JEFFREY E. DAVIS

Teaching Observation Techniques to Interpreters

Education is not preparation for life; education is life itself.
John Dewey

All human science is but the increment of the power of the eye.
John Fiske

Observation is one of the hallmarks of professional work, and developing this expertise is a priority for most professions (e.g., teaching, medicine, psychology, counseling, human services, law, interpreting). Depending on the profession and theoretical orientation, there are various approaches to teaching and applying observation skills. Clearly, the observation techniques used by classroom teachers will be different from those employed by medical professionals. On the other hand, professions that involve very different work settings may share the same principles for conducting observation. Consider the observation techniques (e.g., participant observation

Many of the observation techniques described in this chapter were developed between 2001 and 2004 during the collaborative project between the University of Rochester Medical Center (UR) and the University of Tennessee (UT) and supported by the Fund for the Improvement of Post-Secondary Education (grant #P116B010927) from the U.S. Department of Education. I am extremely grateful to my UT faculty colleagues Marie Griffin and Carol LaCava for their exceptional instructional teamwork and to our UR faculty collaborators, Robert Pollard and Robyn Dean, for generously sharing with us their cutting-edge approaches to interpreter education. Special thanks to Ellis Bacon for discussing with me some of the ideas presented here and for providing a place up in the Great Smoky Mountains for me to write. I take responsibility for the "interpretations" presented in this chapter; any "miscues" are my own.

and ethnography) that have been developed and implemented by cultural anthropologists and that are applicable to other professions (e.g., medicine, journalism, sociology, interpreting). However, interpreters are not trained as anthropologists, and these techniques must be *specifically adapted to fit the world of interpreting work*. In one such approach, which will be highlighted here, Dean and Pollard (2001 and 2005) have developed a descriptive and analytic schema specific to interpreter work, and in collaboration with other interpreter educators and practitioners, they have adapted this framework to the education, observation, and supervision of interpreters (see Dean et al. 2004; Dean, Pollard, English 2004).

As an interpreter, teacher, and researcher for the past three decades, I have followed a multidisciplinary approach to enhancing my work, particularly in conducting observations, analyzing context, enhancing mentorship, and providing meaningful feedback. Fortunately, there is now a body of knowledge in the field of interpretation that clarifies the parameters of the interpreter's role, illuminates the realities of interpreting work, and suggests best teaching practices. Current research and innovative teaching approaches suggest there are better ways to address what we basically know. That is, the interpreted message is determined or at least largely influenced by contextual factors such as setting, purpose, and participants (see Cokely 1992; Metzger 1999; Napier 2002; Roy 2000b; Wadensjö 1994; Winston and Monikowski in this volume).

Along similar lines, Dean and Pollard (D and P hereafter) have presented a new approach to studying the interpreting context and have made a compelling case that in addition to language and culture, the work of interpreters is influenced by the demands of the physical environment, the interpersonal dynamics of the individuals present, and even intrapersonal factors. Although most would agree that awareness of contextual factors and discourse processes is critical to successful interpretation, the way we teach and acquire these skills is another matter. This chapter provides an overview of some observation and contextual analysis techniques relevant to interpretation and describes my experience using D and P's innovative approach to making observations and analyzing context.

Overview of Observation Approaches

First, consider the ethnographic approaches first used by anthropologists to describe culture and now employed by several disciplines in the human sciences to describe the interrelationship between language and culture. How are these observational approaches best adapted for use by sign language interpreters? Traditionally, anthropologists and sociolinguists have followed an ethnographically based methodology to describe the interrelationships between languages and cultures (e.g., Geertz 1973, 1983; Hymes 1974; Saville-Troike 2003; Spradley 1979, 1980). Ethnography has been shown to be a powerful observation and descriptive tool, and this approach has been adapted to the study of interpreting contexts and used to gather information about the interpretation process (e.g., Simon 1994). For instance, discourse analysis employs an interdisciplinary approach and ethnography to study language use in specific communicative contexts. Three ethnographically based approaches that seem particularly relevant to observation and the study of interpreting contexts are discourse analysis (Schiffrin 1994), ethnography of communication (Saville-Troike 2003), and participant observation (Spradley 1980).

Discourse Analysis

Discourse analysis has been successfully applied to the study of interpreting contexts and specifically to teaching interpreters (e.g., Metzger 1999 and this volume; Roy 2000a, 2000b; Winston and Monikowski this volume). Discourse analysis can be broadly defined as "an examination of language-in-use or the study of actually occurring language ('texts') in specific communicative contexts" (Schwandt 2001, 57). Sociolinguists use ethnographic methodology and conversational analysis to observe the relationship between language and society and the ways various discourse features reflect certain social configurations. Metzger (this volume) proposes that "interpreters' work is discourse." Discourse analysis has contributed to our understanding of how the role of the interpreter is more than

a passive and neutral conveyor of others' words and thoughts. Roy (2000a, 10) tells us, "Interpreting is a discourse process in which interpreters are active participants who need to know about and understand interactional behavior as well as explicit ways in which languages and cultures use language and how that changes our perception of what interpreters do." This perspective suggests that the ability to quickly survey and assess the multiple factors operating in a particular interpreting context is critical to successful interpretation and an expertise that is likely to be enhanced by developing keen observation skills. The notion of interpreter as active (or interactive) participant warrants further research and has implications for interpreter education. In sum, one interprets in context, not in a vacuum; thus context is a strong ally for an interpreter.

The Ethnography of Communication

The ethnography of communication (Saville-Troike 2003) explores how and why language is used and how its use varies from culture to culture. A central concept here is *communicative competence*, first introduced by Dell Hymes (1974), an anthropologist and one of the pioneers in the field of sociolinguistics. In essence, when we learn to use a language, we learn how to use it in order to do certain things that people do with language, and communicative competence accounts for this kind of ability. Gumperz (1972, 205) defines the term as follows: "Whereas linguistic competence covers the speaker's ability to produce grammatically correct sentences, communicative competence describes his ability to select, from the totality of grammatically correct expressions available to him, forms which appropriately reflect the social norms governing behavior in specific encounters." Subsequently, Hymes (1974) introduced an ethnographic framework, commonly known by the acronym SPEAKING, to describe contextual factors and the nature of the communicative message (see appendix). What Hymes makes clear is that there is more to understanding how language is used than describing the syntactic composition of sentences or specifying their propositional content. Getting students to focus beyond the word

level is a major challenge for interpreter educators. Hymes's framework can be used to introduce interpreting students to the multiplicity of factors (e.g., setting, purpose, participants) beyond the lexical level that influence the outcomes of the interpreted message. Hymes's model is central to Saville-Troike's textbook (2003) *The Ethnography of Communication*. An example of how this ethnographic approach has been successfully adapted to the study of interpreting contexts can be found in the 2000 curriculum published by the National Multicultural Interpreting Project (NMIP), funded by the Department of Education. During the initial three years of the NMIP project, an extensive task analysis of interpreting in multicultural settings (where much interpreting work takes place) was undertaken. It was evident that interpreters working in multicultural settings must have keen observational skills. Recognizing this, the NMIP curriculum employed the ethnography of communication to increase interpreters' awareness of multiple contextual factors that exist across a range of multicultural settings (Mooney et al. 2000, 1–37).

Participant Observation

Participant observation is an ethnographic approach, recognized as the hallmark of cultural anthropology, that is now widely used as a method of research in numerous other disciplines (e.g., organizational communication, political science, sociolinguistics, education, sociology, medicine). The primary objective of this qualitative research approach is to gain valuable insights from the perspectives of the participants. Stated differently, it is a way to get inside the thought worlds of the participants. According to DeWalt and DeWalt (2002, vii), "participant observation has been used to develop this kind of insight in every cultural setting imaginable, from non-Western cultures little understood by Western social science to ethnic group and sub-cultural groups within North American and European settings." Participant observation is closely linked to ethnography and is an effective means of conducting fieldwork that involves developing keen observation skills, enhanced short-term

memory, informal interviewing techniques, and special note-taking skills. The skills developed in this observation approach also have important relevance for interpreter research, education, and practice. For example, I have used Spradley's textbook (1980) *Participant Observation* to teach and study various contexts (including interpreting). Spradley combines ethnographic interviewing techniques with guidelines for participant observation to teach how to make ethnographic descriptions. This qualitative research methodology can be adapted to observe and analyze a variety of interactive contexts and applied to teach students, practitioners, and researchers to do ethnography through participant observation. This research method offers intriguing possibilities given the importance of observation for interpreters and the complex role of interpreters as active participants in the interpreted event. Professionals working on the front lines of a discipline can offer insights unavailable through other research approaches. In the field of education, we talk about the value of "teacher as researcher," and the same can be said about "interpreter as researcher." This principle is reflected in the present volume, in which the authors are practicing interpreters and teachers.

Rather than being an exclusive tool of anthropologists, ethnography has applications across the human sciences. "It is the one systematic approach in the social sciences that reveals what people think and shows us the cultural meanings they use daily" (Spradley 1980, vii). Ethnography provides in-depth observation analyses of contextual factors, which we know influence the outcome of the interpreted message. It offers a way for students of interpretation to learn that a high level of awareness of contextual factors is critical to interpretation/translation. Ethnography, of course, was designed more as a research methodology than as a way to teach interpreters. At the same time, it helps us sort through questions about interpreters as participants in what is typically a highly interactive communicative context. This process leads us to the notion of interpreting as a reflective practice. That is, interpreters must be ever vigilant as they work in a variety of contexts and encounter a multiplicity of factors (and demands). To be successful requires a high level of

sociolinguistic competency, contextual analysis skills, and the willingness and ability to give and receive feedback. Having considered these major observation-based approaches, I would now like to share my experience and describe some of the benefits of using the demand-control (D-C) schema designed specifically for analysis of interpreting work.

The Demand-Control (D-C) Schema for Interpreting Work[1]

I have been studying and applying the D-C schema for interpreting work since 2001. For interpretation to be successful, interpreters must have the ability to quickly survey, assess, and deal with the multiple factors evident in a particular interpreting context. I have found that the D-C schema meets this need, is complementary to the sociolinguistic approaches described above, and presents a cogent way to conduct observations and analyze contextual factors. This pragmatic method links theory with professional practice, creating an awareness of the range of "control options" available to interpreters in response to a variety of contextual factors. Along with the development of observational skills, this approach combines teaching the value and consequences of various translation choices with ethical and effective decision making. (See Dean and Pollard 2001, 2005; Dean, Pollard, and English 2004 for a more detailed account of D-C-based instructional approaches, especially observation-supervision.)

The EIPI Template

D and P designed the D-C schema to account in the broadest way for the demands (contextual factors) encountered by interpreters.

1. The D-C schema for interpreting work was adapted by Dean and Pollard (2001, 2005) from D-C theory based on occupational health research conducted by Karasek (1979) and Karasek and Theorell (1990).

Stated differently, demands are contextual challenges (in addition to language and culture) that emerge in the course of doing interpretation. This idea forms the central tenet of the D-C schema. EIPI stands for the following categories of factors:

- **E**nvironmental (factors specific to the assignment setting, e.g., roles of the consumers, terminology specific to the setting, physical surroundings)
- **I**nterpersonal (factors specific to the interaction of the participants, e.g., cultural differences, power dynamics, alignment issues, differences in funds of information[2])
- **P**aralinguistic (factors specific to the expressive skills of the d/Deaf and hearing consumers, e.g., style, pace, volume, accent, clarity of the linguistic forms that the interpreter hears and sees)
- **I**ntrapersonal (factors specific to the physiological and psychological state of the interpreter, e.g., fatigue, physical reactions, distracting thoughts or feelings)

Controls of the Interpreter

Based on Karasek (1979) and Karasek and Theorell (1990), Dean and Pollard defined controls as follows: "Controls are skills, characteristics, abilities, decisions, or other resources that an interpreter may bring to bear in response to the demands presented by a given work assignment" (Dean and Pollard 2001). Control options employed by interpreters may include the following:

- education
- preparation for the assignment
- experience
- behavioral actions or interventions

---

2. *Funds of information* refers to the unique perceptions, preconceptions, and interactional roles of the consumers (cf. Pollard 1998). Along similar lines, D and P make frequent reference to *thought worlds*, a term taken from Namy (1977, 25), who wrote, "Interpreting is more than transposing one language into another. . . . It is throwing a semantic bridge between two people from differing cultures and thought worlds."

- positive self-talk
- translation decisions (examples presented later in chapter)

D and P define translation decisions as "specific word or sign choices or explanatory comments to consumers" what some might call linguistic and cultural adjustments. Positive self-talk is an instance of "the simple yet powerful act of consciously acknowledging the presence and significance of a given demand and the impact it is having on an interpreting assignment." D and P stress that "the term *control* is a noun, not a verb, and is preferably stated as *control options*" (Dean, Pollard, and English 2004, 67). In the D-C schema, the control options of the interpreter are divided into three major temporal categories:

1. Before the assignment (education, language fluency, and assignment preparation)
2. During the assignment (behavioral and translation decisions)
3. After the assignment (follow-up behaviors and continuing education)

Through EIPI analysis, students learn to describe and assess appropriate control options (i.e., evaluate their decision latitude) in response to the demands of an interpreting job. The EIPI template provides a framework for students, practitioners, educators, and mentors (and potentially consumers and professionals from other disciplines) to engage in meaningful dialogue about the outcomes of various actions and translation choices that emerge during interpretation. Designed specifically for the analysis of interpreting work, it has been shown to have application across a range of interpreting contexts. See Dean and Pollard (2005) for a more detailed description of the scope of the D-C schema and its numerous applications.[3]

3. Faculty training is critical to the successful application of the D-C schema. For information about training opportunities and research in the D-C schema for interpreting work, see http://www.urmc.rochester.edu/dwc/news.htm.

Curricular Collaboration and Implementation

From 2001 to 2004, faculty from University of Rochester Medical Center (UR) and the University of Tennessee (UT) were involved in a collaborative project titled Reforming Interpreter Education: A Practice Profession Approach.[4] The purpose of this three-year project, supported by the Fund for the Improvement of Post-Secondary Education, was to implement the D-C schema for interpreting work throughout UT's baccalaureate interpreter preparation program (IPP) curriculum and evaluate its effectiveness. As the project progressed, a number of other IPPs and interpreter mentors also began employing elements of the D-C schema (see Dean, Pollard, et al. 2003). Five courses were developed or adapted by UR researchers and implemented by UT faculty. The highlight of the UR-UT project has been the implementation of observation-based coursework designed to enhance students' interpersonal skills and ethical and translational decision-making skills, and to provide a realistic understanding of the contextual factors that impact interpreting work (see Dean and Pollard 2005; Dean, Pollard, and English 2004; Dean, Davis, et al. 2003).

Observation Enhancement

Most interpreter training programs introduce students to observation by encouraging them to participate in Deaf community events and to observe interpreters working in a variety of public settings. Sometimes these assignments involve interviewing the interpreter or Deaf people at the event and writing a report that may or may not include students' observations. These assignments tend to focus on observing the interpreter or understanding the signed message, and sign choices and signing styles receive much attention. Certainly, language immersion and cross-cultural experience are essential to

4. For a description of this project, see: http://www.urmc.rochester.edu/dwc/scholarship/Education.htm.

the development of linguistic and communicative competence. At the same time, we must give full consideration to the best ways to develop in-depth observation and contextual analysis skills across a variety of potential interpreting scenarios during pre-service training.

The observation, practicum, and supervision hours required by other professions (e.g., teaching, medicine, and law) far surpass those required in interpreter training. To help address this apparent gap in interpreter education, the D-C schema incorporates an observation-supervision teaching tool adapted from problem-based learning (PBL). This educational approach is in line with a growing movement away from teacher-driven (didactic) classrooms and toward student-driven education (see Dean and Pollard, 2005). The PBL movement in medical education "was developed in response to the critique that newly graduated physicians were lacking in their ability to interview and diagnose patients (interpersonal skills) and their ability to critically think through patient care and treatment decisions (judgment skills)" (Dean et al. 2004, 152). In a PBL approach, first-year medical students might, for example, learn medical information contextually (i.e., through interactive involvement in patient cases). Observation-supervision[5] is a central tenet in the D-C schema and reverses traditional educational approaches (supervision is commonly used in the practice professions and will be discussed later in this chapter). Rather than starting from the point of memorizing terminology and the code of ethics and moving toward context, interpreting students are first immersed in real-world settings and are encouraged to derive terminology and translation questions from these firsthand observations across a variety of contexts (even when no d/Deaf people are present). This approach enables students to analyze the demands (job requirements) and controls (decision making) relevant to future interpreting scenarios in which they may be involved, and it provides a common language

5. "Observation-supervision posits that, in light of the more holistic view of interpreting work emphasized by the D-C schema, learning about specialty content work (e.g., legal, medical, mental health) is optimized by being in those specific environments and understanding the goal of those environments, the characteristics and motivations of the people present, and the typical communication exchanges that occur in those settings" (Dean, Pollard, Davis et al. 2004, p. 152).

and fosters a safe and meaningful learning environment among students and between learner and teacher, mentor, and supervisor. The objective is for students to gain valuable insights into the "funds of information" brought to the situation by key participants. Observing, analyzing, and engaging in such meaningful dialogue about interpreting work is an alternative to the "sink or swim" approach that is commonly found in the field (see Dean and Pollard 2001 and 2005).

Demand-Control Coursework

The first D-C course in an IPP was team taught by UT faculty Marie Griffin and me with instructional support provided by Robyn Dean. In this course, students were first introduced to the D-C schema and were taught how to apply the schema to a variety of contexts. The students used a series of exercises called situational analyses, including stimulus material in the form of pictures, television show segments, videotaped material, guest lectures, or events in the community (moving gradually from noninterpreted to interpreted events). Judging from the students' performance and feedback, this application of the D-C schema enhanced observation skills through the EIPI analysis of hypothetical interpreting contexts. These activities increased the students' awareness of the control options available to interpreters in response to certain contextual demands, thus enhancing their critical decision-making skills. The noninterpreted events were expanded into "hypothetical interpreting assignments" in order to help student quickly identify contextual demands and discuss the available control options. Observation opportunities in the first D-C course were made available in a variety of ways:

- observation material provided by the teacher or the student
- observation material reviewed either for one specific demand category or for the entire D-C spectrum of EIPI demand categories and control options
- in-class (simulated), or out-of-class (in-vivo) activity
- large-group or small-group activity;

Keep in mind that although the D-C instructional activities described below were implemented in the IPP at UT, these activities have also been widely used in other instructional formats (Dean and Pollard, in press; Dean et al. 2004).

During the UR-UT project, it became evident that the D-C schema could be presented in what Dean et al. call "four distinct elements" (2004, 151).

1. A *theoretical construct* (i.e., its conceptual framework, rationale, principles, and terminology)
2. A *dialogic work analysis* (i.e., situational analyses expanded into hypothetical interpreting settings in which students consider both positive and negative consequences relative to control options, thus enhancing critical thinking and decision making)
3. A *learning tool* (i.e., PBL-style and observation-supervision)
4. An *assessment tool* (Dean and Pollard, 2005)

The D-C schema as a theoretical construct and dialogic work analysis can be introduced during any foundation course, such as principles of interpreting or introduction to interpreting. Dean, Pollard, Davis, and colleagues (2004, 153) report that "unlike the first two D-C schema elements, PBL-style courses and observation-supervision *require significantly more teacher training and adaptation or augmentation of the curriculum*" (my emphasis).

The situational analysis activities showcased in this chapter were designed by Robyn Dean for the first Application of D-C Theory to Sign Language Interpreting course offered at UT. The faculty has subsequently used these activities in other courses, such as the summer Basic Interpreter Training Program. After a description of these instructional activities, I will discuss my experience with the D-C schema as a learning tool.

Simulated Observation Activities

Picture analysis is an in-class simulated observation tool that can be introduced early in the semester. It was first developed by D and P as a way to teach the analysis of the EIPI demand categories in var-

ious interpreted settings. This instructional technique has been successfully demonstrated in various workshops around the country, such as the 2001 Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf (RID) Conference, and in the first D-C course taught at UT. For the picture analysis, the instructor or the students bring in pictures, from magazines or other sources, that look like a potential interpreted setting. The instructor and the students create an interpreting scenario to go along with a picture. Various people in the picture are assigned specific roles (e.g., the interpreter, consumers who are Deaf and those who are hearing, other participants, etc.). After the students are presented with the picture stimulus and scenario, they are asked to predict and discuss the potential EIPI demands that might emerge. Students can work in groups to analyze the picture and accompanying scenario for different EIPI demands. There are several variations of this exercise. For instance, each group can focus on a different EIPI demand category for a more in-depth analysis. Students are asked to consider this question: "How would the EIPI demands affect your job?" After a comprehensive EIPI analysis is accomplished, the controls before, during, and after the assignment are discussed. The picture analysis activity has the following objectives:

- teach the application of EIPI analysis to interpreting scenarios
- develop observation skills
- enhance prediction skills in preparation for interpreting work
- increase understanding of the demands encountered during interpreting work
- introduce students to control options that are available to interpreters

Another simulated activity for situational analysis is the *television show excerpt*. Students use a segment from a television program or movie to practice demand-control analysis. For example, in the first D-C course, Robyn Dean provided the instructors with excerpts from the television show *ER*. In this case, most students were familiar with the characters and story line. To facilitate this type of situational analysis, the instructor provides the hypothetical scenario and

chooses the excerpt for the class to watch. (Students could also analyze a television show excerpt as a homework assignment.) To get the activity started, students describe what they know about the backgrounds of the main characters (race, ethnicity, professional training, significant others, etc.) and discuss what is currently happening in the character's life. This is an excellent activity to help students understand what it means to get inside the thought world of the participants.

Creating another scenario from the clip, the instructor (or students) can specify who the Deaf person might be in each scenario. Introducing a hypothetical Deaf character and interpreter into the scene dramatically shifts the perceptions of demands and opens up the discussion for other considerations. This is an excellent activity for highlighting environmental demands (specific to the emergency room setting in this case) and interpersonal demands (interpreting for the patient, family members, health-care worker). Video clips that illustrate paralinguistic and intrapersonal demands can also be selected to give the full range of potential demands that might be encountered. This is a good "drill" activity to teach students to quickly observe and assess the demands of a situation they walk into.

Expert groups are another way to apply the D-C schema and EIPI analysis. Naturally, it may be overwhelming at first for an individual student to concentrate on all four demand categories simultaneously. A way around this problem is to divide the class into "expert groups" and assign one of the EIPI demand categories to each group. Concentrating on a single demand category allows students a more in-depth analysis, and working in a small group demonstrates what is possible given adequate time, attention, and teamwork. A similar outcome is achieved by assigning individual students to focus on one demand category. As students gain expertise with the analysis and become more confident, they will be able to examine all four demand categories simultaneously and readily apply this observation skill to a variety of settings.

The war story analysis is useful later in the semester, after students are comfortable with applying the D-C schema to a variety of settings. This activity is a good way to get students to consider the

demands and controls of a specific interpreted setting involving Deaf consumer, hearing consumer, and interpreter participants. In this activity, the instructor invites a working interpreter to class as a guest speaker (and fully informs the interpreter of the purpose for the visit). The instructor requests that the guest interpreter come to class prepared to share a true story (or two) of a challenging interpreting assignment. As the guest interpreter shares a story, students (individually or in small groups) begin to list the specific demands (in written notes or on the blackboard behind the speaker) that are evident in the story. Dean (reported in Davis and Griffin, 2002) proposed this activity as a way to get students to think on their feet.

Although it may seem somewhat risky to share so-called war stories with beginning interpreting students, the UT instructors found this activity to be one of the most beneficial offered in the D-C course (Davis and Griffin 2002). The feedback we received from the guest and from the students in the class echoed this opinion. The guest was impressed by the depth of analysis demonstrated by the students, and the students reported that they appreciated knowing up front some of the challenges encountered during interpreting work and felt most of them could be addressed through the application of appropriate controls.

Other variations on this activity are to invite a variety of guests (e.g., a spoken language interpreter, a Deaf consumer of interpreting, a hearing consumer of interpreting, etc.) at different times to share their experiences with the class. Teachers might consider telling their own interpreting stories to allow the students to practice the D-C analysis before inviting guests. The RID *Views*, other RID publications, and Mindess (1999) are good sources for additional scenarios. Incidentally, our class guest told us that he was not distracted by the students' writing down the EIPI demands on the board behind him as he lectured. In this approach, space is given on the board for each EIPI demand category, and one student is assigned to concentrate on each category. The students must recognize and write down the demands in their category that emerge from the guest interpreter's story. Each student is given the opportunity to ask the guest interpreter questions about the demands and

discuss controls that were or were not applied. Ideally, the guests will share what they might have done differently before, during, and after the assignment. This may not be comfortable for all guests, however, and the nature and purpose of the activity should be described at the time the invitation is extended. As a follow-up activity during a subsequent class session, Marie Griffin and I (2002) suggest "red-heart interpreting" stories (stories that demonstrate how interpreting is rewarding despite the challenges). Students expressed appreciation for having a variety of perspectives presented.

During the first D-C course, students were also required to complete a series of out-of-class observations. Students observed several events that were not interpreted or based in the Deaf community. Each of the following types of events was observed: (a) an off-campus event, (b) a cross-cultural event, and (c) an interactive group meeting. The purpose was for the students to learn to apply the principles of the D-C schema to a variety of real-world monologic and interactive contexts that might hypothetically be interpreted. To summarize, both in-class and out-of-class observation activities were used to introduce students to the D-C schema. First, the EIPI analysis was practiced in class with various videotaped or simulated materials and hypothetical interpreting scenarios. Second, the EIPI analysis was applied to a range of noninterpreted events outside class. As observations progressed, students began to consider the range of control options that would be available had these events actually been interpreted. Finally, students practiced applying the D-C schema to an interpreted event in the field. For the final observation assignment in the first D-C course offered at UT, students worked in groups to conduct a full-scale EIPI analysis for a community-based interpreted event (e.g., city, county, or state government public forum, local deaf service center or state commission for the deaf event, religious service, theatrical production, etc.). Throughout the project, a four-step learning approach was followed (learning, applying, integrating, and demonstrating).

For the final assignment, the students presented the D-C schema and analysis to different groups of working interpreters at the uni-

versity and in the community. That is, teams of students prepared and made a group presentation on what they learned from the D-C course. The audiences for the students' presentations were as follows:

- educational interpreters for kindergarten through high school
- postsecondary educational interpreters
- the local RID chapter professional meeting at the community outreach program for the Deaf
- a group of local interpreters specializing in interpreting in religious settings
- a class of beginning interpreting students enrolled in the Principles of Interpreting class

Marie Griffin and I were present at each of the student team presentations. D and P attended the presentation to the Principles of Interpreting class. Some of the professional interpreters attending the students' presentations reacted as follows (Davis and Griffin 2002):

- "Didn't expect to learn from students' presentations but actually learned a lot"
- "Impressed with the level of sophistication and depth of analysis of students' discussions of the work"
- "This all seems so obvious, so why didn't I think of it before?"

Teaching Interpreting Specialty Courses via Observation-Supervision

The next two courses offered during the UT-UR project were Medical Interpreting and Educational Interpreting. Both were taught by means of PBL and observation-supervision. UT students enrolled in these two courses had already mastered the D-C schema during the first course in the sequence. Thus they were prepared to use it to analyze a variety of real and potential interpreting contexts "unencumbered by interpreting responsibilities (as

in a practicum/internship)" and not "blinded by a singular focus on sign vocabulary (as with observations of working interpreters)" (Dean, Davis, et al. 2003, 1).

For example, in the Medical Interpreting course, students shadowed physicians during appointments with hearing patients at the UT Medical Center. Course participants were "exposed to basic medical knowledge, varied medical settings, and typical doctor-patient interactions and conversations through direct observation, in contrast to the superficial, non-contextualized learning that takes place through traditional classroom or workshop instruction methods" (Dean, Davis, et al. 2003). Robyn Dean made the logistical arrangements with the Medical Center and designed the course, and after each series of observations, students would research relevant medical information that emerged during the medical appointments. Students were encouraged to "use medical dictionaries, texts, and medical websites to further their understanding of anatomy (e.g., what does the liver do?), medical procedures (e.g., what happens in an angioplasty?) and more" (Dean, Davis, et al., 2003, 10).

Class time for the medical course was conducted as a "group supervision meeting."[6] *Supervision* here means "a regularly-scheduled time when advice and guidance is given, in order to address specific practice challenges and decisions or professional development in general. The interpreting profession uses the similar but less formal construct of mentorship." The instructor responds to "students' questions and promotes their understanding of the interpreting practice implications of their observation recordings" (Dean, Davis, et al. 2003, 10). For both the Medical Interpreting and the Educational Interpreting courses, Dean developed special observation forms, based on the D-C schema, for students to document, analyze, and report their observations. Then, during the group supervision sessions, students discussed these observations and were guided by the faculty to "consider a range of potential re-

6. *Supervision* (a common term in the practice professions) is used by D and P to describe one of *the most critical elements of applying the D-C schema as a learning tool* (see Dean and Pollard 2005; Dean et al. 2004).

sponses, including translational, attitudinal, and behavioral options. This fosters an open discussion about the implications or consequences of such decisions, in contrast to a rigid, unhelpful focus on *right and wrong*" (Dean, Davis, et al. 2003, 11). The medical course benefited the students by affording them the following opportunities (Dean, Davis, et al. 2003, 11–12):

> In class, students and faculty discuss translation choices (and their implications) for doctor's statements and questions such as:
>
> - At your next appointment, you must provide us with ejaculation fluid.
> - I'm sorry. There is nothing more we can do for your mother but we will try to make her comfortable.
> - This medication is better for you because it is short acting and safer.
> - Are you feeling dizzy, is the room spinning, or are you lightheaded?

And we discuss options for responding to scenarios like:

- Where do you stand during a treadmill stress test so you can be seen?
- What if the doctor continues to talk to a patient who is coming in and out of consciousness?
- What if the patient has raised a concern about being discharged from the hospital but the doctor doesn't seem to hear or acknowledge it?
- How can you show the concern and empathy that the doctor displays vocally and through intonation in a visual manner?
- How does translation time lag and time elongation affect the people and their interactions and how can the negative impact of that be lessened? (12)

In addition to the benefits of discussing these translation, attitudinal, and behavior responses, this training approach has numerous other benefits:

> Students are interacting and working with patients and medical professionals. Witnessing medical appointments helps students to develop a comfort level and respect for the vulnerable position patients

> are placed in when their personal medical history is discussed and physical exams/procedures are performed. They also are privy to the unique perspective of the physician (their communication goals, their ethical dilemmas, their frustrations, etc.), which will help them in their future interpreting work. Lastly, the students have the unique experience of seeing themselves as "practice professionals" working alongside other practice professionals (Dean, Davis, et al. 2003, 12).

My experience with the application of observation-supervision through the D-C schema is that it provides instructors, supervisors, mentors, and interpreting students new and meaningful ways to make decisions and explain their work. Perhaps most important, the students can see how their decisions, like those of physicians, teachers, and other professionals, have consequences, and the exchange of ideas with their colleagues will help them assess those consequences.

Conclusion

The central theme of this chapter has been the importance of observation for professional development of interpreters. Various observation techniques, including ethnographically based approaches such as discourse analysis, participant observation, and ethnography of communication offer valuable contributions, and a new approach to interpreter preparation, the D-C schema for interpreting work, is an excellent way to teach observation skills. Although these approaches represent somewhat different theoretical orientations, they are complementary and significantly contribute to our understanding of the interpreting context. During a three-year collaborative project, the D-C schema was successfully implemented in the IPP at UT. The UT interpreting faculty sees the pedagogic applications of the D-C schema as spiraling and ongoing. Numerous other IPPs, interpreter educators, and mentors around the country have started employing elements of the D-C schema in teaching, mentoring, and supervising interpreters. (See Dean, Pollard, and English

2004 and Dean et al. 2004 for much more information about these activities.)

Observation-supervision similar to that used in the practice professions (e.g., education and medicine) provides a way for more experienced professional interpreters to observe and assess the performance of entry-level interpreters, and vice versa (i.e., it offers a linkage between preservice and in-service training). This linkage enhances professional development, competence, and consumer protection (Dean and Pollard 2005). The D-C schema offers an important and often missing link between the classroom and the field. Developed specifically with interpreting work in mind, it provides a highly practical framework and common language that is applicable across a variety of interpreting settings (educational, medical, mental health, legal, vocational, etc.) and useful to both preservice and in-service interpreting levels. A major highlight of the D-C schema is that it reverses traditional approaches. Rather than starting from the point of rote memorization of specialized vocabulary and ethical tenets and moving toward context, the D-C schema is student driven and context centered. That is, students are immersed in real-world settings and encouraged to derive terminology and translation questions from observations across a variety of contexts. In addition to the numerous benefits described in this chapter, the D-C approach also:

- Informs teaching, practice, and research
- Complements other approaches (e.g., discourse analysis and service learning)
- Enhances other skills known to be critical to effective interpreting (e.g., note taking, translation, exegesis, critical decision making, etc.)
- Applies to a variety of specialized settings (educational, medical, legal, etc.)
- Fosters teamwork, mentoring, and practicum experiences
- Encourages consumer education and professional collaboration
- Contributes to train-the-trainer efforts

In conclusion, no one method offers a panacea. However, techniques that are solidly grounded in theory and research are needed to enhance the way we teach and work as interpreters. Although interpreter preparation should help lay a solid foundation for professional development, the realities of interpreting work contexts (and the participants therein) also determine to a large extent how much one grows as a professional interpreter. This is the unique contribution of observation—to understand interpreting in specific contexts; to predict challenges, conflicts, and concerns that might arise in the field; and to design a professional development plan (for self-improvement) based on that understanding. This is why observation is so critical. It cogently reveals the patterns of best practice that professional interpreters use to meet the challenges raised by working in a diversity of contexts in order to successfully interpret.

References

Cokely, D. 1992. *Interpreting: A sociolinguistic model.* Burtonsville, Md.: Linstok Press.

Davis, J., and M. Griffin. 2002. The University of Rochester-University of Tennessee collaborative project. Paper presented at the biennial conference of Postsecondary Education Programs. Kansas City, Mo.

Dean, R. K., and R. Q. Pollard. 2001. Application of demand-control theory to sign language interpreting: Implications for stress and interpreter training. *Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education* 6 (1):1–14.

Dean, R. K., J. Davis, H. Barnett, L. E. Graham, L. Hammond, and K. Hinchey. 2003. Training medically qualified interpreters: New approaches, new applications, promising results. *RID Views* 20 (1):10–12.

Dean, R., R. Q. Pollard, J. Davis, M. Griffin, C. LaCava, and K. Hinchey. 2003. Reforming interpreter education: A practice-profession approach —Years 1 and 2 progress report. Presentation at the biennial meeting of the Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf, Chicago, Ill.

Dean, R. K., R. Q. Pollard, J. Davis, M. Griffin, C. LaCava, B. Morrison, J. Parmir, A. Smith, S. Storme, and L. Suback. 2004. The demand-control schema: Effective curricular implementation. *Proceedings of the biennial meeting of the Conference of Interpreter Trainers*, 145–61. Silver Spring, Md.: CIT.

Dean, R. K., R. Q. Pollard, and M. A. English. 2004. Observation-supervision in mental health interpreter training. *Proceedings of the biennial meeting of the Conference of Interpreter Trainers*, 55–75. Silver Spring, Md.: CIT.

Dean, R. K., and R. Q. Pollard. 2005. Consumers and service effectiveness in interpreting work: A practice profession perspective. In *Educational interpreting: From research to practice*, ed. M. Marschark, R. Peterson, and E. Winston, 259–82. New York: Oxford University Press.

DeWalt, K. M., and B. R. DeWalt. 2002. *Participant observation: A guide for fieldworkers.* Walnut Creek, Calif.: AltaMira Press.

Geertz, C. 1973. *The interpretation of cultures.* New York: Basic Books.

———. 1983. *Local knowledge: Further essays in interpretive anthropology.* New York: Basic Books.

Gumperz, J. J. 1972. Sociolinguistics and communication in small groups. In *Sociolinguistics: Selected readings*, eds. J. Pride and J. Holmes. Harmondsworth, England: Penguin.

Hymes, D. 1974. *Foundations in sociolinguistics: An ethnographic approach.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Karasek, R. A. 1979. Job demands, job decision latitude, and mental strain: Implications for job redesign. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 24: 285–307.

Karasek, R., and T. Theorell. 1990. *Healthy work: Stress, productivity, and the restructuring of work life.* New York: Basic Books.

Metzger, M. 1999. *Sign language interpreting: Deconstructing the myth of neutrality.* Washington, D.C.: Gallaudet University Press.

Mindess, A. 1999. *Reading between the signs: Intercultural communication for sign language interpreters.* Yarmouth, Maine: Intercultural Press.

Mooney, M., A. Aramburo, J. Davis, T. Dunbar, A. Roth, and J. Nishimura. 2001. *National multicultural interpreting project curriculum.* Stillwater: Oklahoma State University.

Namy, C. 1977. Reflections on the training of simultaneous interpreters: A metalinguistic approach. In *Language interpreting and communication*, ed. D. Gerver and H. W. Sinaiko, 25–33. New York: Plenum.

Napier, J. 2002. *Sign Language interpreting: Linguistic coping strategies.* Coleford, U.K.: Douglas McLean.

Pollard, R. Q. 1998. Psychopathology. In *Psychological perspectives on deafness*, Vol. 2, ed. M. Marschark and D. Clark, 171-97. Mahwah, N.J.: Erlbaum.

Roy, C. B. 2000a. Training interpreters—Past, present and future. In *Innovative practices for teaching sign language interpreters*, ed. C. B. Roy, 1–14. Washington, D.C.: Gallaudet University Press.

———. 2000b. *Interpreting as discourse process.* New York: Oxford University Press.
Saville-Troike, M. 2003. *The ethnography of communication.* 3rd ed. Malden, Mass.: Blackwell.
Schiffrin, D. 1994. *Approaches to discourse.* Oxford, U.K.: Blackwell.
Schwandt, T. A. 2001. *Dictionary of qualitative inquiry.* 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage.
Simon, J. 1994. An ethnographic study of sign language interpreter education. Ph.D. diss., University of Arizona.
Spradley, J. P. 1979. *The ethnographic interview.* New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.
———. 1980. *Participant observation.* New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.
Wardhaugh, R. 1998. *An introduction to sociolinguistics.* 3rd ed. Malden, Mass.: Blackwell.

Appendix

The Ethnography of Communication (Hymes 1974, quoted in Wardhaugh 1998), "The SPEAKING Acronym"

The Setting and Scene (S) of speech are important. Setting refers to the time and place, i.e., the concrete physical circumstances in which speech takes place. Scene refers to the abstract psychological setting, or the cultural definition of the occasion. The Queen's Christmas message has its own unique setting and scene, as has the President of the United States' annual State of the Union Address. A particular bit of speech may actually serve to define a scene, whereas another bit of speech may be deemed to be quite inappropriate in certain circumstances. Within a particular setting, of course, participants are free to change scenes, as they change the level of formality (e.g., go from serious to joyful), or as they change the kind of activity in which they are involved (e.g., begin to drink or to recite poetry).

The Participants (P) include various combinations of speaker-listener, addressor-addressee, or sender-receiver. They generally fill certain socially specified roles. A two-person conversation involves a speaker and hearer with no role change; a political speech involves an addressor and addressees (the audience); and a telephone message involves a sender and a receiver. A prayer obviously makes a deity a participant. In a classroom a teacher's question and a student's response involve not just those two as speaker and listener but also the rest of the class as audience, since they too are expected to benefit from the exchange.

Ends (E) refers to the conventionally recognized and expected outcomes of an exchange as well as to the personal goals that participants seek to accomplish on particular occasions. A trial in a courtroom has a recognizable social end in view, but the various participants, i.e., the judge, jury, prosecution, defense, accused, and witnesses, have different personal goals. Likewise, a marriage ceremony serves a certain social end, but each of the various participants may have his or her own unique goals in getting married or in seeing a particular couple married.

Act sequence (A) refers to the actual form and content of what is said: the precise words used, how they are used, and the relationship of what is said to the actual topic at hand. This is one aspect of speaking in which linguists have long shown an interest, particularly those who study discourse and conversation. Others too, e.g., psychologists and communication theorists concerned with content analysis, have shown a similar interest. Public lectures, casual conversations, and cocktail party chatter are all different

forms of speaking; with each go different kinds of language and things talked about.

Key (K), the fifth term, refers to the tone, manner, or spirit in which a particular message is conveyed: light-hearted, serious, precise, pedantic, mocking, sarcastic, pompous, and so on. The key may also be marked nonverbally by certain kinds of behavior, gesture, posture, or even deportment. When there is a lack of fit between what a person is actually saying and the key that the person is using, listeners are likely to pay more attention to the key than to the actual content, e.g., to the burlesque of a ritual rather than to the ritual itself.

Instrumentalities (I) refers to the choice of channel, e.g., oral, written, or telegraphic, and to the actual forms of speech employed, such as the language, dialect, code, or register that is chosen. Formal, written, legal language is one instrumentality; spoken Newfoundland English is another; code-switching between English and Italian in Toronto is a third; and the use of Pig Latin is still another. In Surinam a high government official addresses a Bush Negro chief in Dutch and has his words translated into the local tribal language. The chief does the opposite. Each speaks this way although both could use a common instrumentality, Sranan. You may employ different instrumentalities in the course of a single verbal exchange of some length: first read something, then tell a dialect joke, then quote Shakespeare, then use an expression from another language, and so on. You also need not necessarily change topic to do any of these.

Norms of interaction and interpretation (N) refers to the specific behaviors and proprieties that attach to speaking and also to how these may be viewed by someone who does not share them, e.g., loudness, silence, gaze return, and so on. For example, there are certain norms of interaction with regard to church services and conversing with strangers. However, these norms vary between social groups, so the kind of behavior expected in congregations that practice "talking in tongues" or the group encouragement of a preacher in others would be deemed abnormal in a "high" Anglican setting. Likewise, an Arab and an Anglo-Saxon meeting for the first time are unlikely to find a conversational distance that each finds "comfortable."

Genre (G), the final term refers to clearly demarcated types of utterance; such things as poems, proverbs, riddles, sermons, prayers, lectures, and editorials. These are all "marked" too. While particular genres seem more appropriate on certain occasions than on others, e.g., sermons inserted into church services, they can be independent: we can ask someone to stop "sermonizing"; that is, we can recognize a genre of sermons when an instance of it, or something closely resembling an instance, occurs outside its usual setting.