interpreter qualification by educational achievement. Native users of ASL value educational competency and perceive that completion of a four-year ITP denotes interpreter qualification.

Survey Question 29 sought to measure whether an interpreter should have certification to be considered qualified. Native users of ASL reported a more positive attitude than non-native users of ASL. Native users of ASL value certification as a means of quantifying interpreter qualification. Reported findings indicate that perceptions held by native signers are the largest and strongest difference in perception held between native and non-native signers in this category.

Survey Question 30 sought to assess whether an interpreter should have a Bachelor's degree in Deaf Studies. Native users of ASL reported a more positive attitude than non-native users of ASL in relation to interpreter qualification predicated by an interpreter completing a Bachelor's degree in Deaf studies within this category. Native users of ASL value educational competency and attainment

evidenced by completion of a degree in Deaf studies over a Bachelor's degree in any subject.

Certified and non-certified perception of interpreter qualification. Survey Question 12 measures the importance of confidentiality; Survey Question 14 measures whether an interpreter graduating from an interpreter training program should be clearly understood; and, Survey Question 22 measures if an interpreter should feel comfortable using facial and body language while utilizing ASL at the completion of an interpreter training program. Certified and non-certified interpreters reported no difference in perception as it relates to interpersonal skills and sign-language skills an interpreter should demonstrate with respect to maintaining confidentiality, being understood when interpreting, and an interpreter's ability to be comfortable when using facial and body language (non-manual markers) when communicating in American Sign Language. See Table 6 for delineation of survey items for which there were differences in perception between certified and non-certified interpreters.

The following findings are for those survey questions in which the differences in perceptions between certified and non-certified respondents on specific qualities skills, and education that every interpreter should possess to be effective are less than 5%.

Survey Question 1 asked whether interpreters should show that they understand Deaf culture. Certified interpreters for the Deaf indicated that interpreters should be able to show that they understand Deaf culture. Differences in perception between certified and non-certified interpreters on this survey question are minor and

Table 6

Certified and Non-Certified Differences in Agreement

Survey Item	Certified	Non-Certified	Difference
Differences 1% to 5%			
1. Understand Deaf culture	100	98	2
2. Flexibility	100	98	2
3. Teamwork	100	97	3
4. Work cooperatively with the Deaf	100	98	2
6. Respect for the Deaf	100	98	2
7. Accept criticism from Deaf consumers	98	97	2
8. Accept criticism from supervisor	97	98	1
9. Be on time	97	98	1
10. Agree with Deaf values	78	83	5
11. Adhere to Code of Ethics	100	98	2
15. Be comfortable interpreting	100	98	2
16. Able to use PSE	95	97	2
17. Able to use Manually Coded English	89	88	1
19. Be conceptually accurate	98	97	1
20. Sign with conceptual accuracy	95	93	2
21. Presentation skills	95	93	2
23. Convey intent of message	95	100	5
24. Certified RID or NAD	83	81	2
28. Attend workshops	100	97	3

(table continues)

Survey Item	Certified	Non-Certified	Difference
Differences 1% to 5%			
35. Participate in Deaf mentoring	79	80	1
Differences 6% to 20%			
18. Able to use slang	83	72	11
26. Two-year interpreter training program	32	47	15
30. Bachelors degree in Deaf studies	26	46	20
31. Masters degree in Communication	22	38	16
33. Masters degree in any subject	45	30	15
34. One-year internship	86	80	6
37. No formal training	4	21	17
Differences greater than 20%			
27. Four-year interpreter training program	49	73	24
32. Bachelors degree in any subject	76	52	24

Note. Degree of differences were cross tabulated using the *strongly agree* response choice on the survey. Numbers represent reported positive outcomes and absolute values.

considered closely aligned with more similarity than dissimilarity in perception with certified interpreters demonstrating a slight gap in the perception that interpreters should show that they understand Deaf culture than their non-certified counterparts.

Survey Question 1 asked whether interpreters should show that they understand Deaf culture. Certified interpreters for the Deaf indicated that interpreters should be able to show that they understand Deaf culture. Differences in perception between certified and non-certified interpreters on this survey question are minor and considered closely aligned with more similarity than dissimilarity in the perception

that interpreters should show they understand Deaf culture than their non-certified counterparts.

Survey Question 2 gauges the perception about an interpreter's ability to be flexible and willing to change according to the needs of the Deaf when interpreting. Certified interpreters for the Deaf indicated that flexibility and willingness to change to meet the needs of the Deaf consumer were perceptions of qualities that interpreters should possess. Certified interpreters reported a more positive attitude than non-certified interpreters for the Deaf within this category. Differences in perceptions between certified and non-certified interpreters are minor and are closely aligned with more similarity than dissimilarity in the perception that interpreters should demonstrate flexibility and willingness to change according to the needs of the Deaf.

Survey Question 3 gauges whether certified and non-certified interpreters for the Deaf perceive that interpreters should be able to work cooperatively while team interpreting. Certified interpreters reported a more positive attitude than non-certified interpreters for the Deaf although perceptual differences between the two groups are minor, and closely aligned with more similarity than dissimilarity in the perception that an interpreter should demonstrate the ability to work cooperatively while team interpreting.

Survey Question 4 measures if certified and non-certified interpreters for the Deaf in this study perceive that interpreters should be able to work cooperatively with the Deaf consumer. Certified interpreters reported a more positive attitude than non-certified interpreters for the Deaf within this category. These differences in perceptions are minor, with more similarity than dissimilarity in the perception that interpreters should be able to work cooperatively with the Deaf consumer.

Survey Question 6 examines the perception that interpreters should be able to show respect towards the Deaf consumer. While certified interpreters for the Deaf reported a more positive attitude than non-certified interpreters for the Deaf, differences in perception between respondents are minor and considered closely aligned with more similarity than dissimilarity between both groups. These figures indicate that respect is a necessary soft skill for interpreters to possess.

Survey Question 7 measures whether interpreters should be able to accept constructive criticism from Deaf consumers. Certified interpreters for the Deaf reported a more positive attitude than non-certified interpreters. Differences in these perceptions are minor and considered closely aligned with more similarity than dissimilarity in the perception that an interpreter should demonstrate the ability to accept constructive criticism.

Survey Question 8 asks whether an interpreter should be able to accept constructive criticism from supervisors and expands on the perception that interpreters should be able to accept constructive criticism from Deaf consumers. Non-certified interpreters reported a more positive attitude than certified interpreters for the Deaf. Responses to this survey question demonstrate that differences in perception between non-certified and certified interpreters are minor and considered closely aligned with more similarity than dissimilarity in the perception that interpreters should be able to accept constructive criticism from supervisors.

Survey Question 9 gauges whether survey respondents believe that interpreters should be on time for all assignments. Non-certified interpreters for the Deaf reported a more positive attitude than certified interpreters for the Deaf within this category. These perceptions are closely aligned with more similarity than

dissimilarity. Being on time is considered a professional conduct behavior that is valued as an interpersonal skill that non-certified and certified interpreters believe qualified interpreters should demonstrate.

Survey Question 10 sought to assess whether an interpreter should agree with Deaf values. Non-certified interpreters reported a more positive attitude than certified interpreters in relation to whether interpreters should agree with Deaf values. Differences in perception relative to interpreter's agreeing with Deaf values between non-certified and certified interpreters for the Deaf are minor and considered closely aligned with more similarity than dissimilarity in perception. Non-certified interpreters responses indicate a slight gap in the perception that an interpreter should demonstrate agreement with Deaf values from their certified counterparts.

Survey Question 11 measures survey respondent's perceptions as it relates to interpreters adhering to a code of ethics. Certified interpreters reported a more positive attitude than non-certified interpreters within this category. Differences in perception between certified and non- certified interpreters are minor and closely aligned in the perception that interpreters should adhere to a code of ethics.

Survey Question 15 addresses whether an interpreter graduating from an interpreter training program should be able to interpret a conversation comfortably. Certified interpreters reported a more positive attitude than non-certified interpreters for the Deaf within this category. Differences in perception between certified and non-certified interpreters are minor and closely aligned with more similarity than dissimilarity in the perception that interpreters should demonstrate the ability to interpret a conversation comfortably than their non-certified counterparts.

Survey Question 16 sought to measure whether an interpreter graduating from an interpreter training program should be able to use Pidgin Signed English (PSE) if the Deaf consumer requests that sign system. Non-certified interpreters reported a more positive attitude than certified interpreters for the Deaf within this category. Differences in perception between certified and non-certified interpreters are minor and closely aligned with more similarity than dissimilarity in the perception that an interpreter should demonstrate the technical ability to use Pidgin Signed English if requested by the Deaf consumer.

Survey Question 17 sought to measure whether an interpreter graduating from an interpreter training program should be able to use Manually Coded English (MCE) if the Deaf consumers requests that sign system. Certified interpreters for the Deaf reported a more positive attitude than non-certified interpreters for the Deaf within this category. Differences in perception between certified and non-certified interpreters are minor and closely aligned with more similarity than dissimilarity in the perception that an interpreter should demonstrate the ability to utilize Manually Coded English (MCE). It appears that utilization of Manually Coded English is valued as a perception of qualification by both certified and non-certified interpreters for the Deaf.

Survey Question 19 sought to measure whether an interpreter graduating from interpreter training program should be able to interpret with conceptual accuracy. Certified interpreters reported a more positive attitude than non-certified interpreters for the Deaf within this category. Differences in perception between certified and non-certified interpreters are minor and closely aligned with more similarity than

dissimilarity in the perception that interpreters graduating from an interpreter training program should be able to interpret with conceptual accuracy.

Survey Question 20 sought to measure whether an interpreter graduating from an interpreter training program should be able to sign from spoken English with conceptual accuracy. Certified interpreters reported a more positive attitude than non-certified interpreters for the Deaf within this category. Differences in perception between certified and non-certified interpreters for the Deaf are minor and closely aligned with more similarity than dissimilarity in perception that an interpreter should be able to sign from spoken English and demonstrate conceptual accuracy while interpreting.

Survey Question 21 asked whether an interpreter graduating from an interpreter training program should feel comfortable using public speaking skills during sign-to-voice translations. Certified interpreters reported a more positive attitude than non-certified interpreters for the Deaf within this category. Differences in perceptions between certified and non-certified interpreters are minor in this category and closely aligned with more similarity than dissimilarity in the perception that interpreters graduating from an interpreter training program should feel comfortable using public speaking skills during sign-to-voice translation.

Survey Question 23 sought to measure whether an interpreter graduating from an interpreter training program should accurately convey the spirit and intent of a Deaf consumer's conversation while sign-to-voicing. Non-certified interpreters for the Deaf reported a more positive attitude than certified interpreters for the Deaf within this category. Differences in perceptions between certified and non-certified interpreters are minor and closely aligned with more similarity than dissimilarity in

the perception that interpreters graduating from an interpreter training program should accurately convey the spirit and intent of a Deaf consumers conversation when sign-to-voice interpreting.

Survey Question 24 sought to measure whether an interpreter graduating from an interpreter training program should pass RID or NAD evaluations for certification. Certified interpreters for the Deaf reported a more positive attitude than non-certified interpreters for the Deaf within this category. Differences in perceptions between certified and non-certified interpreters are minor and closely aligned with more similarity than dissimilarity in perception the perception that interpreters should be able to obtain RID or NAD certification upon completion of interpreter training.

Survey Question 28 sought to measure whether interpreters should attend workshops to improve sign and interpreting skills. Certified interpreters reported a more positive attitude than non-certified interpreters for the Deaf within this category. Differences in perceptions for this survey question are minor and closely aligned with more similarity than dissimilarity in the perception that interpreters should develop sign and interpreting skills through participation in workshops and continuing education.

Survey Question 35 sought to measure whether an interpreter should have access to a mentoring program designed to develop understanding of Deaf cultural values. Non-certified interpreters of the Deaf reported a more positive attitude than certified interpreters of the Deaf. Differences in perceptions are minor and closely aligned with more similarity than dissimilarity in the perception that interpreters should participate in mentoring programs designed to develop cross-cultural understanding within this category.

The following findings are for those survey question in which the difference in perceptions between certified and non-certified interpreters on specific qualities, skills, and education an interpreter should possess to be effective are 6% to 20%.

Survey Question 18 sought to measure whether an interpreter graduating from an interpreter training program should use slang that is popular among Deaf consumers. Certified interpreters reported a more positive attitude than non-certified interpreters for this survey question. Differences in perception within this category indicate a slightly larger difference in perception. Certified interpreters appear to value the ability to utilize slang that is popular among the Deaf.

Survey Question 26 sought to assess whether an interpreter should be considered qualified if they have graduated from a two-year interpreting training program. Non-certified interpreters reported a more positive attitude than certified interpreters of the Deaf. Differences in these perceptions demonstrate larger differences in non-certified interpreters' attitude towards an interpreter's ability to demonstrate educational competency through completion of a two-year interpreting training program. Larger differences in non-certified interpreters perceptions relative to educational competency may be attributed to the recognition that educational competency at the two-year interpreting training program level is a predictor of interpreter qualification as reported by the larger gap in perceptions between non-certified and certified interpreters.

Survey Question 30 sought to answer whether an interpreter should have a Bachelors degree in Deaf studies. Non-certified interpreters reported a more positive attitude than certified interpreters of the Deaf in relation to qualification predicated by graduation with a Bachelor's degree in Deaf Studies as indicated by their responses.

Non-certified interpreters perceive that educational competency at the Bachelor's level with a degree in Deaf Studies is valued over a Bachelor's degree in any subject.

Survey Question 31 sought to answer whether an interpreter should have a Master's degree in communication. Non-certified interpreters reported a more positive attitude than certified interpreters in relation to qualification predicated by an interpreting possessing a Master's degree in communication within this category. Differences in these perceptions demonstrate larger differences between the attitudes of certified and non-certified interpreters in the completion of a Masters degree in communication. It appears that non-certified interpreters value educational attainment as a predictor of qualification through the completion of a Masters degree in communication over completion of a Masters degree in any subject. Non-certified interpreters may favor completion of a masters degree in communication because of the emphasis placed on interpersonal, intercultural, and applied communication theory under-girding a communication curriculum as opposed to majors without these considerations.

Survey Question 33 sought to measure whether an interpreter should have a Master's degree in any subject. Certified interpreters reported a more positive attitude than non-certified interpreters of the Deaf in relation to whether qualified interpreters should have a graduate degree. Certified interpreters reported a more positive attitude than hearing interpreters within this category. Larger differences in perceptions relative to graduate competency may be attributed to the belief that educational competency i.e., knowledge-based and technical competencies rapidly evolve and flourish, therefore, interpreters must continue to improve interpreting and educational competencies to keep pace with the educational achievements of the Deaf

community. Certified interpreters appear to value a more generalized formal education rather than a specific formal education relative to one area, i.e. obtaining a graduate degree in Communications which non-certified interpreters appear to value based upon its interpersonal, intercultural and applied communication theory. It is important to note that certified interpreters registered a larger difference from the non-certified interpreters in their perception regarding educational attainment.

Survey Question 34 sought to measure whether an interpreter should participate in a one-year internship in addition to training in an interpreter training program. Certified interpreters reported a more positive attitude than non-certified interpreters with a larger difference in perception between respondents. Certified interpreters value participation in a one-year internship to supplement interpreter training over non-certified interpreters.

Survey Question 36 sought to measure whether an interpreter should be mentored by a culturally Deaf person. Non-certified interpreters reported a more positive attitude than certified interpreters of the Deaf within this category. Differences in perceptions of non-certified and certified interpreters of the Deaf demonstrate larger differences in perception with non-certified interpreters reporting that interpreters should be mentored by a culturally Deaf person.

Survey Question 37 sought to answer whether an interpreter should not be required to participate in any formal training for interpreting because knowing American Sign Language would be enough to interpret in any situation. The table reports the difference between certified and non-certified interpreters on their response of strongly agree to the statement. While it appears that certified interpreters reported a more positive attitude than non-certified interpreters on this question, it is

important to note that 97% of the certified interpreters and 79% of non-certified interpreters responded strongly disagree to this question. It is reasonable to conclude that formal training for interpreters is significantly valued by both certified and non-certified interpreters alike.

The following findings are for those survey questions in which the difference in perceptions between certified and non-certified interpreters on specific qualities, skills, and education an interpreter should possess to be effective are greater than 20%.

Survey Question 27 sought to assess whether an interpreter should be considered qualified if they have graduated from a four-year interpreter training program. Non-certified interpreters reported a more positive attitude than certified interpreters in relation to qualification predicated by interpreters completing a four-year interpreter training program. Non-certified interpreters appear to value the educational competency of interpreters completing a four-year degree.

Survey Question 32 sought to answer if an interpreter should have a Bachelor's degree in any subject. Certified interpreters reported a more positive attitude than non-certified interpreters in relation to qualification predicated by an interpreter possessing a Bachelor's degree in any subject within this category. Certified interpreters noted differences in perceptions relative to formal education demonstrate that completing a Bachelor's degree without a Deaf Studies concentration appears to be sufficient to indicate educational competency.

Qualitative Analysis of Interpreter Skills

Open-ended questions within the survey were designed to obtain respondent perceptions related to interpersonal and sign language skills that interpreters should

possess at completion of an interpreter training program. The questions also gauged the subjective perceptions of respondents relative to educational requirements for perceptions of interpreter qualification based upon cultural affiliation, familial relationships, acceptance by the Deaf community, qualities interpreters should have, and Deaf consumers and recommendations to improve interpreter training programs. Content analysis was used to identify emergent themes in the data.

Research Question 1 asks what are the similarities and dissimilarities in the perceptions of what characterizes a qualified interpreter as defined by professional interpreters and the Deaf consumers. Research Question 2 asks are there differences of what characterizes a qualified interpreter as defined by professional interpreters and the Deaf consumer in relation to interpersonal skills, sign-language skills, and educational requirements. Research Question 2 also asks does the demographic characteristics of Deaf/hearing, male/female, ASL native/non-native signers, and certified/non-certified interpreters affect perceptions of what characterizes a qualified interpreter as defined by respondents in relation to (a) interpersonal skills; (b) sign-language skills; and, (c) educational requirements? This question was subdivided into Questions 2a, 2b, and 2c; each dealing with Survey Questions 13, 25, and 38 respectively. This analysis considers the implications of both Research Questions 1 and 2 relating to the qualitative data gathered from responses to the Questionnaire of Characteristics of Qualified Interpreters since they are closely aligned in intent.

Interpersonal skills of a qualified interpreter. Survey Question 13: Are there any other interpersonal skills you believe that an interpreter should have? Examples of qualitative themes presented in the data by Deaf consumers and hearing interpreters related to interpersonal skills is found in Table 7. These themes indicate

patterns of similarity and dissimilarity in perception between respondents. The emerging themes in this study were determined by the process outlined in Chapter 3 of this study. The emerging themes extrapolated from the data shows that Deaf and hearing respondents agreed that flexibility, understanding, demonstrating the ability to get along with diverse cultures, respect, cooperation, empathy, and the ability to accept constructive criticism are necessary interpersonal skills or qualities that interpreters should demonstrate. These qualitative themes or subjective perceptions are supported by quantitative data that suggests that there is no difference in perception or a difference in perception of less than 5% in these areas of interpersonal skills. These perceptions of interpersonal skills, soft skills, or qualities appeared to be either aligned or closely aligned which indicated agreement between Deaf and hearing interpreters thus providing validity of perceptions as predictor of qualification.

Other patterns and themes that emerged as responses to this survey question appeared to be related to what one might call perceptions of professional conduct skills that interpreter's need. Respondents agreed that interpreters should demonstrate professional behavior by (a) presenting oneself well; (b) acting with diplomacy, and (c) showing ethical standards. Hearing interpreters also communicated that interpreter's needed to be responsible, demonstrate integrity coupled with personal accountability, and possess good boundaries. In addition, while Deaf consumers believed that interpreters needed to maintain good boundaries, their emphasis was on the need for interpreters to be on time for assignments and prepared for interpreting assignments. Interpersonal skill patterns emerging from hearing responses appeared to be connected to one's self awareness, social awareness, and the ability to have an

open mind. These interpersonal skills could be categorized as presenting oneself well through possession of good boundaries, displaying appropriate manners, empathy, and respecting others viewpoint. These interpersonal skills would be useful while working within cross-cultural settings. An interpreter must be aware of, not only his/her motivations and who they are as a person, but the intrinsic cultural mores presented by Deaf and hearing as they move through an interpreting assignment with an open mind. Deaf consumers also believe that an interpreter should have advocacy skills. The ability to advocate implies the capability to speak favorably of and provide support. This cannot be accomplished without sensitivity to Deaf cultural issues and the interpreter's ability to be diplomatic when presenting bicultural issues or functioning in a bicultural setting.

Hearing respondents also did not specifically mention having advocacy skills, however; evolving themes within the hearing responses appeared to indicate that there was the need for diplomacy. These perceptions imply that there might be times when cross-cultural differences must be mediated with sensitivity for Deaf and hearing concerns during an interpreting assignment. Hearing respondents believe that an interpreter should be organized. While hearing interpreters intimated that an interpreter should have the ability to get along with diverse people, they did not mention socialization, on responses to this question, with the Deaf as a way to achieve cross-cultural skills and/or experience with diverse signing styles and individuals. The need for socialization may or may not be implied by the suggestion that one needs to get along with diverse people. One could extrapolate that experience with diverse individuals and diverse signing styles can only be achieved by socialization within the Deaf community. The Deaf clearly view and have articulated

that socialization within the Deaf community is the means to increase an interpreter's ability to get along with diverse people through cultural exploration and exposure to diverse signing styles.

Deaf consumers and hearing interpreters also agree and support that interpreter's should be able to accept constructive criticism and demonstrate a collaborative relationship when working in a team-interpreting situation or with hearing clients. Hearing interpreters indicated that interpreters needed the ability to create trust. The ability to create trust is an intangible soft skill that may evolve from an esoteric self-awareness coupled with good boundaries and the ability to demonstrate trust-worthiness in social settings that brings a comfortable ambiance cross culturally. Overall, perceptions of interpreter qualification between Deaf consumers and hearing interpreters as it relates to perceptions of interpersonal skills are more similar than dissimilar. However, reported differences of perceptions within patterns naturally occurring in the data provide insight into perceptions by Deaf and hearing individuals as it relates to interpersonal skills. See Table 7 for comparison of emerging themes between the Deaf consumers and hearing interpreters. Representative comments by Deaf and hearing respondents include:

> Interpreters need a strong, deep understanding of diverse personalities, relationships, and institutional and professional (other than interpreting) perspectives and dynamics. It is important that interpreters be. Ready to withhold judgment and advocate only when it is clear that someone will suffer needlessly otherwise. (Deaf Survey Respondent 95, 2005);

> Use extremely good judgment about when to offer or provide information about the Deaf. Classroom interpreting: Do not engage or allow yourself be engaged in discourse with students when interpreting for a Deaf instructor. Stop shying away from and making excuses to not interact with the Deaf in informal situations thus robbing yourself of skills. Learn to accept constructive criticism without taking it personally

Table 7

Interpersonal Skills Emerging Themes

Deaf	Hearing
Flexibility	Flexibility
Understand diverse signing styles	Understand diverse signing styles
Respect	Respect
Cooperation	Cooperation
Empathy	Empathy
Ethical	Ethical
Good boundaries	Self-awareness
Socialization with the Deaf	Responsible
Advocacy skills	Open mind and ability to create trust

or become so defensive. Especially when given in a benevolent manner. Find ways to attend training opportunities instead of making excuses for not doing so. Get over fear of certification tests. (Deaf Respondent 100, 2005);

A friendly professional demeanor is a good skill. Nothing makes me more concerned than a stiff professional without good interpersonal conversational skills. (Deaf Survey Respondent 104, 2005);

Show a vested interest and participate in ongoing professional development. Have a positive attitude about learning various techniques and vocabulary and adjusting to various interpreting situations. Friendliness, balance between professionalism/ethical boundaries and being an approachable/likeable person. (Deaf Survey Respondent 103, 2005);

An interpreter should have participate with Deaf group, Deaf family, and Deaf events. Because the Deaf community that interpreter can learn the vary [sic various/variety] of people's level from low level to high

> function. Some Deaf people have difficult communicate with other high Deaf people. Interpreters should be [sic aware] of their difficulties. (Deaf Respondent 112, 2005);
>
> Diplomacy; tact. (Hearing Respondent 11, 2004);
>
> I think it is essential that the interpreter have strong social skills in general (both in the Deaf community and the Hearing community). They should have some proficiency with diplomacy. They should understand the interactive parameters of both cultures so that they can make the least number of violations of those parameters (i.e., turn taking duration of response, how to interrupt, appropriate use of silence, et cetera). (Hearing Respondent 21, 2004);
>
> Interpreters need to have some people skills (such as appropriate interaction, professional courtesy, and even empathy. (Hearing Respondent 45, 2004);
>
> Adept in cross and intercultural communication. Non-ethnocentric respect for other cultures. Diplomacy. Possess a cultural, rather than a disability paradigm (agree with Deaf values). Common sense. (Hearing Respondent 50, 2004).

Sign language skills of a qualified interpreter. Survey Question 25: Are there any other sign-language skills you believe that an interpreter graduating from an interpreter training program should have? Deaf and hearing interpreter responses to Survey Question 25 consists of themes that outline perceptions relating to sign language skills that an interpreter should possess.

Differences in perception are less apparent between Deaf and hearing respondents within their responses to this question. Emergent themes (see Table 8) defined as linguistic and language processing competency, adjustment of communication modalities, which would predicate the ability to match the signers register and utilize diverse signing styles upon request, the development of language skills through cultural interaction and practical application, learning signs for specialized settings, and the utilization of Deaf mentors, participating in internships and practicums were all points of agreement between Deaf and hearing respondents.

Table 8

Sign Language Skills Emerging Themes

Deaf	Hearing
Basic linguistic competency	Basic linguistic competency
Proficiency in signs for specialized settings	Proficiency in signs for specialized settings
Language processing competency	Language processing competency
Develop language skills through cultural interaction	Develop language skills through cultural interaction
Ability to adjust communication modalities	Ability to adjust communication modalities
Bicultural knowledge-access to diverse signing styles	Ability to sign accurately based on education and ability
Ability to sign and voice accurately	Literacy skills-develop English skills
Utilize mentors and internships	Practicum/internship between formal training
Develop language skills through cultural interaction	Develop language skills through cultural interaction
ASL linguistic competency	ASL idiomatic competency
Use of facial and body expression	Basic lip-reading

Once again, themes relative to socialization and understanding diverse signing styles continue to appear within the data. This would underscore the importance of

these themes, since they continue to be mentioned by either Deaf or hearing respondents.

The utilization of Deaf mentors, participation in internships and practicums would not only under-gird the development and practical application of sign-language skills, but continue to reinforce bicultural knowledge and experience. This knowledge and experience would be gained through mutually exclusive Deaf-hearing partnerships within mentoring and internship relationships thus perpetuating sign proficiency, and cross-cultural experience. Consistent cross-cultural interaction provides a bridge between formal training and professional employment as an interpreter.

Slight differences in perception between the Deaf consumer and hearing interpreter could be triangulated into what would be called basic linguistic competency. Deaf perceptions in relation to having the ability to sign-to-voice accurately, demonstrating linguistic competency in ASL, idiomatic competency, the use of non-manual behaviors inclusive of facial expression and body language would fit within a linguistic competency category. Hearing interpreters also indicate the need for general literacy skills, basic lip-reading skills, and idiomatic competency.

Overall, there appears to be congruence between the perceptions of Deaf and hearing respondents as to the sign language skills an interpreter should possess. Deaf and hearing state:

> Language fluency! It is my opinion that most do not have language fluency, both in English or ASL. (Deaf Survey Respondent 78, 2004),

> I want some interpreter to understand about sign language more and clear more and correct ASL and communicate with them each other. (Deaf Survey Respondent 82, 2005);

> Many of these are not evident upon graduation ☹. Must have the ability to PROCESS one language or another, understand mistakes are allowed and to not feel they can get away with it if they don't correct themselves. (Deaf Survey Respondent 86, 2004);
>
> Interpreters should also be experts in transliteration. I am a native ASL user coming from a DEAF family-but I trust my own word choices more than the interpreter (no offense to anyone!). Often times I've had an interpreter fail in that area simply because s/he fails to follow my word choices; think that because I am a native ASL user, that I have poor English skills. (Deaf Survey Respondent 91, 2004);
>
> Good non-manual skills when interpreting in true ASL. (Deaf Survey Respondent 104, 2005);
>
> They should have the ability to match (assess) the Deaf person's sign skill when interpreting, whether signs are highly skilled or of a lower level, so that the Deaf person can understand. (Deaf Survey Respondent 129, 2005);
>
> I strongly believe a person should be extremely proficient in both languages before they begin to think about interpreting. Upon graduation, there should be no question that this is someone who is comfortable in both languages. (Hearing Survey Respondent 11, 2004);
>
> A strong grasp of the English language and vocabulary for the ability to match register of assignments. (Hearing Survey Respondent 25, 2004);
>
> Need interaction with Deaf individuals to counteract the less-than natural signing styles often picked up in the classroom when trying to force grammatical and structural aspects of ASL. Language is acquired more naturally when it is assimilated rather than directly taught. (Hearing Survey Respondent 50, 2004);
>
> Good English structure/knowledge. (Hearing Survey Respondent 63, 2004); and must be able to process information rapidly, almost instantaneously. (Hearing Survey Respondent 74, 2004).

These comments highlight some of the perceptions held by both Deaf and hearing respondents, and are presented to under gird the emergent themes discussed in this analysis of sign language skills needed by interpreters as perceived by Deaf and hearing respondents.

Educational requirements of a qualified interpreter. Survey Question 38: Are there any other education requirements that you feel are necessary to become a qualified interpreter? Deaf and hearing perceptions regarding educational requirements that are necessary to become a qualified interpreter reflected more similarity than dissimilarity in agreement. Deaf and hearing respondents agreed that socialization with the Deaf, competency in English, ASL fluency, training for interpreting in specialized settings and continuing education through workshops were essential educational requirements for interpreters as delineated in Table 9.

Moreover, having Deaf mentors was a consistent theme among Deaf and hearing responses. Triangulation of agreement between Deaf and hearing respondents would be inclusive of themes relative to linguistic competency. In other words, to demonstrate linguistic competency there would be the expectation that competency would be in both ASL and English, that grammar and vocabulary skills would develop naturally through educational achievement, and mentoring by the Deaf, continuing education, and possible Deaf culture immersion programs. This process would be evolving in order to move towards language competency and eventual fluency. Within these paradigms the ability to adjust to communication modalities and proficiency in specialized vocabulary could evolve.

Education was perceived as a necessary requirement for interpreters by Deaf and hearing respondents alike although the Deaf qualified type of degree needed as being a four-year or six-year degree as opposed to hearing respondents' perception that a degree in any subject would be expedient. This pattern is also noted in the quantitative data, which clearly indicates there is a perception that educational competency is valued by Deaf consumers and hearing interpreters and moves across a

Table 9

Educational Attainment Emerging Themes

Deaf	Hearing
Socialization with the Deaf develop skills and techniques	Socialization with the Deaf to develop skills and techniques
Four-year or six-year degree	Education
Proficient in specialized vocabulary	Proficient in specialized vocabulary
Training in specialized settings	Training in specialized settings
ASL fluency	ASL fluency
Continuing education	Continuing education
Deaf mentors	Deaf mentors
Linguistic competency (English)	English competency
Accurate sign and voicing skills	Internships
Understand interpreting process	Obtain certification
ASL immersion/exchange program	Workshops

two-year to six-year formal education continuum as a predictor of interpreter qualification.

Perceptions of Deaf and hearing respondents as it relates to educational attainment present findings that support education. The findings also support continuing education through workshops, mentoring, training in specialized areas, and linguistic competency. These areas perpetuate ASL and English fluency, as well as socialization with the Deaf to develop and enhance language skill competency.

While education and training are seen as necessary in becoming a qualified interpreter, socialization with the Deaf seems to be a driving force that moves throughout the data with continuity. This driving force lends itself to serious evaluation since it seems to quantify that language acquisition and development comes through cultural contact and mentoring even though training and education have importance in the process. Deaf consumers commented:

> On the job training is SO important. But I also think that mentorship has a huge role in it too. The Deaf mentor shouldn't be just a "culturally Deaf person"-but also have knowledge of ASL, interpreting, AND bilingualism; Period! (Deaf Survey Respondent 91, 2004),
>
> I think that there should be more Bachelor and Master programs available to interpreters. Just as we have program for those who wish to go into business or education, the same should apply with interpreters. Too often I've had interpreters who have graduated from our ITP program here in Minnesota and are incompetent for signing in any field. (Deaf Survey Respondent 92, 2005),
>
> Knowledge of linguistics of both ASL and English including discourse analysis. (Deaf Survey Respondent 104, 2005),
>
> Try change student program. Living with a Deaf family for one semester-emerge in Deaf culture/language as part of requirement-this would help enhance signing skills/receptive & culture as well. Just an idea☺. (Deaf Survey Respondent 126, 2005),
>
> Not rest on your laurels once you get certified or degree. Rather continue to seek opportunities to further develop knowledge and skills. (Deaf Survey Respondent 100, 2005).

Hearing interpreters commented:

> I think that a degree should be required. If we want to be viewed as a professional, we need to behave as a professional. Its takes away from our credibility when we have to say we have absolutely no formal education and any person who learns to sign could potentially become an interpreter and then interpret in the courtroom, doctor's office, et cetera. (Hearing Survey Respondent 1, 2004),
>
> Only that an interpreter should be educated. A Bachelor's degree is sufficient, perhaps in liberal studies or English. While I would encourage education, I don't think it is necessary for all interpreters to

> have advanced degrees (MA, Ph.D, Ed.D, et cetera). (Hearing Survey Respondent 5, 2004),
>
> Be mentored before and/or after graduation by a qualified interpreter trainer. (Hearing Survey Respondent 13, 2004),
>
> Regardless of education, an interpreter is 'qualified' when a Deaf and hearing person communicate effectively as a result of your interpretation. An interpreter must be bilingual and bicultural and fully competent in the process of interpretation. Takes lots of linguistics classes, Deaf culture classes, English classes, learn flexibility, interpersonal skills, timeliness, observe how other professionals act, speak, dress, find interpreter role models, Deaf mentors. (Hearing Survey Respondent 20, 2004), and
>
> English, English, English. (Hearing Survey Respondent 43, 2005).

Children of Deaf adults. Does the Deaf consumer perceive that an adult child of Deaf parents would be more qualified to interpret than an adult child of hearing parents because of access to American Sign Language from birth? Survey Question 39: Some people believe that interpreters, who have Deaf parents, are more qualified to interpret than interpreters who have hearing parents. Do you agree or disagree? Why?

Research Question 3 sought to answer whether Deaf consumers and hearing interpreters perceived that a child of Deaf adults (CODA) was more qualified to interpret than a hearing child of hearing parents. Perceptions of Deaf consumers and hearing interpreters who answered this question appeared to be more similar than dissimilar. Points of agreement for Deaf consumers and hearing interpreters indicated that CODAs may or may not have American Sign Language fluency based on the following factors: (a) education level of the Deaf parent(s), (b) the usage of home signs, (c) linguistic problems, (d) the ability to interpret, and (e) the parent's level of activity in the Deaf community. Deaf consumers and hearing interpreters also agreed that while having Deaf parents does not make a CODA qualified, hearing interpreters

reflected that CODAs are accepted as qualified because they are CODAs, culturally aware, and that in itself predicates acceptance and qualification from the Deaf. However, hearing interpreters suggest that this does not mean that CODAs are proficient in American Sign Language or well versed in interpreting models.

Other themes noted in Table 10 and patterns inherent in the data submitted by both groups of respondents indicated that CODAs may have an advantage over non-CODAs in language acquisition because of their early exposure to American Sign Language. However, CODAs may lack English competency, even though their sign-to-voice skills are better, and according to Deaf consumers CODAs have idiomatic ASL competency.

Deaf consumers and hearing interpreters had similar themes related to interpersonal issues that affect or influence the interpreting situation. Hearing respondents indicated that CODAs lack interpersonal skills have inappropriate boundaries, expressed concerns that interpreting assignment information does not remain confidential, and that CODAs function in a helper mode mentality. Deaf consumers also appeared to recognize that CODAs have control or boundary issues and expressed concern that CODAs may lack ethics. Issues of control or lack of an ethical construct would affect interpreting situations when CODAs interface cross-culturally.

Hearing interpreters also intimated that while CODAs needed education and training, they have an intuitive practicality as it relates to cultural awareness and voicing skills. Both Deaf consumers and hearing agree that non-CODAs are capable of learning American Sign Language and understanding Deaf culture and that motivation, opportunity, and capability are key themes that apply to a non-CODAs

Table 10

Qualification and Children of Deaf Adults Emerging Themes

Deaf	Hearing
May use home signs rather than ASL, but lack English skills	Have intuitive practicality, cultural awareness
Have early exposure to ASL and it is their first language	Voicing skills are better because of early exposure to ASL and opportunity
Qualification is predicated on parent's education and signs used in the home	Need to know different communication modalities
Qualification of interpreter should be based on skill and motivation	Have interpersonal issues related to control, confidentiality, and control-helper
Non-CODAs are capable of understanding ASL and Deaf culture	Lack interpersonal skills and have inappropriate boundaries
Having Deaf parents does qualify the child	
Have idiomatic ASL competency	

gaining interpreting skills. Other themes that occurred in the data were related to Deaf consumer perceptions that indicated that qualification of interpreters should be based on skill, motivation, education, and certification.

> Overall, Deaf consumers and hearing respondents disagree that CODAs are more qualified to interpret than hearing interpreters without Deaf parents. There are CODA's who because of their negative attitudes toward Deaf people and deafness. CODA's are not always fluent in ASL. Also, like any child growing up in a family, there is sometimes a tendency for CODAs torely too much on their specific family experiences and family signs. Deaf parents don't always insist their children sign many things exactly right since the parents and their

friends may understand the CODA's signs. There are hearing people who have the education, knowledge, sensitivity, and experience to interpret just as well if not better than some CODA's. (Deaf Respondent 76, 2004);

While I agree that CODA's are most qualified to understand the Deaf, they still need training. Some interpreters with hearing parents with better trainingby Deaf people are far better than some CODA's with no training. I think it depends on the interpreting and interpersonal skills on individual basis, but those CODA's are sure great with understanding 'DEAF' intentions in language meaning. (Deaf Survey Respondent 85, 2004);

There are so many components that go into interpreting:fluency, professionalism, cultural understanding, interpreting skills, language skills, and many others. Just because you're a CODA doesn't mean you're more qualified. It might mean you're an expert signer, but it also brings with you a whole basket of issues that need to be understood before entering a profession like interpreting (i.e. language variations from one to next-many times CODAs assume I'm like their parents, when I'm not; CODA's internal issues' etc.). I do tend to be partial towards CODAs because of their understanding of the language and my comfort level in switching from one language another with them, but that only-and-ONLY-if they're trained professionally as an interpreter. (Deaf Respondent 91, 2004);

I believe it all depends on the CODAs individually. Because English is not their first language, their performance on translating from voice-to-sign are commonly weak. Secondly, their weak boundary skills interfere significantly with their professionalism in spite of their fluency in ASL. (Deaf Respondent 119, 2005);

CODAs doesn't have skill or formal training for translation and ethics code; they need to have training to be qualified for interpreters. (Deaf Respondent 89, 2004);

While some CODAs may have more native-like skills, that does not necessarily mean that they are natural interpreters. Many CODAs, though fluent in ASL, are often lacking in some of the crucial interpersonal and processing skills that are required of qualified interpreters. So one is not that same as the other. I have met many CODAs who can't interpret at all. I have met many children of hearing parents who have natural interpreting ability. There is not a general rule when it comes to the answer for this question. CODAs who have taken the time to professionally develop their interpreting/interpersonal, skills have often become some of our top interpreters. It comes from hard work and dedication; same as it does for children of hearing parents. (Deaf Respondent 103. 2005);

> An interpreter with hearing parents can be just as good or even better than a CODA if s/he puts forth the effort to learn the language and the culture. Just because a person has Deaf parents does not mean that s/he has always been exposed to true ASL and it does not mean that s/he has a sense of the Code of Ethics. If the person grew up interpreting s/he might have great interpreting skills, but is too involved personally in the interactions and thus not ethical. Having Deaf parents gives an interpreter an advantage in terms of language and culture as well as acceptance into the Deaf community. However, I do believe that if one truly immerses his or herself in the profession success can be achieved. (Hearing Respondent 1, 2004);
>
> I do not think they are necessarily more qualified. I think that as a group, they possess a level of comprehension of ASL that non-native signers usually never achieve, but this does not mean they have equal skills in English, or have high levels of professionalism, interpersonal skills, or general background knowledge. (Hearing Respondent 9, 2004);
>
> Not all CODA's have culturally Deaf parents who are appropriate language models. If they do, then just knowing the language is not enough-one has to know the profession of being an interpreter, such as ethics, interpersonal skills, and English. (Hearing Respondent 23, 2004);
>
> CODA's may have a better grasp of receptive (and possibly expressive) skills and often lack the ethics associated with becoming a 'qualified interpreter'. (Hearing Respondent 24, 2004); and
>
> While CODA's may have more native or near-native ASL skills, they are often too engrained in the 'helper' mode to effectively follow the Code of Ethics and to work well with other non-CODA interpreters. I believe all of the skills necessary to be an outstanding interpreter can be learned as an adult, but that some of the intuitive knowledge (read common sense) does not exist in all individuals-CODA or not. (Hearing Respondent 36, 2004).

Cultural affiliation. What is the extent of agreement between the Deaf consumer and the hearing interpreter that an interpreter's qualification requires cultural affiliation with the Deaf community? Survey Question 40: Some people believe that interpreters who spend more time with the Deaf and participate in Deaf cultural activities are able to interpret better than those interpreters who do not spend time with the Deaf community? Do you agree or disagree? Why?

Research Question 4 sought to answer whether Deaf consumers and hearing interpreters perceived that interpreters were qualified by cultural affiliation. Overall, Deaf and hearing respondents agreed that interpreters who spent more time with the Deaf community and participated in Deaf cultural activities were able to interpret better than those who had no cultural affiliation. See Table 11 for delineation of themes. Similarities in perceptions and themes among survey respondents indicated that participation in cultural activities assisted an interpreters American Sign Language competency by:

1. Expanding sign vocabulary;
2. Improving receptive and expressive skills;
3. Increasing idiomatic competency;
4. Providing a forum for constructive feedback; and
5. Development of cross-cultural understanding.

Other themes that Deaf and hearing respondents supported were the perception that participation in Deaf cultural activities allows the interpreter to understand the idiosyncratic diversity of Deaf people and provides exposure to different signing modalities. Patterns and themes emerging from the data also supported perceptions that cultural participation develops cross-cultural mediation skills by learning how to mitigate cultural differences between Deaf and hearing cultures.

Hearing respondents suggested that while immersion within Deaf culture added to one's comfort level when signing, brings trust, and was an opportunity to increase language acquisition, it might not increase interpreting skills. This perception would be diametrically dissimilar to the Deaf consumers' perceptions that cultural

Table 11

Cultural Affiliation Emerging Themes

Deaf	Hearing
Awareness of what is culturally acceptable	Awareness of what is culturally acceptable
Idiomatic sign competence achieved through interaction with the Deaf	Deaf use role-playing to teach language skills
Interpreters learn emotional nuances of ASL	Interpreters stays on cutting edge of language transitions
Observation of diversified signing styles	Exposure to different signing modalities, increases idiomatic competency
Opportunities for mentoring	Improves receptive and expressive skills
Socialization with Deaf community makes a better interpreter	Development of cross-culture mediation skills
Socialization supports language acquisition	Provides forum for constructive feedback
ASL fluency emerges with socialization	Participation adds comfort ability in signing but may not add to interpreting skill

participation improves language output, that idiomatic and sign competency is achieved through cultural interaction thus enhancing interpreting skills, which is inclusive of sign-to-voice presentation. Deaf consumers intimate that ASL fluency evolves through socialization, and that interpreters learn the emotional nuances of

American Sign Language thus making a better interpreter. Similarly, Deaf consumers present perceptions that indicate that the Deaf view cultural participation as an opportunity to mentor interpreters. Hearing respondents expanded on this theme by identifying one specific method the Deaf utilize in the transmission of language skills. The Deaf employ role-playing as a means of developing linguistic competency and the nuances of American Sign Language.

Deaf Respondent 76 (2004) expressed:

> ASL, like English has too many nuances and subtle differences in meanings and variations for someone to learn them all in school and/or workshops. There is not enough time or opportunity in formal education to show all of the situations and possible variations used in ASL. Interpreters should associate with Deaf people outside of work in cultural and social activities to increase their knowledge of the language and culture. Too many interpreters seem to depend on getting their knowledge of ASL and the culture by attending workshops run by other interpreters. At times, I've had interpreters use signs that I've never seen before and when I question other Deaf people they don't know the sign either. If I ask the interpreter the answer is often the sign was learned at an interpreter workshop;
>
> Because of the tones Deaf people have. We all are very different. Our background is so different from each. Our structure of language is different. Regional sign language. Emotional tones. Hearing people must learn to grasp and they couldn't grasp if they have no experience sharing mentally and emotionally with them. It is very important to know being an interpreter is not a 9 to 5 job. It is 24 hours. (Deaf Respondent 88, 2004);
>
> I agree because too many 'terps' who shy away from the Deaf are the very ones whose ASL skills is so lacking in the subtle areas of the language. Plus I don't believe you can 'master' a language by staying away from native users. The very idea is absurd. (Deaf Respondent 100, 2005); and
>
> It is important to interact with the Deaf community. Our language is constantly changing. As new things are added to our world, new signs are derived to include these new additions, 'Slangisms,' nuances, are all part of what makes our language what it is. Interpreters' who want to stay on the top of their field need to stay on top of the change of the language. Interacting with us on a regular basis increases comfort with the language and not just knowledge. In so doing, the interpreter will

feel more at ease when interpreting and can honestly say that his/her skill sets are updated with the most recent ASL trends. (Deaf Respondent 103, 2005).

Likewise, hearing respondents stated:

I strongly agree with this assertion by simple virtue of the fact that these individuals have (hopefully) more language exposure. It's ludicrous to think that interpreter/translators for the United Nations could ever do their job without first having native-like experience in source and target language. Yet this is the model that we see in interpreting-largely in K-12 educational interpreting-everyday. (Hearing Respondent 8, 2005); By spending time with Deaf individuals at community events, or even in small groups, an interpreter gets to know more about the people's preferred communication style, and how they tend to speak. One also gains important community information that may or may not come up in an interpreting situation. This type of information makes an interpreted scenario go much smoother, and be more effective. However, one also has to be careful to not end up on a situation where there is a conflict of interest, or let prior knowledge influence vocabulary choice to where an error of interpretation occurs. (Hearing Respondent 12, 2004);

It's essential to understand how Deaf people discuss certain things, not only in terms of language use, but as a key to understanding cultural values. The only way this can be learned is through participation. Seeing the interpreter as part of the community events also builds trust. (Hearing Respondent 20, 2004);

As a "member" of the social aspect of the Deaf community interpreters are able to pick up on nuances and idiosyncrasies of native or native-like ASL users. They are also more equipped to work with a wider range of consumers. (Hearing Respondent 30, 2004);

I agree, because I believe those interpreters are exposed to a greater diversity of style, which allows them to both understand and communicate to a wide range of D/deaf people and also allows them to 'portray' a wider variety of hearing and Deaf personalities/style. It also bonds them more to Deaf people so that they can have and want a better rapport. I think some CODA's struggle with how to do this with hearing people. (Hearing Respondent 46, 2004); and

As a person spends time with the Deaf community, he/she is able to learn the nuances of the language, such as facial expression, body language, and the cultural norms that every interpreter needs to know. Receptive skills are also greatly enhanced. (Hearing Respondent 61, 2004).

Acceptance by the Deaf community. What is the extent of agreement between the Deaf consumer and the hearing interpreter that an interpreter's qualifications to interpret require acceptance by the Deaf community? Survey Question 41: Some people believe that interpreters are considered more qualified to interpret by the Deaf if they are accepted by the Deaf community regardless of their interpreting skill level. Do you agree or disagree? Why?

Research Question 5 sought to measure the extent of agreement between Deaf consumers and hearing interpreters that qualification of an interpreter is predicated on acceptance by the Deaf community. See Table 12 for delineation of themes. Hearing respondents' perceptions related to interpreter qualification predicated by acceptance of the Deaf community seemed to follow themes related to a category called personal considerations, which appeared to be based on:

1. The level of trust the Deaf had for an interpreter;
2. Favoritism;
3. Intuition of the Deaf person;
4. An interpreter's attitude;
5. Family ties;
6. An interpreter's involvement and bond with the Deaf community;
7. The willingness of the Deaf person to mentor an interpreter; and
8. The respect of the interpreter for the Deaf community.

Hearing interpreters perceive that while the Deaf may predicate qualification on an interpreter's skill or interpreting ability, the Deaf consumer may qualify or quantify acceptance by utilization of an interpreter with lesser skills if the Deaf consumer perceives that the interpreter's attitude is right, if the interpreter operates in

Table 12

Acceptance by the Deaf Community Emerging Themes

Deaf	Hearing
Deaf will accept as qualified based on personal considerations	Qualification based on personal considerations
May be accepted as qualified by recognizing that interpreter does not have requisite skill	Acceptance may be predicated on subjective attitude, intuition, involvement with Deaf community
Acceptance is based on a case-by- case basis and is subjective	Acceptance based on comfort ability, mentoring, bond with Deaf community
Deaf will choose less qualified because they know the interpreter	Acceptance based on bond with Deaf, family ties, cultural comfort
Mentoring	Based on performance.
Qualification is based on skill	Acceptance based on helper-model
Acceptance does not predicate skill level	Qualification is built on trust and confidence between Deaf and interpreter
Qualification should not be based on personal considerations	

a helper-mode, and their performance in the interpreting assignment. Hearing respondents also indicate that qualification by acceptance may be inherent in the interpreter's ability to traverse diverse signing styles, and that trust and confidence seemed to be linked to acceptance of an interpreter with less interpreting skill.

Similarly, Deaf consumers agree that qualification can be based upon personal considerations, which can be predicated on subjective standards of the Deaf

consumer. These subjective standards are generally based upon Deaf consumers perceptions that:

1. Acceptance would be on a case-by-case basis; and

2. That acceptance by the Deaf consumer does not indicate that the interpreter chosen has requisite skill, but rather the Deaf consumer has chosen a less qualified interpreter because the Deaf consumer knows them instead of utilizing an interpreter they do not know.

These themes could support that Deaf consumers prefer an interpreter they feel comfortable with and trust rather than interpreter who has the requisite skill. Despite perceptions that Deaf consumers will accept a less qualified interpreter for the above personal considerations, Deaf consumers present perceptions intimating that:

1. Acceptance of an interpreter does not predicate qualification or skill level of the interpreter;

2. That qualification should be predicated by evaluation of skill level; and

3. Qualification should not be predicated by subjective standards or personal considerations, but that this does occur and is supported the themes presented.

While Deaf and hearing respondents agree that qualification by acceptance of the Deaf community occurs, similarities in perception indicate that Deaf consumers and hearing interpreters appear to understand why this occurs, and provide a rationale based upon themes. Interpreter qualification is predicated by subjective standards, based upon trust, confidence, and appropriate attitude, more than on requisite interpreting skills although it is perceived that qualification should be skill-based.

Deaf respondents stated:

I do think this happens. However, sometimes it happens because the Deaf person feels the interpreters knows and understands them better than the more skilled interpreter. Sometimes it happens because of interpreter attitude. There are some certified interpreters that I would never ask to interpret for me. Another possible reason is the less skilled interpreter may be more willing to do more than just fill the role of interpreter. They tend to be more like the 'helper' model. Lastly, many people just feel more comfortable with people we know. (Deaf Respondent 76, 2004);

Some people whose skills are not top-notch but they have attitudes that promote trust. They are constantly seeking to learn and improve, they don't have a standoffish air about them, they see beyond the dollar sign to the value of what they do and the value of the people they do it for. (Deaf Respondent 100, 2005);

I disagree with this. Reason being is due to the skills it takes to be an interpreter. Just because a Deaf person accepts the interpreter, does not necessarily mean he/she is qualified for a job. (Deaf Respondent 92, 2005); and

If a person is not accepted in the Deaf community then it makes you wonder why. If it is because of a paternalistic attitude, audism, or other negative trait, then we don't want that person to interpret for us. If a person is not accepted because the interpreter has violated the code of ethics then again why would we want that person to interpret for us? So if a person is not accepted then they would be welcomed as an interpreter in any given situation. Therefore, regardless of their skill, in our eyes they would not be considered qualified. (Deaf Respondent 103, 2005).

Hearing respondents indicated:

It depends on who is defining qualified. If a Deaf person defined it, they would most likely say that is true. If a non-interpreting hearing person defined it, they would say it's false. I think it depends. Sometimes a person who is accepted but has horrible skills is trusted more, but as a result, the Deaf consumer does not get accurate information. It is also important to consider whether or not the hearing consumers accept the interpreter. An interpreter who is accepted but far too chummy with Deaf consumers might be viewed as inappropriate and unprofessional. If the two interpreters were at the exact same skill level and both professional, I think the person who is more involved is more qualified. (Hearing Respondent 1, 2004).

> I strongly agree. Relationships (CODA, GODA, etc.) strongly influence how an interpreter is accepted/respected. (Hearing Respondent 2, 2004).
>
> This question implies that skill is the most important consideration in an interpreter. It is not. In my experience, many Deaf consumers will forgive a multitude of signing 'sins' if the interpreter has a good, cooperative attitude. Much of what we do is show-up on time, provide cultural mediation, et cetera. These are not, per se, signing skills, but are considered crucially important. (Hearing Respondent 5, 2004).
> Yes, I have seen this. Even mediocre interpreters are finding terping [interpreting] jobs because they are known in the Deaf community. The Deaf enjoy taking partial credit for 'hatching a terp' and they are forgiving of terps [interpreters] who make more attempts to be part of the culture. (Hearing Respondent 6, 2004).
>
> I believe that most Deaf people have a keen intuition, and are able to observe the difference between an interpreter who genuinely cares about the Deaf community and continuing to improve their interpretation versus someone who is only interpreting to make money. The Deaf person is the one who has to trust that the message being elicited is intact; if they do not trust the interpreter (for whatever reason) the process is ineffective. So, with that perspective, the interpreter with less experience but with a positive cultural attitude will be more effective, although it is the Deaf person who gets to make this choice in each situation (they may prefer the more experienced interpreter in traffic court for example!). (Hearing Respondent 20, 2004).
>
> Somewhat agree. It goes back to the adage of a Deaf person prefers a not-so skilled interpreter with a great attitude than a skilled interpreter with a poor attitude. Also familiarity with the person allows the Deaf person to feel more comfortable with the interpreter. (Hearing Respondent 23, 2004); and
>
> I do agree with this statement albeit not always the case. I think Deaf people trust interpreters who are accepted by the Deaf community more easily and if the interpreter has the right attitude they are also deemed more 'qualified'. I feel this is due to the idea that is someone has the right attitude, they can grow and 'become'. (Hearing Respondent 30, 2004).

Deaf Consumer Perceptions of a Qualified Interpreter

What qualities does the Deaf consumer seek out in interpreters? Survey Question 42: As a Deaf consumer, what skills and qualities do you look for when you need an interpreter to interpret for you?

Research Question 6 sought to measure what qualities a Deaf consumer desires in an interpreter. In order to understand Deaf consumer perceptions, Survey Question 42 on the Questionnaire of Characteristics of a Qualified Interpreter asked the Deaf consumers what skills and qualities do you look for when you need an interpreter to interpret. Emerging themes detailed in Table 13 seemed to be consistent throughout Deaf consumers' responses and are categorized into four units related to skills and qualities. These are comprised of four areas that include signing competencies, interpersonal skills and professional conduct, education, and Deaf cultural competencies.

Emerging themes represented as a category called signing competencies-Sign Language skills included 15 consistent themes. Deaf consumers indicated that interpreters should demonstrate ASL fluency, have a good command of ASL, and native signing skills. Additionally, the ability to utilize different communication modalities, which included the use of PSE, MSE, or CASE, was a desired skill for interpreters of Deaf . Deaf consumers indicated the importance of demonstrating excellent sign-to-voice skills, coupled with the ability to emote, sign accurately, and demonstrate signing confidence. Good presentation skills were also valued and desired by Deaf consumers as a needed skill for interpreters of Deaf.

Appropriate use of expression was clearly a desired quality along with executing clear finger spelling. Emerging themes addressing signing competencies seem to move across a continuum that follows a logical pattern of thinking. A Deaf consumer desires an interpreter with ASL fluency, who can demonstrate good presentation skills inclusive of interpreting and articulating excellent sign-to-voice skills with appropriate register in different communication modalities as needed

and/or requested. Interpreters need to demonstrate clear finger spelling, appropriate non-manual behaviors, i.e. facial expression, use of signing space, and emotive expression while signing and interpreting substantiating a good command of ASL, and confidence in signing delivery.

Deaf respondents indicate:

> I want them to have a good command of English and ASL. Many have a stronger conscious command of the latter and not the former. Even though I am fluent with ASL, I am sometimes worried about the ability of the interpreter to voice for me. While I have not completed my Master's, I have a post-graduate command of English. I often voice for myself because of this worry. Yet, that confounds the hearing person in the interaction. (Deaf Survey Respondent 95, 2005);
>
> Ability to use facial expressions (classifiers); ability to emote accurately as well as ability to sign accurately. (Deaf Survey Respondent 97, 2004); and
>
> A professional and friendly demeanor, the ability to sign-to-voice accurately and to let me know if they are not sure what I mean. I constantly have to monitor interpreters via speech reading to make sure my message is getting across the way I want it to be. (Deaf Survey Respondent 104, 2005)

Emerging themes included seven interpersonal patterns and three professional conduct skills which appeared to be consistent qualities desired by Deaf consumers of interpreting services. Deaf consumers' desire interpreters who are flexible, demonstrate confidence and professionalism, remain friendly, polite, cordial, and respectful in their interactions with the Deaf consumer. Deaf consumers indicated that interpreters should have good character and ethical standards in place. It would appear that Deaf consumers' value and desire interpreters who can be on time for interpreting assignments, demonstrate professionalism with ethical standards, while executing deportment in interpersonal relationships in the interpreting environment.

Table 13

Deaf Consumers and Interpreter Qualification Emerging Themes

Signing Competencies	
ASL fluency.	Ability to use different communication.
Good sign-to-voice skills	Conceptually accurate sign/register modalities
Clear finger spelling	Ability to emote and sign accurately
Lip Reading	
Excellent sign-to-voice skill	Sign competency
Interpersonal Skills	
Friendly	Respectful
Flexibility	Ethical
Confidence	Good character
Good manners	
Professionalism	
Desire excellence	Good presentation skills (sign-to-voice)
Education	
Attend interpreter training program	Attend workshops
Good command of English	
Cultural Competence	
Cultural understanding of the deaf way of signing	

Evidence of these themes can be found in the personal comments of Deaf respondents that intimate:

> I will accept a less skilled interpreter over one who has an attitutde. I'm the interpreter, sit where I tell you, pay attention, etc. I know what's best; I graduated from an interpreter training program. If you are not an interpreter, then you don't understand. Don't tell me how to interpret.

> Someone who respects the Deaf person and doesn't treat them like an idiot. Punctual, proper dress. The specific skills needed for a particular job…good attitude; friendly. Sensitivity for specific cultural norms and values; (Deaf Survey Respondent 76, 2004).

> Flexibility, can adapt to communication mode desired, willing. Don't like 'I'm good!' attitudes, capitalizing on the job for money and not for the welfare of consumers; accepting assignments they're not qualified for. (Deaf Survey Respondent 86, 2004); and

> I look for good, clear, conceptually accurate signing, as well as a general respect for the Deaf culture and towards myself as a Deaf individual. I like to see a good use of grammatical and emotional facial express although I once had an interpreter who was very good, but a bit too [sic to] dramatic in his facial expressions. The interpreter should understand my educational level and attempt to conform his/her interpreting to this both expressively and receptively (voicing). (Deaf Survey Respondent 93, 2005).

Deaf consumers expressed that education is valued and interpreters should attend, not only an interpreter training program, but workshops as well to increase signing competencies. There were four consistent themes expressed throughout the data. These included:

1. ASL fluency;

2. Having a good command of English;

3. Developing good presentation skills in relation to sign-to-voice competency; and

4. Non-manual expressive skills, i.e. facial and body expression.

Deaf consumers indicated that they value interpreter training coupled with workshops to improve skills, a good command of English, and excellent presentation skills. Presentation skills were described as accurately interpreting the message, utilizing sign-to-voice translation with appropriate English as the interpreter moves

from American Sign Language to English while matching the Deaf person's register to appropriate English words and vocabulary.

Deaf survey respondent 132 (2004) articulates:

> I'm preferred that interpreter have training;
> Have them [sic interpreters] to training/workshops. (Deaf Survey Respondent 135, 2004);
>
> Good attitude, able to be receptive [sic sign-to-voice] my language able to translate to English very well. (Deaf Survey Respondent 131, 2005);
>
> How well they perform in the environment (do they socialize with whom I'm meeting with or not), their signing skills, voicing skills and how well their personality matches mine. (Deaf Survey Respondent 92, 2005); and
>
> I am looking for someone who believes that interpreting is about the communication and the language; it is not about the person him/herself. I like interpreters who have made a very clear choice that they are doing what they want to do. They have also made a conscious effort to be at the top of their game and feel that if they are not then they have cheated the Deaf community. I like interpreters who take time to interact with us and who make themselves allies. Because of my high register, I need an interpreter who has an extensive vocabulary who can match my register and have a good skill set of vocabulary word choices to match my signs. These are all important skills and qualities to me. (Deaf Survey Respondent 103, 2005).

Deaf consumers desire the participation of interpreters in Deaf culture through socialization with the Deaf. Furthermore, they value interpreters who demonstrate cultural understanding of the Deaf. As a result, cultural competency could be developed and attained through cultural interaction between Deaf consumers and hearing interpreters within the context of Deaf community. It is a widely perpetuated value throughout the data in this study that cultural knowledge and experience can only occur through exposure to Deaf culture.

Deaf survey respondent 88 (2004) expressed:

> Well articulated. Intellectual and immersed in Deaf culture and is well known in the Deaf community. Most important is that the interpreter is

> able to interpret to the information accurately 99.9%. If interpreter ask me to repeat once, I respect, but several times, I reject;
>
> Ability to voice!!! I can deal with a lousy signer, but a lousy voicer no-way. Bilingualism and fluency, ability to meet my interpreting needs, cultural understanding, adherence to COE [sic Code of Ethics], confidentiality, appropriateness of appearance, and appropriateness of interpretation. (Deaf Survey Respondent 91, 2004);
>
> Socialize with the Deaf-go to church with Deaf; (Deaf Survey Respondent 99, 2004); and
> Professionalism, good character in knowledge of Deaf culture.

Overall, emerging themes presented by Deaf consumers indicated that skills and qualities Deaf consumers desire in interpreters were related to specific signing competencies, malleable interpersonal skills, which included professionalism and the possession of ethical standards, educational competencies that include a good command of ASL and English, and cultural competencies/connections, which indicated the importance of socializing with and understanding Deaf culture.

Quality Interpreter Training Programs Recommendations

Research Question 7 sought to measure what a Deaf consumer believes makes a quality interpreter training program. Deaf consumers answered Survey Question 43, which specifically asked what advice you would like to give interpreter training programs to help them train and develop qualified interpreters. See Table 14 for delineation of emerging themes. Perceptions of Deaf consumers were categorized into four distinct categories such as recruitment considerations, instructional preferences, training outcomes, and cultural interaction.

Recruitment considerations. Emerging themes represented a category described as recruitment considerations and included five consistent themes or patterns. Deaf consumers responded that recruitment efforts for interpreter training programs should focus on recruiting interpreters, especially male interpreters.

Table 14

Deaf Consumer and Training Recommendations Emerging Themes

Recruitment Considerations	
Pre-requisite of minimal signing skills	Recruit interpreters especially males
Evaluation for fit in interpreting profession	Emphasize interpreting as a profession
Instructional Preferences	
Provide specialized training for medical, legal, and community interpreting	Deaf-hearing co-teach with hearing closely affiliated with Deaf community
Use Deaf mentors	Emphasize interpreting as a profession
Practicum/internships	Development of ethics
Continuing education and workshops	Involve Deaf in training
Use Deaf instructors	Intercultural participation-socialization with Deaf to understand diversity in Deaf community
Development of interpersonal skills	Exposure to variety of interpreting situations four-year rather than two-year program

Deaf consumers' comments reflected:

> Recommend: Need a lot of male interpreters to purpose for Deaf male client for his doctor appointment to feel more comfortable to express his personal problems; (Deaf Survey Respondent 138, 2004);

> "Screen individuals first! Many should not be in this field. (Interp. 20+ years can't voice zilch! Can't improve, etc.). Emphasis field is TOUGH! Not just a 'beautiful language' and want to 'help' Deaf people; it's a profession. (Deaf Survey Respondent 86, 2004);

> Require a minimum level of signing prior to enrollment in the program- the program should not be the place where interpreters learn to sign, but where they can improve upon the sign knowledge that they already possess, as well as learning the interpreting specific set of skills and knowledge; (Deaf Survey Respondent 93, 2005); and
>
> I strongly suggest that training program to provide personality test, and some basic psychology courses like human development to help enhancing student wholeness. (Deaf Survey Respondent 119, 2005).

Instructional preferences. Emerging themes represented as a category called instructional preferences included four consistent patterns relative to Deaf consumers' preference for Deaf involvement in interpreter training. Deaf consumer responses suggested the importance of utilizing Deaf instructors, Deaf mentors, instructors who were closely affiliated with the Deaf community and a desire for shared partnerships between Deaf and hearing through co-teaching. Deaf consumer responses signify:

> With the exception of voicing skills, all communication in ITPs should be in ASL. More Deaf/hearing co-teaching by Deaf instructors/professors familiar with interpreting; (Deaf Survey Respondent 78, 2004);
>
> Find mentors for the trainees. Deaf mentors are wonderful. If they can be helpful in their critiquing the skills (helpful suggestions, NOT criticizing!); (Deaf Survey Respondent 94, 2004); and
>
> ITP's should have Deaf persons affiliated with the program, and Deaf persons should help mentor interpreter trainees. (Deaf Survey Respondent 93, 2005).

Overall themes within this category supported active involvement of the Deaf in training and mentoring interpreters for Deaf consumers. Historically, before the advent of interpreter training programs, the Deaf community actively taught sign language and mentored hearing individuals who were interested in learning sign language. Eventually, these hearing individuals, as well as hearing children of Deaf parents, provided volunteer interpreting services for their Deaf parents, friends, and colleagues in what was considered a non-professional capacity as described in the

literature review. While the advent of interpreter training programs and the development of certification standards and qualification appeared to have lessened Deaf involvement in interpreter training programs, the Deaf nonetheless expressed intense feelings about instructional issues relative to teaching ASL and training interpreters and their participation in the process.

Deaf respondent 76 (2004) states:

> Stop producing students who believe there is this one stereotypical Deaf person and we all fit the mold. Include Deaf people in teaching the interpreting classes as much as possible. It makes no sense to have hearing people doing most, if not all of the teaching in classes like ASL to English translation, or ASL to English interpretation. Both of these areas are considered weaknesses for interpreters, but no wonder. Hearing people are deciding the meanings of ASL signs, not deaf people.

There is also the recognition that not all Deaf are qualified to suggest cultural, linguistic, and interpreting advice. Deaf Survey Respondent 91 (2004) reflects:

> Where to begin? I wish interpreter programs would stop trying to tell students that RID certification = qualification. They have to remember that RID certification only tests a person's minimal qualifications, not their fluency/expertise. There is so much more to becoming a qualified interpreter than simply getting a certification. Also, do not assume that because a person teaches in an ITP, that s/he is the 'best' person to look to for cultural, linguistic, and interpreting advice. Just because a Deaf person is Deaf, doesn't mean s/he is the person to go to for advice on signs or cultural issues; same goes for interpreters. Like I said, so many obstacles to navigate.

Training outcomes. Emerging themes represented as a category called training outcomes included six consistent patterns. Deaf consumers intimated the importance of acknowledging diversity among Deaf consumers and strongly conveyed that interpreter training programs should consider training for differences in communication modalities. This theme appeared to be consistent and was usually followed by statements indicating a need for interpreter training in specialized

settings, which included, but were not limited to, medical, legal, and computer specialty fields. Over arching themes appeared to be relative to developing interpersonal skills of interpreters and ensuring that interpreters have ethical standards are encouraged and taught. Deaf consumers conveyed that interpreter's needed to be honest about their interpreting skills when accepting interpreting assignments one might not be qualified to interpret. Attending workshops to develop signing skills in addition to participating in a four-year interpreter training program was strongly encouraged and supported. Acceptance of constructive feedback in order to improve and enhance skills, socialization with the Deaf and utilization of the Deaf as instructors and mentors were also reoccurring themes throughout respondents' responses. Deaf survey respondent 85 (2004) states:

> Be part of Deaf community, respect our preferences for signing style, understand the value of interpreting skills, be flexible, don't think that what you learned at colleges makes your signs correct in spite of how many years you have used this sign.

Other Deaf respondents express:

> Learn all types of signing. (Deaf Survey Respondent 87, 2004);

> They should go to workshop daily to learn sometime new. They need to mingle with different Deaf consumers so that they will be able to interpret what Deaf consumers need. (Deaf Survey Respondent 130, 2005);

> To understand classifiers; 2. To understand how to deal with deaf consumers complaining being late or not liking the other interpreters; 3. To be aware of police approaches; 4. To have knowledge of mental heath situations; 5. To understand ER room; 6. To be a professional interpreter; (Deaf Survey Respondent 135, 2004)

> Immerse in culture any way they can. Deaf clubs, Deaf schools, Deaf church, Deaf tournaments, Deaf plays and many more. Know the limit-do not accept the job if not familiar. *Turn down a job if know the limits is best!* Learn law and medical by taking workshops. Have time to gather with deaf people all the time. Respect their language. Accept their critics without running with tears in eyes. If being criticized by them; it

> means they need to improve; not meaning they failed. (Deaf Survey Respondent 88, 2004);
>
> Smile, friendly, and ask if they don't understand my signing; (Deaf Survey Respondent 83, 2004);
>
> Make sure they are honest about their skills. They should know if they are qualified to interpret any place. (Deaf Respondent 136, 2004);
>
> Find a way to get more Deaf people involved in all aspects of the training program including mentoring and evaluation. (Deaf Respondent 104, 2005); and
>
> Set up high expectations, use Deaf people in your training program, recruit interpreters, more practicum and internship hours. (Deaf Respondent 77, 2004).

Deaf consumers clearly articulate support for interpreter training programs to ensure that training includes acknowledgement of diversity in the Deaf community as it relates to signing preferences. There is also a strong preference for the provision of specialized training in medical, legal, and other settings outside the educational venue, and that interpreters need to uphold ethical standards especially when it relates to accepting assignments one is not qualified to interpret. The utilization of Deaf mentors is strongly encouraged and seen as positive reinforcement of learning outcomes related to language and interpreting in order to critique skills and provide valuable feedback outside the classroom setting. It would appear that the emphasis on extended hours for practicum and internship would increase opportunities to build confidence while strengthening language and interpreting skill proficiency. The importance of cultural immersion and utilization of Deaf teachers and mentors appears to be a repetitive theme through out the quantitative and qualitative data analyzed in this study.

Cultural connections. Deaf consumers strongly believe that socialization with the Deaf is necessary to develop and enhance language competency and signing

skills. Deaf consumers suggested that interpreter training programs should require interpreter trainees to participate in social settings with the Deaf to improve signing skills, promote and acquire understanding of the Deaf, and encourage active interaction and involvement with the Deaf. Once again, themes that emphasize cultural understanding, socialization, involvement with the Deaf community and Deaf professional's desire to be involved in the training of interpreters through instruction or mentoring, convey the depth of passionate feeling Deaf consumers possess in relation to American Sign Language and its transmission to hearing interpreters through instructional and cultural venues.

Deaf Survey Respondent 126 (2005) states:

> Develop genuine relationship with Deaf person in the community. If they are involved in Church-get into Deaf ministries, it helps with relationships, language, culture, help interpret variety classes, worship services, workshops and retreats; Fellowship with Deaf communities as often as possible, make friends and knowledge (background) of what is happening in Deaf culture;
>
> Try to socialize with Deaf in any events to develop sign and interpersonal skills. Maybe live in same dormitory where deaf students' life if you are a student. (Deaf Respondent 80, 2005);
>
> I want interpreters to understand how our Deaf people feel. For example, Deaf culture different between hearing world and deaf world. Also interpreters should try to hang out with Deaf people; (Deaf Survey Respondent 98, 2004); and
>
> Be around the deaf community to learn their culture. (Deaf Survey Respondent 132, 2004).

Deaf consumers emphasize that recruitment of interpreters is necessary especially for males to interpret in sensitive assignments were female interpreters presence might be inappropriate. Determining appropriate fit seemed to be an interrelated theme. It was suggested that screenings, personality tests, and signing prerequisites should be required before entrance into an interpreter training program.

Deaf consumers intimated that the utilization of Deaf instructors, mentors, and those who have close affiliation with the Deaf community should be actively involved in the instruction of interpreter trainees. Deaf consumers also advocated for collaborative teaching among Deaf and hearing instructors. It appears that Deaf consumers, in this study, recognize the value and contribution hearing instructors with strong cross-cultural ties to the Deaf community bring to the educational process of training interpreters. Interpreter training programs should emphasize diversity in Deaf signing preferences and train interpreters for differences in communication modalities while providing training within medical, legal, and other venues where specialization is required. Deaf consumers also support extended hours for practicum, internships, and workshops to improve interpreting skills. Evaluation of present policy related to practicum and internship requirements might be beneficial. Socialization continues to be a prevalent theme throughout with active interaction and involvement with the Deaf seen as a positive reinforcement for language, interpreting skill development, and cultural understanding to unfold.

Chapter 5

Discussion

Overview

This chapter includes a summary, conclusion, and recommendations based on the data collected in this research study on perceptions of interpreter qualification by Deaf consumers and professional interpreters. This study documents perceptions relating to interpreter qualification based on interpersonal skills; sign language skills; educational requirements; qualifications based on cultural affiliation; acceptance by the Deaf community; and familial relationships as in whether having a Deaf parent made a difference in perceptions of qualification. This study also examined perceptions of the qualities that Deaf consumers desire in interpreters, and characteristics that they believe quality interpreter training programs should possess. The results of this study constitute a careful generalization of the data collected and the investigator makes no claim of the representative nature of findings.

The purpose of this study was exploratory in nature. It:

1. Investigated the similarities and dissimilarities in perceptions of what characterizes a qualified interpreter as defined by Deaf consumers and professional interpreters relating to interpersonal skills, sign language skills, and educational requirements;
2. Measured the perceptions of Deaf consumers and hearing interpreters to determine whether cultural affiliation with the Deaf community makes an interpreter more qualified to interpret than an interpreter without cultural affiliation within the Deaf community;

3. Examined the perceptions of Deaf consumers and hearing interpreters that acceptance by the Deaf community means that an interpreter is qualified to interpret for the Deaf;

4. Explored the perception of whether adult children Deaf parents are more qualified to interpret than a hearing children of hearing parents because ASL is the first language for hearing children of Deaf parents;

5. Quantified qualities that the Deaf consumers seek out in hearing interpreters; and

6. Solicited the Deaf consumers opinion on what makes a quality interpreter training program.

The independent variable in this study was interpreter qualification. The dependent variables were contingent upon perceptions relating to interpersonal skills, sign language skills, educational requirements, which were explored utilizing demographic characteristics comprised of Deaf, hearing, female, male, native, non-native, certified and non-certified interpreters. Additional dependent variables used to analyze emerging themes in the qualitative data were cultural affiliation, acceptance of an interpreter by the Deaf community, and qualification based on familial relationships. Perceptions of Deaf consumers were sought to determine qualities desired in interpreters, and characteristics that the Deaf consumer believes a quality interpreting training program should have. The study sought answers to the following research questions:

1. Are there differences in perceptions of what characterizes a qualified interpreter as defined by professional interpreters and the Deaf consumer in

relation to interpersonal skills, sign language skills, and educational requirements?

2. Do the demographic characteristics of Deaf/hearing, male/female, ASL native/non-native signers, and certified/non-certified interpreters affect perceptions of what characterize a qualified interpreter as defined by respondents in relation to interpersonal skills, sign language skills, and educational requirements?

(a) Are there differences in perceptions between Deaf/hearing, male/female, ASL native/non-native signers, and certified and non-certified interpreters regarding the interpreter's interpersonal skills?

(b) Are there differences in perceptions between Deaf/hearing, male/female, ASL native/non-native signers, and certified and non-certified interpreters regarding the interpreter's Sign Language skills?

(c) Are there differences in perceptions between Deaf/hearing, male/female, ASL native/non-native signers, and certified and non-certified interpreters in relation to the interpreter trainee's level of education?

3. Does the Deaf consumer perceive that an adult child of Deaf parents would be more qualified to interpret than an adult child of hearing parents because of access to American Sign Language from birth? Survey question 39.

4. What is the extent of agreement between the Deaf consumer and the hearing interpreter that an interpreter's qualification to interpreter requires cultural affiliation with the Deaf community? Survey question 40.

5. What is the extent of agreement between the Deaf consumer and the hearing interpreter that an interpreter's qualifications to interpret require acceptance by the Deaf community? Survey question 41.

6. What qualities does the Deaf consumer seek out in interpreters? Survey question 42.

7. What does the Deaf consumer believe goes into a quality interpreter training program? Survey question 43.

Findings

Interpersonal skills research questions 1 and 2. Deaf and hearing respondents perceptions related to interpersonal skills were more similar than dissimilar. Perceptions related to soft skills categorized as interpersonal skills were aligned or closely aligned. Deaf and hearing respondents value flexibility, understanding, the ability to get along with diverse cultures, respect and cooperation, empathy and the ability to accept constructive criticism. These interpersonal qualities or soft skills were expanded by the respondents to include perceptions of professional conduct which encompassed presenting oneself well in the interpreting assignment, acting with diplomacy, and demonstrating ethical values. Deaf consumers believed that interpreters needed good boundaries, but emphasized that interpreters also needed professional conduct skills, i.e., to be on time and prepared for assignments. Additionally, hearing respondents emphasized that interpreters needed to be self-aware, socially aware, have an open mind, and have the ability to create trust in Deaf and hearing relationships. Deaf respondents strongly supported socialization with the Deaf community as a way to achieve cross-cultural skills and experience with diverse signing styles. While hearing respondents support understanding Deaf culture, they

did not emphasize accepting Deaf values; however, Deaf respondents clearly articulated that interpreters should agree with Deaf values. This was a major difference in perception between Deaf and hearing respondents and may imply that while Deaf values are understood and respected, agreement of all Deaf values may not be totally accepted by hearing interpreters. Socialization was strongly supported by the Deaf as a means to achieve cross-cultural knowledge and increase the ability to get along with diverse people through cultural exploration and exposure to diverse signing styles.

Overall, perceptions of interpreter qualification are more similar than dissimilar. Interestingly, greater value was placed on interpreters demonstrating soft skills or interpersonal skills by women as opposed to men who appeared to have stronger perceptions related to educational or technical requirements of qualification. These differences may be attributed to gender differences as opposed to whether one is hearing or Deaf.

Interpersonal or soft skills can be under girded, demonstrated, and strengthened by an interpreter's ethical standards and ability to present oneself well. Aristotle (Shaw & Barry, 1995) concluded that there was an, ideal of excellence, for any craft or occupation, that there must be an ideal of ideal of excellence for human beings and that when one attempts to find the ideal of excellence professionally and personally, one would succeed in finding happiness in life. Educators and leaders in the interpreting and Deaf community need to advocate for a more potent or rich understanding of ethics and develop or strengthen the ethical framework of interpreters at the beginning of the interpreting journey. A meaningful curriculum should emphasize and initiate discussion, exploration of interpreting, and cross-

cultural concerns with student learning outcomes that will raise the bar for motivation and morality thereby assisting the student in careful construction of an ethical platform to provide ethical congruence in the interpreting profession. Understanding one's motivations through reflection and mutual accountability can provide a meaningful opportunity to strengthen the ideal of excellence also as stated Aristotle. Transformational leadership that is modeled within interpreter training programs, by developers of curriculum, and stakeholders can support a process that engages both leader and follower to raise the level of motivation and morality (Northouse, 1997). Deaf and hearing educators, Deaf consumers, and interpreting leaders need to raise the present level of ethical accountability within the interpreting profession at the onset of interpreting training especially since ethical accountability and behaviors are valued.

Ralph Tyler exposits (1949) that learning occurs through the active behavior of students in the learning process. Learning occurs when students assume responsibility in the learning process. Students learn best when activities around particular functions, i.e., cross-cultural immersion and socialization occurs within a meaningful and experiential context. In this respect, comprehensive and expressive skills can flourish. Interpreter trainees would benefit from cross-cultural experiences throughout training with structured service learning opportunities through community-based agencies to enhance language acquisition and strengthen interpreting skills in a less formalized arena.

Cross-cultural interaction and socialization are important. They must be stressed to develop cross-cultural understanding, respect, and exposure to diversity within the Deaf community especially as it relates to a variety of signing modalities

and development of American Sign Language proficiency. Careful consideration of student learning activities should emphasize not only mentoring, or shadowing seasoned interpreters, but the possible development of a service learning component for interpreting students. A service learning component would emphasize immersion in Deaf culture through social events and/or structured learning service commitments to enhance ASL language acquisition. It would also provide opportunities to interpret for Deaf consumers on a small-scale in order to strengthen interpreting skills and build confidence.

Sign language skills. Deaf and hearing respondents perceptions related to sign language skills an interpreter should demonstrate are more similar than dissimilar. These similarities emphasize linguistic and language processing competency; the ability to adjust communication modalities between American Sign Language, PSE, and MCE upon request; matching the signers register; and, learning signs for specialized settings, which encompass educational, medical, legal, and religious interpreting venues. Socialization with the Deaf community and utilization of Deaf mentors, participation in internships and practicums were points of agreement in perception between respondents as a way to achieve signing competency. A driving force in the perceptions of the Deaf consumer continues to be the emphasis on socialization with the Deaf to reinforce bi-cultural knowledge and to perpetuate sign language proficiency. This would be inclusive of linguistic and idiomatic competency, coupled with sign-to-voice accuracy and creating trust between the Deaf consumer and interpreters. Cross-cultural experiences, mentorships, and internships provide a bridge between formal training, informal interaction, and professional employment as an interpreter.

Overall, there appears to be more similarity than dissimilarity in perceptions related to sign language skills qualified interpreters should demonstrate with a strong emphasis on socialization as a driving force by Deaf consumers.

Knowles et al. (1998) suggests that training includes any of the following: workshops, coaching, self-study, and practice. Balon (1998b) asserts that adult learners need training that is practical, realistic, and that can be utilized effectively. Balon also advocates that training effectiveness is enriched when the use of community is integrated into the training program. Balon feels that adult learners will see the link between training sessions and how the training can be practically applied within the community being served. Tyler (1949) believes that an educational program is not effective if the expectation to perform is unrealistic compared to what can be achieved. He suggests that one select the number of objectives that can realistically be attained in the time available for learning and determine which objectives are the most expedient in the learning process.

Children of Deaf adults as interpreters-research question 3. Deaf consumers and hearing respondents disagreed that CODAs are more qualified to interpret than hearing interpreters without Deaf parents. However, while there is a perception among some hearing interpreters that CODAs are qualified based on having a Deaf parent, it would be more accurate to say that this study indicates that CODAs are accepted and utilized as such because they are intrinsically enculturated and trusted by the Deaf community. CODAs bring a level of comfort and familiarity to the Deaf. However, Deaf consumers and hearing interpreters have indicated that while CODAs may be culturally aware, acculturated to Deaf culture, and could have idiomatic competency, they may not demonstrate linguistic competency in American Sign

Language based upon the following factors which could diminish their competency as an interpreter. These factors include:

1. The education level of the Deaf parent;
2. The usage of home signs;
3. The ability to interpret, ASL and English linguistic problems; and
4. The parents level of activity in the Deaf community.

Deaf consumers and hearing interpreters also perceive that CODAs often demonstrate inappropriate boundaries, lack appropriate interpersonal skills and ethical standards, yet their early exposure to ASL lends itself to idiomatic competency or an intuitive linguistic practicality. While hearing interpreters intimated that CODAs needed education and training, it was recognized by hearing interpreters that CODAs possess an intuitive practicality as it relates to cultural considerations and sign-to-voice skills. Deaf consumers also agreed that non-CODAs are capable of becoming qualified interpreters through skill, motivation, education, and certification. Qualification should be predicated on those qualities. Overall, Deaf consumers and hearing respondents disagreed that CODAs are more qualified to interpret than hearing interpreters without Deaf parents. However, there is an acknowledgement that perceptions of a CODA's qualification by affiliation are often predicated on subjective cultural distinctions made by the Deaf consumer and are influenced by the knowledge that a CODA has had an early exposures to ASL and enculturation. While subjective distinctions are made, there is also the cognitive recognition by the Deaf that individual motivation, understanding Deaf culture, ASL competency, educational attainment, and certification should predicate interpreter qualification.

Cultural affiliations-research question 4. Deaf consumers and hearing interpreters perceived that participation in Deaf cultural activities assisted an interpreter's American Sign Language competency by: a. Expanding sign vocabulary; b. improving receptive and expressive skills; c. increasing idiomatic competency; d. providing a forum for constructive feedback; and e. developing cross-cultural competency and cultural mediation skills.

Socialization or cultural affiliation provides opportunities to observe the idiosyncratic diversity of Deaf people and exposure to different or a variety of signing modalities. While these perceptions appear concrete to Deaf consumers, hearing interpreters do not perceive that cultural affiliation will necessarily increase interpreting skills. There appears to be a distinction between interpreting skills and increasing linguistic competency between respondent's perceptions. This is antithetical to Deaf consumers' perception that cultural participation, through socialization, improves language output, idiomatic and sign competency, and fluency thereby producing a better interpreter. Deaf consumers also perceive that the emotional nuances of American Sign Language can be obtained through cultural affiliation coupled with mentoring and that fluency evolves through socialization.

Acceptance by the Deaf community research question 5. Hearing respondents' perceptions, related to interpreter qualification by acceptance, appear to be predicated by personal considerations based on the level of trust the Deaf has for an interpreter, favoritism, intuition of the Deaf person, an interpreter's attitude, family ties, an interpreter's bond with the Deaf community, whether the interpreter is being mentored by a Deaf person, and whether the interpreter respects the Deaf community. Deaf consumers agree that qualification by acceptance of an interpreter can be based

on subjective standards, which indicate preference for an interpreter whom they feel comfortable with and trust versus an interpreter with requisite skill. Acceptance of an interpreter by Deaf consumers is based upon a case-by-case basis, and does not necessarily imply that interpreter has the skills needed or that one is qualified based on preference. It appears that the Deaf consumer's acceptance of an interpreter with less skill implies, by subjective standards, a comfort and trust in that particular interpreter.

Despite perceptions that Deaf consumers will accept a less qualified or skilled interpreter or cultural distinctions based on preference, Deaf consumers intimate acceptance of the interpreter does not necessarily predicate that the interpreter is qualified, but logically believe that interpreter qualification should be determined by evaluation of an interpreter's skills. Therefore, choice of an interpreter is, if possible, predicated by preference or personal considerations rather than the interpreter's qualification. Qualities that interpreters should possess and demonstrate related to trust, confidence, appropriate attitude would be indicative of the importance of interpersonal, i.e., soft skills and cross-cultural interaction between Deaf and hearing interpreters. There appears to be a synergistic relationship between soft skills; the ability to inspire trust, confidence, respect, attitude signing skill, and the ability to traverse cultural membership, with perceptions of qualities that interpreters need to possess to effectively negotiate cross-cultural interactions and interpreting assignments.

Deaf Consumer Desired Qualities for Interpreters Research Question 6

Deaf consumers' perceptions of desired qualities can be categorized into four distinct areas: 1. Perceptions of signing competencies; 2. Interpersonal skills and professional conduct; 3. Education; and 4. Deaf cultural competencies.

Signing competencies. Deaf consumers indicated that interpreters should demonstrate ASL fluency with a good command of ASL; the capability to utilize diverse communication modalities including: 1. PSE, MSE, or CASE; excellent sign-to-voice skills coupled with the ability to emote accurately; 2. the ability to execute clear finger spelling; and, 3. demonstrate signing confidence.

Deaf consumers also value good presentation skills that are inclusive of demonstrating the appropriate non-manual behaviors. These presentation skills include: appropriate facial expression, use of sign space, and emotive expression in the delivery of sign-to-voice presentation, and signing spoken messages.

Interpersonal skills. Deaf consumers value interpreters who are flexible, confident, and demonstrate professionalism while being friendly, polite, cordial and respectful in their interactions with Deaf consumers. Deaf consumers value interpreters who have good character and possess ethical standards; being on time for assignments, being professional and ethical, as well as well-mannered in their employment relationship appear to be qualities that Deaf consumers seek in interpreters.

Educational requirements. Deaf consumers value educational attainment and support interpreter training; workshops to increase signing and English competencies; development of presentation skills; and, sign-to-voice competency.

Deaf cultural competency. Deaf consumers value interpreter's participation in Deaf culture through socialization. Socialization leads to cultural competency through exposure to Deaf culture. Socialization with the Deaf has been a consistent theme throughout this study and indicates that this is an elemental driving force in developing language competency, cross-cultural understanding, building trust, and obtaining interpreting experience.

Deaf Consumers and Quality ITPs Research Question 7

Deaf consumers indicated four distinct categories related to recruitment considerations, instructional preferences, training outcomes, and cultural interaction. Deaf consumers indicated that male interpreters were needed especially for sensitive medical assignments. Deaf consumers further indicated that efforts should be focused on recruiting male interpreters. There were perceptions that screening tools should be utilized to determine appropriate fit for interpreting, which should include personality testing coupled with a signing prerequisite before entrance into an interpreting training program.

Deaf consumer perceptions strongly indicated their preference for Deaf involvement interpreter training suggesting the importance of using Deaf instructors, mentors, having collaborative partnerships with hearing educators, and more specifically, instructors in training programs who are closely affiliated with the Deaf community

Overall themes support active involvement of the Deaf in training and mentoring interpreters. The Deaf nonetheless have expressed intense feelings about instructional issues relative to teaching ASL and training interpreters and have

indicated their desire to participate in the process of instructing and training interpreters.

Recommendations

Recommendations in this study should be seriously considered as a dialogue to effect policy decisions related to the creation, development, and revision of interpreter training programs as it affects the development of interpersonal skills including personal conduct and ethical development, sign language competencies relative to the expansion of classes to include specialized signing modalities. Also this dialogue should encourage educational attainment to add knowledge-based skills that will support interpreting in a variety of settings including educational, medical, legal, industry, religious, and community-base settings. Careful consideration of marketing strategies to recruit CODAs, especially males, and to develop strategies to implement key stakeholders input on quality interpreter training programs would guarantee successful outcomes of goals implemented.

Develop interpersonal skills. The following suggestions are designed to develop interpersonal skills for interpreter trainees:

1. Create student learning outcomes that will strengthen positive interpersonal skill development in the following areas: professional conduct skills, cross-cultural mediation and advocacy skills, presentation skills, organizational skills, and ethical development to raise the level of ethical congruence at the onset of interpreting training.
2. Expand current cross-cultural interaction through service learning or supplemental instruction to increase cultural interaction between interpreting students and the Deaf community with student learning outcomes that achieve

development of cross-cultural understanding, exposure to Deaf values, building alliances, trust, and strengthening ASL language competency through linguistic exposure.

Develop sign language skills. To enhance sign language skills through cultural integration, interpreting students should be required to:

1. Actively participate in Deaf cultural events, extended mentorships, internships, and practicums to achieve linguistic and idiomatic competency. Designing supplemental instructional modules related to non-manual behaviors, idiomatic fluency, and sign-to-voice practicum with measurable student learning outcomes apart from required classes to support learning in the classroom may strengthen student-learning outcomes. These modules can be experiential, collaborative in nature, and utilize innovative technological advances to promote learning in a variety of settings outside the traditional classroom environment. The development of training programs and supplemental learning modules can be effectively linked to experiential learning modalities that utilize four progressive stages of learning: reporting, processing, generalizing, and application (Anonymous, 2000). Synthesis can occur when all of these elements produce change and learning can be effectively applied in the solution to real life interpreting situations. Instructional preference for these additional modules should be given to Deaf educators in order to guide the interpreter's learning experience culturally, linguistically, and expand the necessary link between the Deaf community, interpreting student, and the interpreter training programs.

2. Evaluation of present curriculum standards as it relates to cultural interaction, mentorships, and practicums would be useful to determine if present academic standards meet the need for developing cultural, linguistic, and idiomatic fluency for interpreting students, and are successful. Deaf and hearing educators should collaborate and determine realistic, measurable student learning outcomes for interpreting students.

3. Since interpreting students at community colleges and universities are generally adult students, pedagogical frameworks should be inclusive of linguistic and Deaf cultural activities developed to maximize the learning experience (Anonymous, 2000). Generally, adults learn best by doing, and possess learning styles that are categorically different from children. Learning is achieved when adult students participate and assume responsibility for the learning. This would imply active learning versus passive learning. Consequently, educators and stakeholders should anticipate the needs of adult learners in order to make meaningful decisions in curriculum development; and

4. Assess the needs and skills, i.e., strengths, weaknesses, and learning styles of present interpreting students, to gauge student learning styles and utilize data to develop future learning outcomes which target specific learning styles to present different learning modalities to support and strengthen student learning thereby encouraging positive achievement results.

Educational attainment and post-graduate training. Deaf and hearing respondents present findings that support education; continuing education through workshops; mentoring; training in specialized areas; linguistic competency, which

perpetuates ASL and English fluency; and, socialization with the Deaf to develop language and cross-cultural skills. While education and training are perceived as necessary and valued for interpreter qualification, socialization with the Deaf continues to be a driving force through the data collected in this study. Overall, males reported a more positive attitude towards education than females in this study. This may be reflective of gender perceptual differences rather than differences in perceptions between hearing and Deaf respondents. Deaf respondents clearly articulated the perception that an interpreter should have a 4-year or 6-year degree in Deaf Studies while hearing respondents indicated that a degree in any subject would be acceptable. The findings suggest support of educational achievement as a perception of interpreter qualification by Deaf and hearing respondents with Deaf respondents clearly indicating that completion of a 4-year or 6-year degree in Deaf Studies and/or Communication was more desirable than a degree in any subject.

Deaf and hearing respondents clearly support educational attainment for interpreters. Therefore, education is important and should be appropriated to enhance an interpreter's overall understanding of general education in math, science, history, art, and specific disciplines, which develop a broad knowledge base and increase literacy skills. Education can increase English literacy skills, oral presentation skills, and provide exposure to cross-cultural diversity within post-secondary settings that allow for experiential learning outside of a student's cultural orientation. General education and cross-cultural experiences can enhance an interpreter's ability to feel comfortable in a variety of interpreting settings that may require a knowledge base consistent with post-secondary educational and diversified cultural experiences.

Kirkpatrick (1993) tells us that learning can be defined by evaluation of attitudes changed and what knowledge and skills were learned. He further believes that evaluation apprises reaction, learning behavior, results of training, and that effective trainers aspire to evaluate all training activities to gage the success or failure of the training to produce desired learning outcomes within the educational process.

The following recommendations are consistent with Tyler's (1949) supposition that evaluation should occur in four stages inclusive of a collection of baseline data, a formative evaluation to address the need for changes as the curriculum in implement, and a summative evaluation at the formal termination of a curriculum terminating with a follow-up evaluation. They are also consistent with building alliances between stakeholders to improve quality education/training programs and ensure readiness for certification by strengthening interpersonal, sign language fluency, and cultural competencies.

Interpreter training programs. Suggestions for 2-year and 4-year interpreter training programs include:

1. Continue to develop partnerships with internal and external stakeholders in order to shape or revise organizational goals and training programs by sharing best practices and adding the body of knowledge available to benefit key stakeholders, i.e. educators, administration, curriculum committee, Deaf community, and interpreting students.
2. Assess the needs and skills, i.e. strengths, weaknesses, and learning styles of present interpreter trainees, based upon understanding adult learning theories and internal motivations of interpreter trainees' desire to be an interpreter.

3. Customize present interpreter training programs with learning outcomes based on the data collected in formative and follow-up evaluation assessment by creating activities or learning outcomes that specifically target and strengthen cross-cultural interaction, socialization, interpersonal, technical skill, and ethical development for interpreter trainees.

4. Strengthen and solidify shared partnerships, thereby allowing new patterns of thinking to emerge to produce continuity, sequence, and integration of organized learning experiences. Continuity perpetuates the ongoing vertical reiteration of major curriculum elements. Sequence goes beyond continuity by stressing the importance of building knowledge from successful experiences. Integration unifies the body of knowledge relative to the learner's behavior in relation to learning experiences (Tyler, 1949).

5. Develop an appropriate evaluation instrument to disseminate at the completion of 2-year and 4-year training program and assess similarities and differences in student learning outcomes and determine whether students are prepared for certification upon completion of the interpreting training program.

6. Evaluate assessment of training (summative evaluation) and implement changes recommended by training participants to modify and improve the student learning outcomes of the training program.

7. Develop additional classes and multiple learning outcomes by including opportunities to broaden sign language skills in specialized areas inclusive of medical, legal, community-based venues, Manually Coded English, and

Pidgin Sign Language. Develop and/or strengthen ethics-based curriculum, and cross-cultural experiences.

8. Expand 2-year program by adding additional classes in specialized areas, i.e. medical, legal, community interpreting, MCE, and PSE.

Recruitment of CODAs as interpreters. To mitigate current interpreter shortages, actively recruit CODAs for interpreter training programs with a marketing plan that will pay close attention to the needs of CODAs. Design and implement sign language classes specifically designed for CODAs that will correct ASL linguistic deficiencies prevalent in home signs and strengthen English literacy. Also consider:

1. Target CODAs, especially males, for recruitment into interpreter training programs.

2. Continue to utilize and increase Deaf instructors, Deaf mentors, internships and practicums with service agencies that are managed by Deaf.

3. Explore the feasibility of using screening tools to determine appropriate fit for perspective interpreters; and,

4. Implement signing prerequisites for students to pass before admission to interpreter training programs.

Cultural affiliation opportunities.

1. Socialization with the Deaf is essential to evolving ASL fluency and remaining in the forefront of linguistic transitions. To develop linguistic and cultural competencies, interpreting students should be required to increase opportunities for socialization through supplemental instruction provided by supplemental instruction leaders who are Deaf, mentoring, and attending Deaf events with greater frequency.

2. To support interpersonal, cultural, technical skills, and ethical development for interpreting students, appropriate student learning outcomes should be developed to occur concurrently with socialization requirements.

3. Develop and strengthen core ethic classes through exploration of case studies, role-playing of ethical dilemmas to enhance ethical decision making skills, and create an ethical life statement to reflect that reflects emotionally healthy and appropriate boundaries in relationships based upon readings, discussion, and ethical decision making opportunities.

Collaborative affiliation with the Deaf community. To increase collaboration and improve quality of interpreter training programs:

1. Educators and stakeholders of interpreting training programs should continue to build collaborative relationships with the Deaf community and provide opportunities for interpreter training students to develop the ability to inspire trust, signing confidence, respect for Deaf cultural values, and signing skills through continued cultural interaction using extended internships, practicums, mentoring, cultural experiences, and courses designed to evaluate and streamline interpersonal and personal conduct skills.

Building desired interpreter qualities. Suggested strategies include:

1. Initiate, develop, implement, and revise courses that use diverse communication modalities, for example, PSE, MCE, or CASE;

2. Initiate, develop, implement, and/or restructure courses, which focus on the development of interpersonal skills, ethical standards, and professionalism to perfect and strengthen professional conduct skills.

3. Encourage professional and personal development for interpreter trainees and interpreters.

4. Require internships, practicums, and mentoring that utilize community service agencies to broaden interpreting experiences.

5. Socialization with the Deaf is a driving force in establishing signing and cultural competencies. Continue to encourage socialization between interpreting students and the Deaf community by creating learning activities that allow the interpreting student to effectively integrate cultural experiences while improving ASL fluency in real-life settings.

6. Provide meaningful cultural experiences with student learning outcomes to increase expected language competency coupled with the development of cross-cultural understanding, and opportunities for ethical evaluation while developing a personal ethical statement for individuals working in a bicultural setting.

Implications for Further Study

The investigator recommends further study to measure student-learning outcomes at the completion of an interpreting training program. This study would analyze whether learning was effective by documenting strengths and weaknesses of the interpreting training curriculum according to student's perceptions. Further investigation of the effectiveness of present interpreter training marketing strategies would most likely assist in developing, enhancing, and/or revising marketing programs for the sole purpose of recruiting, training, and retention of potential interpreters specifically targeting CODAs and males. Effective and purposeful recruitment of interpreters, especially CODAs may alleviate interpreter shortages.

Conclusion

American Sign Language is a subtle, elegant, powerful language of rich, complex linguistic structure. Preserving the integrity of American Sign Language within its cultural context is mandatory for the perpetuation of sign language and Deaf culture. Perpetuation of Deaf culture, respect for Deaf community, understanding why the Deaf community feels strongly about its participation in interpreting training programs and their belief that the Deaf are the best role model for language acquisition, were central themes in Deaf consumers' perceptions in relation to interpreter qualification.

Proactive leadership by educators and stakeholders in developing and perpetuating excellent interpreter training programs is needed to produce qualified interpreters who can meet and/or exceed present certification standards. Interpreter training programs should not be designed without creating a transformational environment in which individuals can personally and professional actualize, contribute to the common good, and share in the reward of a job well done. Autry (1991) espoused that those in leadership should recognize the values and humanness of people and that leaders benefit by building relationships that motivate people to perform at their highest level of achievement while Ghandi once expressed the sentiment that, "if we are to work beyond the walls, we must look beyond the self" (Drucker, 1999). Hesselbein, Goldsmith, and Somerville (1999) intimated that leaders must be able to utilize a conceptual framework outside past paradigms to maximize resources and create successful outcomes. This is balanced by their assertion that relationships are key to organizational success and that leaders must be able to form and re-form partnerships where mutual trust, respect, commitment to specific goals

will ultimately guarantee mutual success. Educators and key stakeholders responsible for developing, improving, revising, maintaining a standard of excellence, and effecting, designing, implementing, and revision of policy within interpreting training programs will need to be sensitive to paradigms shifts that may naturally occur during interpreting training and Deaf consumer's viewpoints and needs. The ability to reconcile opposing cultural viewpoints, foster and maintain alliances, maintain broad connections through collaboration and consensus, and determine what constitutes effective best practices to train and produce qualified interpreters will be key for successful interpreting training programs. In order to build effective interpreting training programs, individual and collaborative relationships must be nurtured and built on principles of respect, understanding, and acceptance. There must be a firm commitment to train interpreters who can provide optimal performance and excellence thus demonstrating best practices relative to interpersonal, sign language skill, and educational competencies that other interpreter training programs can utilize.

REFERENCES

Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, Pub.L.101-336 (1991).

Anderson, N. & Easterbrooks, S. (1999, April). *Current status of interpreter certification for students who are deaf or hard of hearing.* Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Council of Exceptional Children. Charlotte, NC.

Anonymous. (2000). *Training adults: Experiential training models*. Retrieved March 15, 2004, from http://hab.hrsa.gov/test/tg/tg/-4b.htm.

Anonymous. (2004). *GLAD'S position on ab2921*. Retrieved May 7, 2004, from http://www.gladinc.org/press.htm.

Armstrong, D.F., & Stokoe, W. (1995). *Gesture and the nature of language.* Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

Autry, J.A. (1991). *Love and profit: The art of caring leadership.* New York: William Morrow and Company.

Balon, D. (1998a). *Training briefs: Assessing and addressing member training needs.* Washington, DC: Mosaica: The Center for Non-Profit Development and Pluralism.

Balon, D. (1998b). *Training briefs: Integrating community into training*. Washington, DC: Mosaica: The Center for Non-Profit Development and Pluralism.

Berleson, B. (1952). *Content analysis in communication research.* Glencoe, IL: Free Press.

Bruck, L. (1978). *Access: The guide to a better life for disabled Americans*. New York: Random House.

Bruner, J.S. (1966). *Toward a theory of instruction.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

California Education Code, § 300.23.

California Education Code, § 56100(a) and (i).

California Education Code, § 56363.

California Code of Regulations, Title 5, § 3051.16(b)(1).

Code of Federal Regulations, Title 34.

Code of ethics draft ready soon for public review. (2003, May). *Views, 20* (5).

College district handles interpreter shortage by making them part of the team. (2003). Disability Compliance for Higher Education: Successful Strategies for Accommodating Students and Staff with Disabilities, *8*(7).

Colonomos, B. (1992). Reflections of an interpreter trainer. *The Reflector, (2),* pp. 5-14.

Costly or not, institutions must provide reasonable accommodations. (2004). Disability Compliance for Higher Education: Successful Strategies for Accommodating Students and Staff with Disabilities, *9* (4).

Craig, R.L. (1996). *The ASTD training and development handbook*. New York: McGraw Hill.

Crystal, D. (1987). *The cambridge encyclopedia of language*. Boston: Cambridge University Press.

Dahl, C. & Wilcox, S. (1990). Preparing the educational interpreter: A survey of sign language interpreter training programs. *American Annals of the Deaf*, *135* (4), 275-279.

Deaf students claim interpreters weren't qualified to provide service. (2004). Disability Compliance for Higher Education: Successful Strategies for Accommodating Students and Staff with Disabilities, *9* (8).

Drucker, P. F. (1999). *Management challenges for the 21st century.* New York: HarperCollins Publishers, Inc.

Dubow, S., Greer, S., & Peltz-Strauss, K. (1992). *Legal rights: The guide for deaf and hard of hearing people.* Silver Spring, MD: National Association of the Deaf.

Elder, M. (1993). Deaf survivors of sexual abuse: A look at the issues. *Moving Forward Newsjournal*, *2* (5).

Frishberg, N. (1988). Signers of tales: The case for literary status of an unwritten language. *Sign Language Studies*, *59*,149-170.

Frishberg, N. (1990). *Interpreting: An introduction*. Silver Springs, MD: Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf.

Gannon, J.R. (1981). *Deaf heritage: A narrative of deaf America*. Silver Spring, MD: National Association of the Deaf.

Goodlad, J.I. (1979). *Curriculum inquiry*. New York: McGraw Hill.

Goodlad, J.I. & Richter, M.N., Jr. (1966). *The development of a conceptual system for dealing with problems of curriculum and instruction.* Cooperative Research Program, USOE, Project No. 454, Los Angeles, CA.

Green, C. (2003a, August 18). Black and white rainbows. [Msg 23688]. Message posted to http://tech.groups.yahoo.com/groups/terps-l/message 23688.

Green, C. (2003b, March 21). [Msg 21790]. When is the best time.....? [Msg 21790]. Message posted to http://tech.groups.yahoo.com/group/terps-l/message/21790.

Grosz-Sager, N. (2002, Fall). Educational interpreter standards approved. *IMPACT (Independently Merging Parents Association of California). Newsletter*, p.1.

Gustason, G. (1985). Interpreters entering public school employment. *American Annals of the Deaf*, *130*, 265-266.

Gustason, G. (1994) University and college programs for personnel in deafness. *American Annals of the Deaf*, *136*, 259-272.

Harvey, H.B. (2004, March 20). New assembly bill affecting interpreters. [Msg 25265]. Message posted to http://tech.groups.yahoo.com/group/terps-l/message/25265.

Hayes, P.L. (1992). Educational interpreters for deaf students: Their responsibilities, problems, and concerns. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 53* (02), 462. (UMI No. AAT92188857)

Hesselbein, F., Goldsmith, M., & Somerville, I. (1999). *Leading beyond the walls.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Hiatt, D.B. (1990). *Curricular decision-making*. Revised from paper presented at Educology, Canberra, Australia, 1986, at Pepperdine University, Malibu, CA.

Hiatt-Michael, D. (in press). *Changing the workplace to community learning organization.* Paper presented at the 24th Annual Conference of The Society of Educators and Scholars, Long Beach, CA.

Higgins, P. (1979). Outsiders in a hearing world, *Urban Life, 8* (1), 5

Houle, C.O. (1961). *The inquiring mind*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.

Huffman, C. (2004, March 19). New assembly bill affecting interpreters. [Msg 25259]. Message posted to http://tech.groups.yahoo.com/group/terps-l/message/25259.

Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), Pub. L. No. 94-142, 89 Stat. 773 (1975).

Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). (1997).

Jones, A. (2004). Continuing education critical to professional development. *Views, 21,*2.

Jones, B., Clark, G., & Soltz, D. (1997). Characteristics and practices of sign language interpreters in inclusive education programs. *Exceptional Children*, *63*, 257-268.

Jones, B.E. (1993). Responsibilities of educational sign language interpreters in K-12 public schools in Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, *55* (05), 1241. (UMI No. AAT9425925)

Kirkpatrick, D. (1993). *How to train and develop supervisors*. New York: American Management Association.

Knowles, M.S., Holton, E.F. & Swanson, R.A. (1998). *The adult learner*. Worburn, MA: Butterworth-Heinemann.

Lane, H. (1992). *The mask of benevolence: Disabling the deaf community*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf Publishing.

Lane, H., Hoffmeister, B, Bahan, B. (1996). *A journey into the deaf-world*. San Diego, CA: DawnSign Press.

Lentz, E.M., Mikos, K., & Smith, C. (1988). Vista: American sign language series, functional notational approach signing naturally. San Diego, CA: DawnSign Press.

Lewis, L., Farris, E., & Greene, B. (1994). *Deaf and hard of hearing students in postsecondary education.* (NCES94-394). Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office.

Madjidi, F. (1996). *Understanding statistics: Custom course packet*. Malibu, CA: Campus Custom Publishing, Inc.

Marschark, M., Sapere, P., Convertino, C., Seewagen, R., & Maltzen, H. (2004). Comprehension of sign language interpreting: Deciphering a complex task situation. *Sign Language Studies, 4*(4), 345-368.

McCall, C. (2000). *Understanding statistical methods: A manual for students and data analysts*. San Jose, CA: Kinko's ExpressYourselfPress.

McIntire, M. (1991). *Implementation of a national endorsement system for interpreter preparation programs*. Northridge, CA: Conference of Interpreter Trainers.

McKenzie, S. & Starwalker, M. (2002). *Mt. San Jacinto college district: Proposal for a program in english/asl interpreter training program leading to a certificate and/or associate degree*. San Jacinto, CA: Submission to the MSJC Curriculum Committee.

McMillan, J.H. & Schumacher, S. (1997). *Research in education: A conceptual introduction.* New York: Addison Wesley Longman, Inc.

Miles, M.B., & Huberman, A.M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis* (2nd ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publishing.

Mt. San Jacinto College. (2002). *Mt. san jacinto college master plan 2000-2005.* San Jacinto, CA: Mt. San Jacinto College Printing Office.

NAD interpreters to come into rid certification maintenance program and ethical practices system. (2003, February). *Views, 20*(2).

Northhouse, P.G. (1997). *Leadership: Theory and practice.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Padden, C.A. (1987) *Sign Languages*. In J.V. Cleave (Ed), *Gallaudet Encyclopedia of Deaf People and Deafness*. New York: McGraw Hill.

Padden, C.A., & Humphries, T. (1988). *Deaf in America: Voices from a culture.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Parvaz, D. (2004a, March,20). New assembly bill affecting interpreters. [Msg 25267]. Message posted to http://tech.groups.yahoo.com/groups/terps-l/message/25267.

Parvaz, D. (2004b, March 20). New assembly bill affecting interpreters. [Msg 25270]. Message posted to http://tech.groups.yahoo.com/groups/terps-l/message/25270.

Pollock, J. (2004, March 19). *Re: Fw: New assembly bill affecting interpreters-important.* [Msg 25253]. Message posted to http://tech.groups.yahoo.com/groups/terps-l/message/25253.

Pollack, J. (2004, March 20). Fw: New assembly bill affecting interpreters- important. [Msg 25237]. Message posted to http://tech.groups.yahoo.com/groups/terps-l/message/25253.

Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf. (2007). *Standard practice papers*. Retrieved January 10, 2007, from http://www.rid.org./interpreting/overview/index.cfm/aid/59.

Rehabilitation Act of 1973, § 504, 29 U.S.C. 791 et seq.,

Richardson, J.G. (1996). Court interpreting for deaf persons: Culture, communication, and the courts. *State Court Journal*, *20*,(1). Retrieved March 10, 2004, from http://wwwmcsc.dni.us/is/memos/S99-1242.htm.

Rutherford, S.A. (1988). The culture of American deaf people. *Sign Language Studies*, *59*, 129-147.

Ryan, G.W., & Bernard, H.R. (2004). *Techniques to identify themes in qualitative data.* Retrieved March 8, 2004, from http://www.analytictech.com/mb870/ryan-bernard techniques.

S.A. 2912, 2203-4 Leg., Reg. Sess. (CA 2004).

Sanderson, G., Siple, L, & Lyons, B. (1999). *Interpreting for postsecondary deaf students*. (Report on the National Task Force on Quality of Services in the Postsecondary Education of Deaf and Hard of Hearing Students). Rochester, NY: Northeast Technical Assistance Center, Rochester Institute of Technology.

Schein, J.D., Mallory, B.L., & Greaves, S. (1991). *Communication for deaf students in mainstream classrooms*. Alberta, Canada: University of Alberta, Edmonton.

Schick, B., & Williams, K. (1991). *Communication for deaf students in mainstream classrooms*. Alberta, Canada: University of Alberta, Edmonton.

Senge, P. (1990*). The fifth discipline*. New York: Bantam Doubleday Dell Publishing Group, Inc.

Shapiro, G., & Markoff, J. (1997). Latent coding. In G.W. Ryan and H.R. Bernard's techniques to identify themes in qualitative data. Retrieved April 20, 2004, from http://www.analytictech.com/mb870/ryansbernard_techniques_to_identify_themes_in.htm.

Shaw, W.H., & Barry, V. (1995). *Moral issues in business*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company.

Shroyer, E. & Compton, M. (1994). Educational interpreting and teacher preparation: An interdisciplinary model. *American Annals of the Deaf*, *139*(5), 472-478.

Simon, J.H. (1994). An ethnographic study of sign language interpreter education. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, *55* (05), 1211. (UMI No. AAT9426564)

Smith, R.M. (1982). *Learning how to learn.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Cambridge.

Sorenson Communications. (2005). *Meeting the growing need for American sign language interpreters.* Salt Lake City, UT: Sorenson Communications, Inc.

Stokoe, W. C. (1980). *Sign and culture: A reader for students of American sign language*. Silver Spring, MD: Linstok Press.

Stuckless, R., Ashmore, D., Schroedel, J., & Simon, J. (1997). *Introduction: A report of the national task force on quality of services in the post-secondary education of deaf and hard of hearing students*. Rochester, NY: Northeast Technical Assistance Center, Rochester Institute of Technology.

Stuckless,R., Avery, J., & Hurwitz, A. (1989). *Educational interpreting for deaf students: Report of the national task force on educational interpreting*. Rochester, NY: National Technological Institute for the Deaf/Rochester Institute of Technology.

Taylor, C. & Elliot, R. (1994). Identifying areas of competence needed by educational interpreters. *Sign Language Studies, 83*, 179-190.

Tyler, R. (1949). *Basic principles of curriculum and instruction*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Universities scramble to provide accommodations for deaf students. (2000). Disability Compliance for Higher Education: Successful Strategies for Accommodating Students and Staff with Disabilities, *6*(4).

U.S. Department of Education. (1988). *To assure the free appropriate public education of all handicap children: Tenth annual report to congress on the implementation of public law 94-142, the education for handicapped children act*. Washington, DC: State Program Implementation Studies Branch of the U.S. Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services.

Vocational Rehabilitation Act Amendment, Pub.L. No. 89-333, 79 Stat.1282 (1965).

Wilcox, S. (1989). *Foreign language requirement? Why not American sign language*? Washington, DC: Eric Clearinghouse on Languages and Linguistics.

Wilcox, S. (1992). *Academic acceptance of American sign language*. Silver Spring, MD: Linstok Press.

Wilcox, S. (2003a). *Universities that accept ASL in fulfillment of foreign language requirement.* Retrieved June 30, 2004 from http://www.unm.edu/~wilcox/SLFl/univlist.html.

Wilcox, S. (2003b). *Why is ASL a language?* Available: http://www.cabrillo.cc.ca.us/divisions/flac/sis/cstem/asllanguage.html.

Womack, J.R. (2004a, March 20). New assembly bill affecting interpreters. [Msg 25266]. Message posted to http://tech.groups.yahoo.com/group/terps-l/message/25266.

Womack, J.R. (2004b, March 20). New assembly bill affecting interpreters. [Msg 25260]. Message posted to http://tech.groups.yahoo.com/group/terps-l/message/25260.

Woodward, J. (1972). Implications for sociolinguistic research among the deaf. *Sign Language Studies*, *l,* l-7.

APPENDIX A: Survey Cover Letter

April 18, 2003

Mr. Joe Anonymous
1245 Any Street Road
Anywhere, CA 90002

Dear Mr. Anonymous:

My name is Victoria Stuard. I am a doctoral student in Organizational Leadership at Pepperdine University writing my dissertation on Interpreter Qualifications for the Deaf. As an associate professor teaching American Sign Language at a local community college, an assistant professor at a private university, and an NAD Level IV certified interpreter, I am interested in pursuing research that will benefit the interpreting profession and the deaf community as consumers of interpreting services.

Enclosed is a survey about interpreter qualifications. This research will document the perceptions of professional interpreters and deaf consumers toward interpreter qualifications which differ from prevailing standards. There may be implications for interpreter training.

Your participation in this survey is voluntary. There are no risks involved in your participation and all demographic information will remain confidential. Your participation will provide valuable feedback in determining if there exists a gap between "what is" and "what should be" when defining interpreter qualifications. When the dissertation is complete, the results will be available to you.

If you are willing to participate in this research study, please complete the enclosed form and return it in the enclosed envelope no later than _____.

Please feel free to contact me with any questions or concerns related to this survey. You can reach me at (626) 815-6000, extension 3321, or through my e-mail account at VStuard@apu.edu.

Sincerely yours,

Victoria Stuard, M. A., NAD IV

INFORMED CONSENT FOR SURVEY PARTICIPANTS

If you would like to participate in this study on Interpreter Qualification, please sign this informed consent to indicate that you understand and agree that:

1. Your name and identity will remain confidential and you will be identified by an alpha numeric code. The alpha numeric coding key will be kept in a locked file cabinet in my office.
2. Excerpts from the qualitative questions of this survey may be part of the final research report, but your name will not be used.
3. Your participation in this study is voluntary. If you decide you do not want to participate, inform the investigator and your survey will not be included in the research study.
4. Any and all data that is collected for this study will be used for research purposes only and under the guidance and supervision of the Pepperdine University faculty in the Graduate School of Education and Psychology.

I agree to participate as a survey respondent in this dissertation study under the conditions stated above.

_____

Signature of Participant Date

Victoria L. Stuard
(xxx) xxx-xxxx
Vstuard@apu.edu
Pepperdine University
18111 Von Karman Avenue
Irvine, CA 92612
(949) 223-2500

Doctoral Program in Organizational Leadership
Dr. Cara Garcia/Dissertation Chair
Graduate School of Education and Psychology

APPENDIX B: Survey Instrument

Questionnaire of Characteristics of Qualified Interpreters

1. Demographic Information.

We would like to know about you. Please complete this section of the survey by checking the boxes.

Educational Background:

Degree: Associate __ Bachelors __ Masters __ Two-year Interpreter Training Program __ Four-year Interpreter Training Program __

Certification: Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf National Association of the Deaf __

None __

Signer Information: Deaf ___ Hearing ___

Number of Certified Years of Experience: ____ Yr. ____ Mo.

Signer Information: Native ___ Non-native ___

Years Signing ___ Yr. ____Mo.

Years of Professional Experience: With Certification ___ Yr. ___Mo.

Without Certification ___ Yr. ____Mo.

Gender: Male ___ Female ___

2. Interpersonal Skills

We are interested in your opinion about the interpersonal skills that qualified interpreters should have. Please circle your response below as follows:
Key: Strongly Agree (SA) Agree (A) Disagree (D) Strongly Disagree (SD)

In your opinion interpreters should be able to:

1.	Show that they understand Deaf culture	(SA) (A) (D) (SD)
2.	Be flexible and willing to change according to the needs of the Deaf when interpreting	(SA) (A) (D) (SD)
3.	Work cooperatively in a team interpreting situation	(SA) (A) (D) (SD)
4.	Work cooperatively with the Deaf client	(SA) (A) (D) (SD)
5.	Show patience while interpreting for diverse Deaf clients	(SA) (A) (D) (SD)

6. Show respect towards Deaf consumers (SA) (A) (D) (SD)
7. Accept constructive criticism from Deaf consumers (SA) (A) (D) (SD)
8. Accept constructive criticism from supervisors (SA) (A) (D) (SD)
9. Be on time for all assignments (SA) (A) (D) (SD)
10. Agree with Deaf values (SA) (A) (D) (SD)
11. Adhere to a code of ethics (SA) (A) (D) (SD)
12. Maintain confidentiality in relation to interpreting assignments (SA) (A) (D) (SD)
13. Are there any other interpersonal skills you believe that an interpreter should have?

Write in Space

3. Sign Language Skill Levels as a Result of Interpreter Training Programs

We are interested in your opinion about sign language skills that interpreters who have graduated from Interpreter Training Programs should have. Please circle your response below as follows: Key: Strongly Agree (SA) Agree (A) Disagree (D) Strongly Disagree (SD)

In your opinion, an interpreter graduating from an interpreter training program should be able to:

14. Interpret in American Sign Language and be clearly understood by the Deaf consumer (SA) (A) (D) (SD)
15. Interpret a conversation comfortably (SA) (A) (D) (SD)
16. Use Pidgin Signed English if the Deaf consumer requests that sign system (SA) (A) (D) (SD)
17. Use manually coded English if the Deaf consumers requests that sign system (SA) (A) (D) (SD)
18. Use "slang" that is popular among Deaf consumers (SA) (A) (D) (SD)
19. Interpret from American Sign Language with conceptual accuracy (SA) (A) (D) (SD)
20. Sign-to-voice from spoken English with conceptual accuracy (SA) (A) (D) (SD)
21. Feel comfortable using public speaking skills during sign to voice translations (SA) (A) (D) (SD)
22. Feel comfortable using his/her facial and body language while using American Sign Language (SA) (A) (D) (SD)

23. Accurately convey the spirit and intent of a Deaf consumer's conversation while sign to voicing (SA) (A) (D) (SD)

24. Pass certification standards from RID or NAD (SA) (A) (D) (SD)

25. Are there any other sign language skills that an interpreter graduating from an Interpreter Training Program should have?

Write in Space

4. Education Requirements for Qualified Interpreters

We are interested in your opinion about education that is necessary to be considered a qualified interpreter. Please circle your response below as follows:
Key: Strongly Agree (SA) Agree (A) Disagree (D) Strongly Disagree (SD).

In your opinion a qualified interpreter should:

26. Be considered qualified if they have graduated from a two year interpreter training program (SA) (A) (D) (SD)

27. Be considered qualified if they have graduated from a four-year interpreter training program (SA) (A) (D) (SD)

28. Make every effort to attend sign language workshops to improve language and interpreting skills (SA) (A) (D) (SD)

29. Have certification to be considered qualified (SA) (A) (D) (SD)

30. Have a bachelors degree in Deaf studies (SA) (A) (D) (SD)

31. Have a masters degree in communication (SA) (A) (D) (SD)

32. Have a bachelors degree in any subject (SA) (A) (D) (SD)

33. Have a masters degree in any subject (SA) (A) (D) (SD)

34. Participate in a one-year internship program in addition to training in an interpreter training program (SA) (A) (D) (SD)

35. Have access to a mentoring program designed to develop understanding of Deaf cultural values (SA) (A) (D) (SD)

36. Be mentored by a culturally Deaf person (SA) (A) (D) (SD)

37. Not be required to participate in any formal training for interpreting because learning American Sign Language would be enough to interpret in any situation (SA) (A) (D) (SD)

38. Are there any other educational requirements that you feel are necessary to become a qualified interpreter?

5. Cultural Connections and Qualified Interpreters

Please write your opinions about the following questions.

39. Some people believe that interpreters, who have Deaf parents, are more qualified to interpret than interpreters who have hearing parents. Do you agree or disagree? Why?

Write in Space

40. Some people believe that interpreters who spend more time with the Deaf and participate in Deaf cultural activities are able to interpret better than those interpreters who do not spend time with the Deaf community. Do you agree or disagree? Why?

Write in Space

40. Some people believe that interpreters are considered more qualified to interpret by the Deaf if they are accepted by the Deaf Community regardless of their interpreting skill level. Do you agree or disagree? Why?

Write in Space

41. As a Deaf consumer, what skills and qualities do you look for when you need an interpreter to interpret for you?

Write in Space

42. As a Deaf consumer, what advice would you like to give Interpreter Training Programs to help them train and develop qualified interpreters?

Note: Individual responses are confidential. Descriptive statistics and content analysis will be utilized to summarize data.

Thank you for taking time to answer these questions.

APPENDIX C: Content Validity Rating Instructions

Directions: In order to determine content validity and reliability for this Questionnaire of Characteristics of Qualified Interpreters, please read the questions below and indicate whether the question is Not Relevant (NR), Somewhat Relevant (SR), Relevant (R), or Very Relevant (VR). Please feel free to comment on the validity of questions 13, 25, 37, 38, 39, 40, and 41. Your comments will ensure content validity and comprehensibility of the questionnaire.

Attachment: Survey Instrument.

APPENDIX D: Panel of Experts

In order to ensure the content validity of the survey data instrument, each question on the Questionnaire of Characteristics of Qualified Interpreters will be reviewed for content validity by a panel of experts. This panel of experts includes:

1. Marilyn Findley, M.S.; CSC
Independent Consultant: Interpreting and ADA Professional Expert
Dynamic Communications West
Counselor – Specialist on Deafness
Mt. San Jacinto College
San Jacinto, CA 92583

2. Carman Hall, M.A.
Chief Executive Officer
Hearing Consumer
Pacific Lifeline Shelters
Upland, CA

3. Brenda McCleese, M.A.
Director, Vineyard Deaf Ministries
Deaf Consumer
Long Beach, CA

4. Kathy Rock-Veyit, AA, NADIII
Manager, Deaf Services
Dayle McIntosh Center
Garden Grove, CA 92843

5. Sonia Wilson, B.A.
Deaf Consumer
Azusa, CA 91702

APPENDIX E: Instruction Letter to Panel of Experts

Date

Panel Member
1245 Any Street
Anywhere, CA 90002

Dear Expert Member:

Thank you for agreeing to participate as an expert member on a panel to review the content of the Questionnaire of Characteristics of Qualified Interpreters in order to validate the efficacy and comprehensibility of this survey that is related to interpreter qualification. A copy of Chapter One is included with this letter to assist you in determining whether the questions asked in the survey are relevant to interpreter qualification.

Please read the attached questionnaire and determine whether the questions are clear, comprehensible, and relevant to this study on interpreter qualification. The content validity rating sheet lists each question with a corresponding Likert-type scale that has a numerical value of one to four. Please indicate if the question is (1) not relevant, (2) somewhat relative or (3) relevant. Questions that are either relevant or somewhat relevant will be included on the questionnaire. Survey questions that are not relevant will be discarded. Please comment on the relevancy of the qualitative questions listed as survey question 12, 25, and 38-43 respectively. Survey questions will be edited or deleted according to your input as an expert member of this panel.

If you have any questions about these instructions, please call me at (626) 815-6000, Extension 3321, and I will answer your questions. Once again, thank you for your time and participation on this panel to validate the content of this survey data instrument. I have enclosed a Starbucks Coffee Card® to express my appreciation for your participation.

Sincerely yours,

Victoria Stuard, MA; NADIV

APPENDIX F: Script for Deaf Consumers

English Translation:

My name is Victoria Stuard. What is your name? I attend Pepperdine University. I am a doctoral student. I am researching perceptions of qualifications of interpreters of the Deaf. I am interested in the Deaf consumers perception of a qualified/skilled interpreter. Are you interested in completing a survey that would tell me your perception of a qualified interpreter? If so, please complete this survey. When you have completed the survey, I will give you a Starbucks coffee card, with a candy bar to express my appreciation for your time. Your name and any personal information about you will be confidential. There is no danger or personal risk to you physically or emotionally in participating in this survey. Your participation may help interpreter training programs learn how to produce better interpreters. Thank you.

ASL Translation for Investigator:

I/me name V-i-c-t-o-r-i-a S-t-u-a-r-d. You name what? I/me d-o-c-t-o-r-a-l learn+er. I/me study what-for? Ed.D. Where? Pepperdine University. I/me research. Research what? Perceptions/opinions Deaf users interpreters. I/me want understand what you think qualified/skill interpreter. Interpreter become qualified/skill? How? Tell me-explain what q-u-a-l-I-f-I-e-d interpreter. You interested finish survey paper with questions? If true, please finish survey. You finish survey you, I/me give-you Starbucks coffee card with candy. What for? I/me demonstrate appreciation for finish survey. You name private. Information private. Danger you none. Danger physical none. Danger emotional none. You join help I-T-P's learn become better, make qualified/skill interpreters. Thank you.

ASL Translation for Deaf Intermediary:

I/me name (fingerspell name). You name what? I/me Deaf help + er. I/me help V-i-c-t-o-r-i-a S-t-u-a-r-d. What-for? I/me help Deaf. Do-do research. Research what? Perceptions/opinions Deaf users interpreters. I/me want understand what you think qualified/skill interpreter. Interpreter become qualified/skill? How? Tell me-explain what q-u-a-l-i-f-i-e-d interpreter. You interested finish survey paper with questions? If true, please finish survey. You finish survey you, I/me give-you Starbucks coffee card with candy. What for? I/me demonstrate appreciation for finish survey. You name private. Information private. Danger you none. Danger physical none. Danger emotional none. You join help I-T-P's learn become better, make qualified/skill interpreters. Thank you.