Conference Interpreting and Interpreting Teams

Christopher Stone and Debra Russell

The practice of Deaf people working as interpreters is growing in both importance and prevalence in many countries, and numerous contributions to this volume demonstrate that Deaf people have worked as interpreters (DIs) for a very long time. Traditionally, however, they do not perform as platform interpreters at conferences.

Conference interpreting is unidirectional work from one language to another, typically for our spoken-language colleagues into their L1. The need for conference interpreting in Deaf history is not always apparent, but interpreting likely occurred at several historic events. For instance, from 1834 on (Mottez, 1993), Deaf people invited nonsigning people to attend the Paris banquets, where signing people (e.g., Eugène de Monglave) acted as interpreters for them. By the third banquet, Deaf people from Italy, England, and Germany were also attending, and much was made of the universality of sign language, suggesting that some form of International Sign (IS) was being used. As such it is possible that some Deaf French attendees supported the hearing interpreters working from IS to LSF (French Sign Language) for attendees such as Monglave to interpret into spoken French, although this is not documented.

In North America, the use of DIs at conferences has grown since the 1980s. One of the first times that DIs served as interpreters was very likely at the Conference of Interpreter Trainers (CIT) in February 1983 at Asilomar, California (Dr. C. Roy, personal communication, August 30, 2013). The conference organizers had invited faculty from the Monterrey Institute of International Studies, Conference Interpreting program, to give talks on interpreter education for four days.

At the first day of the conference Etilvia Arjona gave a talk titled "Education of Translators and Interpreters." The response to Arjona's presentation was given by Dr. C. Roy. Since Dr. Roy's talk was prepared in advance and she knew it would be interpreted, she invited MJ Bienvenu, a Deaf interpreter and translator, to provide a sight translation as she

talked. Dr. Roy gave Bienvenu a copy of the talk, discussed it, and marked pausing points to make sure the talk and its interpretation stayed at approximately the same place in the text. She then made her presentation with the DI, MJ Bienvenu, standing by her side on the stage and working from written English to American Sign Language (ASL).

In the same decade, the Deaf Way conference in 1988 attracted some 6,000 Deaf people to Washington, DC, and also showcased DIs working in the conference domain and into IS. Many other Deaf institutions, such as the World Federation of the Deaf (WFD), have included DIs in teams of interpreters working into IS. This practice appears to have started at the Espoo, Finland, congress in 1987, when Gil Eastman (Sign Enhancers, Inc., 1989: 27'35"–30'00") worked with cointerpreters (CIs) (Bill Moody and Betty Colomous, both of whom also worked as interpreters at the event (R. Ojala-Signell, personal communication, October 8, 2013). Since that 1987 conference the WFD tends to ensure that DIs are included in their teams, who work with a CI into IS. More recently, the work was expanded at the Durban, South Africa, WFD congress in 2011, where DIs worked both into and from IS; their nondeaf cointerpreters not only provided a "feed" for the IS but were also given a feed by the DIs to work into spoken English.

Around the end of the twentieth and the beginning of the twenty-first centuries, DIs began working at conferences in a variety of ways: from one sign language to another or from English (presented via transliteration), or, more recently, from live subtitling and communication access realtime translation (CART) and speech-to-text reporting (STTR). This first occurred (to the authors knowledge) in the UK at the Association of Sign Language Interpreters (ASLI) conference in 2008, when two DIs worked from the STTR to BSL (British Sign Language) (i.e., to their L1), much like their spoken-language interpreter counterparts, and in subsequent years this has become standard practice at ASLI annual general meetings and conferences. One further thing to note is that, at the ASLI conference in 2008, one of the DIs worked not only from English but also from ASL and ISL (Irish Sign Language) and from IS into BSL, demonstrating a palette of working languages to rival that of many of the spoken language interpreters working at international institutions.

Boudreault (2005) addresses the numerous roles that DIs perform and emphasizes the need for increased research on Deaf interpreting. Research has been done on language contact between users of different signed languages, the structure and lexicon of International Sign (Allsop, Woll, & Brauti, 1995; Supalla & Webb, 1995; Rosenstock, 2008), and

International Sign interpreting (McKee & Napier, 2002). However, to date no one has explored the use of Deaf/non-Deaf teams and the approaches they use in order to provide conference interpreting services in IS (see Ressler, 1999, for an analysis of ASL/ASL non-Deaf/Deaf teams in laboratory conditions with no audience present; see also Sforza, this volume, for an analysis of Deaf/Deaf teams working with Deaf-blind people).

THE STUDY

This study is an examination of Deaf interpreters and nondeaf coInterpreters working as interpreting teams in an international setting. It explores the strategies employed by Deaf-nondeaf (DI-CI) interpreting teams to provide effective renderings into International Sign. Specifically, this study considers the assumptions, preparation approaches, and strategies of Deaf interpreters when working from a natural sign language (in this case either American Sign Language or British Sign Language) into IS and those of nondeaf interpreters working as the feed interpreters. It also explores their construction of roles and philosophical orientation.

Several research questions guided the study, and for the purposes of this chapter, we have drawn data addressing the following questions:

> What linguistic strategies are used by the CIs when processing spoken English to British Sign Language or American Sign Language for a platform DI working from BSL or ASL to IS?
>
> What linguistic strategies are used by the CIs when processing spoken English to IS for the platform DI working from IS to IS?

This study, which is qualitative in nature, used a purposive sampling technique (Ritchie & Lewis, 2003, p. 78) to recruit interpreters who were working at international events. The study consisted of two phases: the first included video recording the teams working in international settings, and the second included interviewing the teams after they had completed their assignment.

Participants

All of the participants had at least 10 years experience working as sign language interpreters. Similarly, all of the participants had extensive

experience working in multilingual, international settings, where several teams of interpreters work concurrently. All of the interpreters had worked with each other in teams before; the English-BSL-IS team had previously worked together as a team, whereas the English-ASL-IS team members had not done so.

All of the interpreters had been involved in interpreter training both as recipients and as deliverers of that instruction. These trained interpreters were selected by the organizing committee to work at the conference. All of the interpreters have professional certification in their own countries, are active members of their national professional associations, and are involved in transnational interpreter organizations. The DIs have been actively involved in promoting Deaf interpreters within the profession for both conference and community work, in traditional ways, and for multilingual Deaf people working in multilingual settings.

Two of the participants are Deaf DIs who were born and raised in sign-language-using Deaf families. The DI on the English-BSL-IS team was working from a dialect of the DI's native language; the DI on the English-ASL-IS team was working from a nonnative language. Both CIs are nonnative sign-language users; both were working in their principal language combination and had experience doing so with DIs in conference and community settings. During rest periods and when communicating with interpreters from the wider team, all of the interpreters used ASL, which was a nonnative language for all of them, although it was one of the principal working languages of one of the CIs.

Phase One: Interpreting Work

The interpreting renditions that were filmed occurred in a single session during a weeklong conference. During that session, several interpreting teams were working alongside each other. These included a team that was providing an IS-English interpretation, a team that was providing an ASL-English interpretation, a French-English spoken-language interpreter, and several other teams of sign language interpreters working into languages other than the official languages of the conference. This chapter focuses on the work of the IS-English interpretation team, which consisted of four interpreters: two Deaf interpreters and two nondeaf cointerpreters.

The four interpreters formed two teams of two DI-CI pairs each: one team worked with BSL as the pivot language (Takeda, 2008, p. 67; Keiser, 1999, p. 85); in other words, the CI worked from English to BSL, and then

the DI worked from BSL to IS (and vice versa); the other team used ASL as the pivot language; that is, the CI worked from English to ASL, and then the DI worked from ASL to IS. Each team was filmed using a Kodak zi8 DV camera, with 23 minutes 15 seconds recorded of the English-BSL-IS team and 25 minutes 32 seconds of the English-ASL-IS team.

The video footage of the interpreters' work was imported into ELAN (a video annotation software developed by MPI). Time-coded annotations were added to the footage to explore strategies within and between the DI-CI teams. Different tiers were used to identify the pace and prosodic structure of the pivot language with respect to (1) the target language, (2) language accommodations made by the CI for the DI, and (3) back channels used by the DIs and the CIs to support the coconstruction of an interpreted rendition targeted at those in the conference audience who were relying on IS.

Findings from the Interpreting Work

A detailed analysis of the interpreting work revealed three important strategies that CIs use in order to support both successful interpretation and effective teamwork (see Stone & Russell, 2013, for a complete analysis and reporting of data). For example, the strategies, which were created by the interpreter and were not inherently part of the source text, appeared to ensure that the DIs had full access to the information (Metzger, 1999; Wadensjö, 1998; Berk-Seligson, 1990). Those strategies employed the following:

- Chunking indicators

  Elements in the interpretation that clearly identify a completed piece of information, or chunk, as decided by the CI. These were holds, pauses, and drops. The holds were extensions of the final hold of a sign and the holding of a sign, an index, or the initial letter of a fingerspelling.
- Accommodations

  Elements that indicate that the information the CI is delivering is in process (i.e., not complete); these are the opposite of chunks. They are used to ensure that the DI is aware of the continuing nature of the information and allow the CI to receive a complete chunk of information. Our data revealed the use of holds (i.e., extensions of the final hold position of a sign); we also saw repetitions of manual signs.

When comparing the chunk indicators and the accommodations, we noted that CI1 and CI2 had different styles when working as feeders to DIs. For instance, CI1 used extended signs both as chunk indicators and as accommodations, whereas CI2 predominantly used drops as chunk indicators and extended signs as accommodations. As there appears to be no difference in the production of these two different functions, the use of dissimilar manual indicators of two distinct aspects of intrateam communication may also suggest the experience team 2 has of working together over several years supported the development of this strategy:

- Affirmations

  Elements in the interpretation used to support the DI and affirm the IS rendering of information while also indicating the continuation of the SL; as such, this could be considered a subtype of accommodation. In the main these manifested as head nods (rapid, slow, or slow to rapid), although on occasion the DI and the CI briefly interacted (e.g., CI1 asked DI1, "Am I okay for you?"). The affirmation head nods predominantly co-occurred with other elements.

We also completed a detailed analysis of the interpreting work of the DIs. Those data revealed two important strategies that CIs used in order to support successful interpretation and effective teamwork. Specifically, these are the chunking of the IS and specific feed requests from the CIs. As with the CIs' information delivery and management strategies, these are generated by the interpreter. The data also demonstrated that DIs used more audience-oriented chunk indicators than the CIs provided in the feed interpretation (155 vs. 111; 176 vs. 86). The DIs are therefore able to chunk the target language (TL) differently from the feed interpretation; although the teams work well together, the CIs do not exert influence on the DIs in terms of when and where to chunk information. The specific feed requests occurred when the DI explicitly requested that the CI continue interpreting or repeat an interpretation. Although interpreter generated, these elements are transparent to the Deaf audience and inform them of the interpreting process.

As reported previously, the two teams differ in a number of ways. Although the members of team 1 have worked on the same interpreting team before, CI1 has never worked as a feed interpreter for DI1; they are less familiar working with each other in this way and have different

first sign languages. For instance, CI1's first sign language (ASL) is the language used when teams 1 and 2 talk within the larger team and is also the feed language CI1 uses with DI1. The members of team 2 have interpreted together in a number of situations in this way, including working with another spoken language via an interpreter; they have the same first sign language, which is used as the feed language by CI2 with DI2. Differences in the teams can be seen in table 1 below.

Table 1. Strategy Types (10% and Above)

CI strategy	Team 1	Team 2
chunking indicator	4	1
accommodation	2	1
affirmation	2	1
Subtotal	*8*	*3*
DI strategy	Team 1	Team 2
chunking indicator	4	1
feed request	1	2
Subtotal	*5*	*3*
Total	13	6

Team 1 used all four of the different types of indicators (chunks, accommodations, affirmations) and feed requests; however, they used more than double the number of types within each strategy compared to Team 2.

Phase Two: Semistructured Interviews

After the interpreting event at the conference was filmed, each team was interviewed during a rest period. The semistructured interviews covered several topics: the preparation undertaken individually and as a team, the type of teamwork the DI-CI team consciously engaged in, the design of the rendition interpreted to the audience, and the philosophical orientation of each team member with regard to interpreting.

The interviews were conducted in ASL, so all of the participants had equal access to the questions and the responses. This also enabled a Deaf cultural frame for the responses. The interviews were filmed with a Kodak

zi8 DV camera and were analyzed (without being translated) with iMovie to generate categories and themes (Stone & West, 2012). The culturally rich, *thick* descriptions uttered in ASL, rather than written English translations, thus informed the development of the categories and themes.

CATEGORIES AND THEMES

Analysis of the videos of the interpreting team at work and of the postinterpreting interviews enabled the identification of several thematic categories. For the purposes of this chapter we focus on the themes of team collaboration, team building, linguistic strategies, and team dynamics. Although these categories are by no means exhaustive, they appear to be the four that were paramount and common to both teams. The following quotes, taken from the interviews, demonstrate these aspects of their work.

Team Collaboration

Throughout the interviews, the participants stated that they held explicit conversations with each other about how to manage the interpreting work and about previous conference assignments that were successful. That discussion shaped the way the teams would approach the interpreting assignment. Both DI-CI teams divided the work either into time periods or by speaker; if the latter, this was time dependent. Similarly, each DI-CI team opted to interpret for a speaker depending on the following factors:

1. team knowledge of the speaker, and/or
2. team knowledge of the speaker's topic, and/or
3. the speaker's language

If the work was divided into time periods, the DI-CI teams aimed for 30-minute time slots because they were working into IS and wanted to maintain discourse coherence. Similarly, if a speaker were scheduled for a 20-minute block of time, the work was completed by one active interpreter or interpreter team.

Each DI-CI team functions as a pair when working from English via their pivot language into IS. The nonworking interpreters supported the working interpreters according to their language pair (i.e.,

DI supported DI, and CI supported CI). At no point did the CI from the nonworking interpreting team support the DI from the working team or vice versa. This working pattern appeared to have both functional and etiquette purposes as it caused less confusion for each pair of interpreters. It also ensured that any strategies that a pair developed would enhance its teamwork. A statement made by one of the DIs demonstrates this point:

> DISCUSS WHICH PREFER YOU FEED-ME ME WHICH MUTUALLY-AGREE
> *We discussed which language strategies best suited us as a team [for the pivot language to IS].*

These strategies are developed within the pairs rather than by the team of four. An example of collaboration that demonstrated a sense of creating a consistent and shared interpretation regardless of which interpreter was actively working is found in the following quote:

> FEEL_LIKE BLEND – ME DO_DO? DOWNLOAD YOUR WORK, INCORPORATE, USE AGAIN NEXT TURN
> *For me it felt like osmosis—I tried to incorporate what you did, internalize it, and use it on the next turn.*

This was echoed by another interpreter:

> ME MAX BRAIN COLLAPSE . . . INTERPRET WRONG MESSAGE. THANK YOU APPRECIATE YOU CORRECT ME – ME SIGN WRONG MEANING – YOU GIVE SHORT SIGN/SENTENCE – GREAT – WHEW!
> *I was at the saturation, brain-dead point, and I got the information wrong. I really appreciated it when you corrected me – I put something out, but it didn't have the correct meaning – you fed me just a short sign or phrase – that was great.*

When asked about the process of correcting an interpretation, the interpreters indicated that they had also agreed to do that before beginning the work, so it was their "norm" and was understood as support. They also acknowledged that there was no sense of unequal power within their team:

> LUCKY – NO POWER STRUGGLE TWO OF US _ YOUR PERSONALITY, MY PERSONALITY - FIT NICE
> *There were no power struggles between us – our personalities worked really well together.*

The CIs also understand that their role as team members is to ensure that the DI gets all of the relevant information but not to judge the DIs' interpretations:

YOUR RESPONSIBILITY YOU GROW-CIRCUMFERENCE DEAF STRONG THAT YOUR ++
Your responsibility is to enrich the message to meet Deaf audience members' needs – that's your responsibility [not mine].

This clear division of labor also ensures that no power struggles occur between the team members.

During the interviews, different types of team-collaboration strategies were also discussed. It became clear that the lived experience of being Deaf influences the teams' work patterns and the ways in which they collaborate within and between pairs. One of the first things the participants noted was that Deaf people make greater use of their peripheral vision (Codina, Buckley, Port, & Pascalis, 2011). This led to several comments from the DIs during the interviews:

HAVE PERIPHERAL-VISION/ATTENTION-ON-CI
The CI was monitored via my peripheral vision.

MORE TIME LOOK-AT-AUDIENCE THAN AT YOU [CI]
I spend more time looking at the audience than directly at you [the CI].

CAN SIMULTANEOUS IF PRESENTER IX3 WELL PRESENT IX1 CAN KNOW NOT HAVE-TO SEE IX2
We can interpret simultaneously if the presenter presents well, I can work simultaneously, I don't have to constantly look at the CI.

This further confirms the findings of Sforza (this volume). However, the DIs cannot always rely on peripheral vision and do rely on watching the pivot-language feed from the CI:

SOMETIMES IX1 KNOW IX2 (neg) IX2 IX3 LOST IX3 IX2 IX1 STOP MUST PAUSE "WHAT-SAY COME-ON" DELIVER-INFORMATION BECAUSE CANNOT MIND-PICTURE-INFORMATION SOMETIMES AHEAD
Sometimes I know that the CI does not understand the speaker. I have to stop interpreting, which can be frustrating; I want the pivot language because I cannot visualize the information, especially if I am ahead of the speaker.

This collaboration also leads to specific kinds of team building and team interaction.

TEAM BUILDING AND TEAM INTERACTION

The role of the CI is to monitor DI output and offer the support that one would expect within a nonDeaf team. One of the CIs succinctly explain this:

WATCH GET-ATTENTION "NO" "OH NO"
I watch the DI and get their attention to let them know their rendition needs correcting, which they are open to.

Other strategies are also required to work as a CI within the English pivot language/IS team. One is to use a blended approach of moving between consecutive and simultaneous interpreting, which can at times means the Deaf interpreter is working consecutively and the CI is working simultaneously, and at other times the CI may be working consecutively and the Deaf interpreter is producing simultaneous interpretation (Russell, Shaw, & Malcolm, 2010; Roberson, Russell, & Shaw, 2012; Roberson, Russell, & Shaw, 2012). This use of blending consecutive and simultaneous interpreting within an interaction is in sharp contrast to the practice of always using the simultaneous approach to produce the pivot language:

CONSECUTIVE OR SIMULTANEOUS MIDDLE SLIDE-BETWEEN
I move between consecutive and simultaneous modes.

HEAR COMPLEX WAIT IX_2 CATCH-UP FINISH OK LOOK IX_1 COMPLEX READY SIGN-INFORMATION
If I hear a complex piece of information, then I wait until the DI has caught up and finished their chunk. Then I look directly at the DI and tell them the next part is complex and sign that information.

This team interaction also includes the use of facial expressions to demonstrate that the CI is confident in his or her rendition into the pivot language:

LET-YOU-KNOW DO-NOT-UNDERSTAND . . . IMPORTANT FACE SHOW TRUST
I indicate if I do not understand something . . . it is important to use facial expression to develop a trusting working relationship.

This is clearly part of an interactive team strategy that DIs pick up on:

STRUGGLE IX2 FACIAL-EXPRESSION IX1-CHANGE-INTERPRETATION CARRY-ON-STEADY

If I am struggling, the CI can offer support with information given to me via facial expression. This enables me to adjust my rendition so that I can continue on a more even keel.

This demonstrates that nonverbal cues are used in conjunction with language to offer support to the DIs. Cues also communicate the need for the pivot language to be repeated or rendered differently:

YOU PAUSE PERSEVERATE EYE-GAZE "OH" I NEED EXTRA MORE
If stand still and maintain your gaze with me, I know that I need to adjust my pivot language.

WITH OTHER BEEN TAP-FOOT -F-O-O-T- TAP-FOOT -I-F- APPROPRIATE TAP-FOOT AGAIN
With a different CI I have used the strategy of tapping my foot for the CI to repeat their rendition, if appropriate.

Nonverbal cues also enhance the CI team's cohesion and aid the flow of the work:

SEE FROM BODY-MOVEMENT CAN CONTINUE FEEDING MOVE-AGAIN IX-STOP
I can tell from the DI's body movement when it is a good time to sign more information and when it is a good time to pause.

This last comment was made by the CI who was a member of the interpreting team that had greater experience working together. Their strategy seems to have developed over time. It may also be that this CI has more experience working with DIs and so has developed this as an effective strategy in that setting; it appears that DIs also use this technique when working together (see Sforza, this volume).

One further thing to note is the difference between the two teams with respect to their experience and the dynamics of their negotiation strategies. The pair with less experience working together appears to negotiate strategies as they gain more experience throughout the week, although this was not unproblematic, as noted by the CI:

YOU TOO-MUCH FLEXIBLE
You can be too flexible as a team.

The pair with more experience working together appeared to judge the information flow according to the DIs' interpreting process. This single strategy was highly effective for this team.

PREPARATION FOR THE CONFERENCE

Initially the teams read the program for the conference and identified it as a "standard" conference format. They also skimmed the other materials made available to them. As the conference approached, and the timetable was firmed up, team 2 engaged in more detailed reading. In a previous conference one of the DIs had also manually rehearsed the presentation in IS:

> WE-MEET WE-TWO READ-THROUGH-PAPERS SIGNING ME-SIGNING IX READ SIGNING ENGLISH SIGNING ME INTERNATIONAL TRANSLATE + THROUGH EVERYTHING TOGETHER PREPARE THROUGH-EVERYTHING
>
> *My CI and I met and read through all of the papers manually, rehearsing our renderings. The CI read the English and signed it to me, and I then rendered the information in all of the preparation materials into IS.*

This strategy is not dissimilar to strategies used by Deaf translators when rendering scripts to camera for live television broadcast and recording museum and other public information in sign language (Stone, 2009).

When meeting in person, they divided the work as described earlier. They also discussed the presentations and used the Internet to ensure comprehension and mutual understanding. They also met with the speakers when possible to identify their goals for each presentation.

Within the conference setting the DIs clearly looked for Deaf people in the audience members to identify through back-channeling and used that knowledge to better accommodate them:

> LATER CATCH IX DEAF IX IX IX BECAUSE SIGN BUT MOST DEAF NO HEARING . . . LOOK SOMEONE EYE-BROWS CATCH IX DEAF
>
> *While interpreting, I identified Deaf people in the audience by their use of sign language, but I realized most of them were hearing signers . . . if I saw one of them back-channel, I could identify them as Deaf.*

> LOOK-AROUND IX PERSON-NOD FOLLOW-THEM IX NODDING FOLLOW SEARCH TRY FIND SOMEONE
>
> *I look to see if there is someone nodding [as a back channel to my interpretation] and then engage with them at that moment [as an active "listener"]. I look for active "listeners" in the audience.*

> WATCH YOUR AUDIENCE EYE CONTACT WITH PEOPLE USE YOUR SERVICE BEST ADVICE

The best advice I have ever received was to make eye contact with the people using your services.

KNOW SOME IX IX IX REMEMBER MUTUAL-EYEGAZE MUTUAL-NODDING
I knew some of the Deaf people in the audience and made sure I engaged in eye contact and active back-channeling.

The CIs focused principally on one of the DIs with whom they were working and accommodated their pivot language as described earlier:

FOR ME DEAF IMPORTANT ONE IX FULL-ATTENTION
For me there was only one Deaf person who was important. That was the DI, and I gave that person my full attention.

Team 2 reported that, because they have worked together on numerous occasions, they have worked out the signals that work well for them. By continuing to use the same signals over time, they have refined them by making them subtle and purposefully not obvious to others. Team 1 also reported that they discussed how to support each other; however, they did not explicitly discuss chunking, affirmations, or accommodations.

Team 1 used much more noticeable signals, which were also visible to others, to communicate to each other. They also employed several strategies to determine chunk size, possibly to determine what would work best for them. One of the more notable techniques was CI1's use of rapid nods to indicate the continuation of the SL and to suggest a negotiation of information while being highly visible to the audience. However, this head nod did not seem to have a consistent shared meaning within the interpreting team.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY AND FUTURE RESEARCH QUESTIONS

This is a preliminary study of two interpreting teams, and as such it is unclear whether these findings would apply to other international conference settings. As a first step in the study of IS teams working in conference settings, it reveals some of the practices and linguistic strategies used by Deaf and non-Deaf teams. Topics for future research include the impact of preparation (e.g., reviewing the presentation materials beforehand, meeting with the presenters) on the IS interpretation and on the linguistic feed from the CI to the DI.

Further research could usefully explore the pivot language and the expectation that ASL is a language that DIs can work from. Also worthy of future investigation is the cognitive load associated with working from L2 languages and, in this case, from a natural sign language to IS and comparing it with the mental demands of working between two natural sign languages.

The nature of the pivot language also warrants additional consideration since both of the CIs in this study have used IS, and this background may influence the type of interpretation decisions they make as well as their construction of the natural sign language. Moreover, the quality of the feed and the experience may be different and thus deserves more investigation.

Additional studies could also examine the effectiveness of feeding approaches, comparing (1) a DI working from speech to text input, (2) a DI working with a non-Deaf interpreter of the DI's choice, and (3) a DI working with a non-Deaf interpreter with whom the DI has not previously worked. Moreover, it would be interesting to compare two versions of the IS interpretation: one that is shaped by the interpreters' knowing the audience members who are relying on the interpretation and another for an audience that is not known to the interpreting team.

CONCLUSION

Overall the findings speak to a number of issues surrounding the development of DIs in conference settings and highlight their various working practices. Most striking is the use of a blended approach when providing an IS interpretation rather than following a simple simultaneous method, as is often the dominant practice. This is worth looking at in greater depth to identify how the interpreting team determines when and how to use simultaneous and consecutive interpreting in a conference presentation.

The data also suggest that conference organizers should allow DIs to select their own CI to work with. These DI-CI teams come as a single unit with established practices and should not be arriving at an event and forming a team as they work inasmuch as the novelty of their interaction affects the effectiveness of their work and ultimately the audience's experience in accessing the material via interpretation.

The interviews conducted in this study highlight the need for opportunities for Deaf and non-Deaf interpreters to come together to discuss and share their practices. This can take place in interpreter-training programs and within the context of professional development. As DIs become a more visible force within interpreter organizations, such conversations can be included at all levels of organizational activity, from the writing of best-practice papers about working with DIs, to planning for advanced training, to addressing matters of teamwork and collegiality. Clearer avenues need to be identified to ensure that these discussions then inform professional practices.

REFERENCES

Allsop, L., Woll, B., & Brauti, J. (1995). International sign: The creation of an international Deaf community and sign language. In H. F. Bos & G. M. Schermer (Eds.), *Sign language research 1994: Proceedings of the 4th European congress on sign language research* (pp. 171–188). Hamburg: Signum.

Berk-Seligson, S. (1990). *The bilingual courtroom: Court interpreters in the judicial process*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Boudreault, P. (2005). Deaf interpreters. In T. Janzen (Ed.), *Topics in signed language interpretation* (pp. 323–353). Philadelphia: Benjamins.

Codina, C., Buckley, D., Port, M., & Pascalis, O. (2011). Deaf and hearing children: A comparison of peripheral vision development. *Developmental Science, 14*(4), 725–737. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-7687.2010.01017.x.

Keiser, W. (1999). L'histoire de l'Association Internationale des Interprètes de Conférence (AIIC). *Interpreting, 4*(1), 81–95.

McKee, R., & Napier, J. (2002). Interpreting into International Sign Pidgin. *Sign Language and Linguistics, 5*(1), 27–54.

Metzger, M. (1999). *Sign language interpreting: Deconstructing the myth of neutrality*. Washington, DC: Gallaudet University Press.

Mottez, B. (1993). The Deaf-Mute banquets and the birth of the Deaf movement. In R. Fischer & H. Lane (Eds.), *Looking back: A reader on the history of Deaf communities and their sign languages* (pp. 143–155). Hamburg: Signum.

Ressler, C. I. (1999). A comparative analysis of a direct interpretation and intermediary interpretation in American Sign Language. *Journal of Interpreting,* 71–97.

Ritchie, J., & Lewis, J. (Eds.) (2003). *Qualitative research practice: A guide for social science students and researchers*. London: Sage.

Roberson, L., Russell, D., & Shaw, R. (2012a). A case for training sign language interpreters for legal specialization. *International Journal of Interpreter Education*, *4*(2), 52–73.

Roberson, L., Russell, D., & Shaw, R. (2012b). American Sign Language/English interpreting in legal settings: Current practices in North America. *Journal of Interpretation*, *21*(1). http://digitalcommons.unf.edu/joi/vol21/iss1/6.

Russell, D., Shaw, R., & Malcolm, K. (2010). Effective strategies for teaching consecutive interpreting. *International Journal of Interpreter Education, 2* (1).

Rosenstock, R. (2008). The role of iconicity in international sign. *Sign Language Studies, 8*(2), 131–159.

Sign Enhancers, Inc. (Producer). (1989). *Autobiography of Gilbert Eastman* (video). Retrieved November 13, 2013, from http://videocatalog.gallaudet.edu/?video=16578.

Stone, C. (2009). *Toward a Deaf translation norm.* Washington, DC: Gallaudet University Press.

Stone, C., & Russell, D. (2013). Interpreting in International Sign: Decisions of Deaf and non-Deaf interpreters. In B. Costello, R. Shaw, & M. Thumann (Eds.), *Proceedings of the Conference of the World Association of Sign Language Interpreters, Durban, South Africa, July 14–16, 2011, Vol. 3*. Collingwood, Australia: WASLI.

Stone, C., & West, D. (2012). Translation, representation, and the Deaf "voice." *Qualitative Research, 12*(6), 645–665. doi: 10.1177/1468794111433087.

Supalla, T., & Webb, R. (1995). The grammar of international sign: A new look at pidgin languages. In K. Emmorey and J. S. Reilly (Eds.), *Language, gesture, and space* (pp. 333–352). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Takeda, K. (2008). Interpreting at the Tokyo war crimes tribunal. *Interpreting, 10*(1), 65–83. doi 10.1075/intp.10.1.05tak.

Wadensjö, C. (1998). *Interpreting as interaction.* London: Longman.

Webb, R., & Supalla, T. (1994). Negation in International Sign. In I. Ahlgren, B. Bergman, & M. Brennan (Eds.), *Perspectives on sign language structure: Papers from the 5th International Symposium on Sign Language Research, Vol. 1, Salamanca, Spain, 25–30 May 1992* (pp. 173–186). Durham: ISLA.