Shifting Positionality: A Critical Examination of the Turning Point in the Relationship of Interpreters and the Deaf Community

Article · January 2009
DOI: 10.1093/acprof/9780195176940.003.0001

1 author:

Dennis Cokely
Northeastern University
18 PUBLICATIONS **269** CITATIONS

Shifting Positionality: A Critical Examination of the Turning Point in the Relationship of Interpreters and the Deaf Community

Dennis Cokely

Northeastern University

Interpreters have always occupied a unique social and cultural position relative to the communities within which they work. It is they who are positioned "between worlds" and who make possible communication with "outsiders." While there is emerging literature on the positionality of those who provide access to another spoken language world (e.g., Karttunen, 1994; Valdes, 2003), there is surprisingly little literature in this regard on sign language interpreters/transliterators[i]. Given that sign language interpreters/transliterators are positioned between sign language and spoken language worlds, there are critical aspects of their social and cultural positionality that have no counterpart among interpreters who are positioned between two spoken language worlds. Although this chapter focuses on the shifting positionality of sign language interpreters/transliterators in the United States, the observations developed here will, I believe, hold relevance for Deaf Communities and sign language interpreters/transliterators in other countries.[ii]

Our Historic Footing

In order to fully appreciate the dramatic shifts in positionality that have occurred it is important to understand that the roots of the practice of sign language interpreting/transliterating lie squarely within the aegis of Deaf Communities. Prior to the early 1970s, interpretation/transliteration was seen as a voluntary and charitable activity that fell to those non-

deaf persons with some level of competence in sign language. This usually meant that the pool of prospective interpreters/transliterators consisted of the daughters or sons, siblings or extended relatives of Deaf adults or those who lacked any blood ties to the Deaf Community but who were engaged in an occupation that placed them in regular interaction with members of the Community (e.g., teachers, social workers, ministers). [iii] Ultimately, however, members of the Community would determine for themselves whether and when someone possessed sufficient communicative competence and had also demonstrated sufficient trustworthiness that they would be asked to interpret/transliterate. Absent any external, objective criteria that might serve to validate someone's competence as an interpreter/transliterator, the Community relied upon the judgment and experience of its members to determine who could function effectively as an interpreter/transliterator. This judgment, it would appear, was based more on one's overall fluency in sign than one's technical skill at interpreting/transliterating (Fant, 1990) and, perhaps more importantly, a sense that the individual would act in the best communicative interests of the d/Deaf individual. This meant a rather limited pool of prospective interpreters/transliterators and thus it is no wonder that as the communicative needs of the Community increased, the number of those judged capable by the Community was insufficient to meet the Community's needs. The notion of Community selectivity raises an interesting series of questions about those who presumably would be judged most trustworthy by the Community, Children of Deaf Adults (CODAs). One wonders for example, what were the factors that led some CODAs to shun the Community and avoid interpreting altogether and what were the factors that led the Community to choose some CODAs and not choose other CODAs.

For their part, those individuals who were asked (or, given the times, perhaps "chosen" better captures the reality) to function as interpreters/transliterators perceived their work as

"…just another way of helping deaf family members, friends, co-workers or complete strangers. It was a way of contributing to the general welfare of deaf people…." (Fant, 1990, pg. 10). This view of "interpretation/transliteration as my contribution" is certainly in keeping with the Community's expectations of reciprocity (Smith, 1983) and the characterization of the American Deaf Community as a collectivist culture (Mindess, 1999). Interpreters and transliterators not only became part of the fabric of the Community but advice on who was considered a competent practitioner or a promising interpreter/transliterator-in-the-making was part of the received wisdom of the Community passed along by older Deaf adults to younger members in much the same way advice was given about "Deaf-friendly" doctors, dentists or other needed services.

Fant (1990) also asserts that this view of "interpretation/transliteration as my contribution" was in keeping with societal norms of the time in which good deeds were a matter of private, not corporate concerns. It is probable that such a view of "interpretation/transliteration as my contribution" has existed since there have been Deaf people with non-deaf relatives and friends. However, in the United States, at least, during the decade of the sixties this view of interpreter/transliterator volunteerism occurred within a wider societal context of Kennedy's Camelot and Johnson's Great Society. It is not too farfetched to believe that the "ask what you can do for your country" infectious spirit of the times contributed to the founding of the organization that is now known as the Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf.

In this view of "interpretation/transliteration as my contribution" few people actually called themselves interpreters or transliterators. They were asked to do the work but the work of interpreting did not define them or their relation to the Community. Individuals who worked as interpreters or transliterators were employed as schoolteachers, educational administrators, rehabilitation counselors or religious workers; many worked as housewives. The assumption was

that no one earned a living by doing the work of interpreting/transliterating, largely because there was no expectation of compensation. "We did not expect to be paid, we did not ask to be paid, because we did not do it for the money. We felt it was our obligation, our duty to do it and if we did not do it, the deaf person would suffer and we would feel responsible" (Fant, 1990, pg. 10). Interpreting/transliterating was not even viewed as an occupation, much less a profession. This was underscored, even in the mid-seventies when individuals were expected to volunteer their services as interpreters/transliterators at local, regional, national and international conferences and conventions. A case in point that demonstrates the expectation of "interpretation/transliteration as my contribution" is the Seventh Congress of the World Federation of the Deaf, held in 1975 in Washington, DC. At that Congress sign language interpreters/transliterators were expected not only to volunteer their services but also were expected to register for the Congress and pay for all of their own expenses. Spoken language interpreters (Spanish, French and German), on the other hand, were well compensated and given working conditions in accord with prevailing international conference standards.

That interpreting/transliterating was viewed neither as occupation nor profession was evident at the 1964 meeting that would result in the founding of the organization that is now known as the Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf.[iv] Of the 73 participants at that meeting (15 of whom were deaf) and 6 observers, 90% were actively engaged in the field of education. Most of the non-deaf educators present could and did interpret/transliterate, but "…they did not think of themselves as interpreters" (Fant, 1990, pg. 7). It is noteworthy (and serves to underscore the discussion thus far) that only two of the participants even called themselves "interpreters". The usual course of events is that professionals come together to create an organization that will serve their goals and needs. In the case of interpreters/transliterators this sequence was reversed

and the organization appeared before there was a commonly recognized understanding of the work of interpreters and transliterators and certainly before practitioners thought of themselves as professionals.

"At a workshop on interpreting for the deaf conducted at Ball State Teachers College, June 14-17, 1964, in Muncie, Ind., a National Registry of Professional Interpreters and Translators for the Deaf was organized."[v] (Quigley and Youngs, 1965). However, within six months of the organizational meeting, the name had been changed to the Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf (RID). Fant states that dropping the word "Professional" better expressed the organization's intent to recruit, train and maintain a registry. There were eight stated purposes of the organization, the third of which was to recruit "qualified interpreters and translators". According to Fant, "We were eager to recruit, train and verify the competence of interpreters, but I do not believe that we thought they would become full-time interpreters. It is my opinion that we perceived the new interpreters functioning in much the same way as we had, that is, holding full-time jobs and interpreting on the side" (Fant, 1990, pg. 7)

It is quite likely, however, that another, perhaps more significant, force contributed to the name change. I believe a compelling case can be made that at the time the notion of a "professional interpreter" was, for the Community, the antithesis of "interpretation/transliteration as my contribution." If the prevailing view of "interpretation/transliteration as my contribution" rested on an assumption of Communal proximity, perhaps the notion of "interpreter/transliterator as professional" was seen as the embodiment of distance and detachment. Although it seems clear that the original intent of including the word "professional" was to reflect individuals who were skilled and competent, perhaps it was felt that the popular understanding of a "professional" (well compensated and aloof) would be perceived negatively by the Deaf

Community which, after all, had a centuries-old history of being maltreated by "professionals". This name change, a generally unheralded event, can be seen as the organization's first collective response to a shift in positionality of interpreters/transliterators vis-à-vis the Community. The name change was certainly influenced by the fact that the work was seen as only a part-time endeavor. However, in light of the well-documented historic oppression experienced by the Community at the hands of "professionals" and given the importance of social proximity to the Community, the original organizational name may have been perceived as too dramatic and negative a shift away from the Community. Creating an organization was one thing, creating an organization of "professionals" was something quite different.

Shifting Plates of Positionality

Just as the earth's tectonic plates move uncontrollably and alter the relationship of landmasses to each other, so too events within society at large, the Deaf Community and the newly formed organization altered the societal and Community positionality of interpreters/transliterators. While the Ball State organizational meeting is often viewed as a critical turning point in the positionality of interpreters/transliterators and the Deaf Community (e.g., Stewart, et. al. 2004), there is compelling evidence that subsequent events, not the founding of the organization, would irrevocably alter the social and cultural positionality of interpreters/transliterators as a group.

The organizational event that occurred in 1964 marked the beginning of a shift away from the relationship that interpreters and transliterators had enjoyed with the community. However, events that occurred between 1972 and 1975 marked a pivotal period resulting in an irreversible widening of the fissure between interpreters/transliterators and the Community that

had begun to appear in 1964. In 1972 the grant that had provided organizational support for the RID ended. That grant was prepared by the National Association of the Deaf (NAD) and submitted to the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration of the Department of Health Education and Welfare. The grant provided funding to hire the RID's first Executive Director (a Deaf man, Al Pimentel) and support staff. The grant also made it possible to house the organization's home offices within the NAD's home offices. Thus the grant made possible, on an organizational level, the symbolic realization of the prevailing relationship between interpreters/transliterators and the Deaf Community.

In 1972, when the grant expired the RID had a membership fewer than 400 members. Many of these members did not contribute to the Community as interpreters or transliterators but were supporters of the idea of an organization of practitioners. Thus membership dues were insufficient to sustain salaries and rent. The RID was forced to reduce its staff to only part-time (non-deaf) secretarial support, to move out of the NAD home offices and relocate to available, rent-free space at Gallaudet College. In hindsight the physical relocation away from the NAD, the inability to renew the Deaf Executive Director's contract and the retention of non-deaf support staff was a sign of growing separation from the Community. The organizational separation and attendant decisions represented a type of "separation by proxy" of interpreter/transliterators and the Community and would be widened and reinforced by other events that also occurred that same year.

The year 1972 also marked the beginning of RID's program to test and certify the qualifications of interpreters/transliterators. In October of that year a workshop was held in Memphis, Tennessee to launch the certification system. The primary motivation for the certification system was the fact that an alarmingly high number of members did not possess

what was felt to be minimally acceptable skills and yet they were card-carrying members of the Registry. At that time membership in the RID was gained simply by having two members sign an application that they would vouch for the applicant's abilities. In its early stages this procedure may have had some validity since, according to Fant, "…most of the members were skilled interpreters and quite adept at spotting other skilled interpreters, or they were consumers who were sophisticated at identification of skilled interpreters." (Fant, 1990, pg. 41). In one sense this process might be viewed as an organizational attempt to mirror the Community's "received wisdom" practice that had served it well for many years. However as the number of new RID members grew within a relatively short period of time, it became clear that an increasing number of these newer members were unable to sustain a level of quality that was acceptable to the Community. The result was that the number of RID members with marginal skills (and no vested support from the Community) increased and the Registry became quite suspect in the eyes of the Community. While the crucible of Community work attested to an individual's competence, in the eyes of society at large mere membership in the organization of practitioners became a sufficient testament to one's competence.

This practice of RID members vetting new members represented another subtle shift in positionality vis-à-vis the Community. It is understandable that the vetting model that would be used would have elements of the prevailing model used by other certifying bodies (i.e., only members of the organization are able to vet those who would be certified by the organization) and of the vetting model used by the Community (membership based on judgment of and acceptance by the members). However, the lack of overt, research-based criteria meant that intuitive judgments, which formed the original basis for membership and certification decisions, could not be uniformly applied nor sustained. This meant that a growing number of individuals

were deemed worthy of RID membership and of holding its certification but who did not or could not conform to the Community's notion of competence. RID certification was, after all, only the organization's certification not an independent, research-based, Community-validated assessment of an individual's competence. By joining the RID one could, without having the Community's imprimatur, have membership within the organization of interpreters and thus claim the title of "interpreter".

For society at large the issue of qualifications of those who were members of the Registry was not a matter of question. "State officials, knowing little about deafness and less about interpreting, were easily convinced that everything was in order, simply because there was a registry of interpreters." (Schein, 1984, pg. 112). It seems quite clear now that, from the perspective of government agencies, the *fact* of RID testing and certification was of far greater significance than questions about its validity and reliability. This is clear from the reports of pressure exerted on RID by the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration to begin a national certification program immediately after the RID grant ended in 1972. As will be discussed later, the research basis upon which to build a valid and reliable testing and certification system was simply not available at the time and yet this seemed not to be a matter of concern.[vi]

With the 1972 implementation of a national testing program aimed at certifying interpreters/transliterators, the processes involved in weaning and vetting practitioners were removed from the Community. What had essentially been a process of demonstrating competence and trustworthiness over time, control over which was vested in the Community, became a process of demonstrating competence at a single point in time, control over which was vested in examination boards. Given the absence of an adequate research base in the field the now-predictable result was that there was great variability in the judgments of evaluation teams.

The initial evaluation design called for Deaf people to be represented on evaluation teams. This, no doubt, was an acknowledgment of the importance of the Community's judgment in qualifying interpreters/transliterators. However, those Deaf people who agreed to serve on evaluation teams (and who were also members of the RID) were placed in the untenable position of upholding the standards of the Community in a testing situation that did not well reflect the expectations of the Community. The position of and pressures on these representatives of the Community should not be discounted lightly. Lacking an empirically supported base for their work, they could not be the successful distillate of the Community's wisdom on evaluation teams. Some local evaluation teams gained a reputation for being stricter than others with the result that it was not unusual for candidates to take the test in areas where teams were reputed to be more lenient. The critical issue then became one of credentialed incompetence. Individuals who otherwise would not be deemed as qualified by the Community could, in effect, be credentialed in the eyes of society. This perception became more critical given other events begun in 1972.

1972 was the year that the widespread proliferation of Manual Codes for English began in the United States. These artificially created systems of signing (e.g., Anthony, 1971, Gustason, & Zawoloko, 1972) not only purported to represent English manually, but also claimed to be easier to learn than American Sign Language (ASL).[vii] Given the historic oppression of ASL and the long-standing failure of the educational systems to create appropriate environments in which Deaf students could become fluent in reading and writing English, it is not surprising that these systems would gain popularity. Unfortunately such coded systems appealed to administrators faced with research demonstrating that the use of manual communication (i.e., signing) in the classroom is not detrimental to a deaf child's educational experience,[viii] to parents who, in their naiveté, believed the advertising campaigns that using a system that purports to manually mirror

spoken English will result in academic success, and to those individuals who seek an easy way to "learn to sign."[ix]

At the time RID's testing and certification system was not sufficiently sensitive to the differences between the signing of the Community and signs that were English-like. It is my belief that the early failure to capture this difference lead to heightened dissatisfaction within the Community with services rendered by RID members. For example, an increasing number of members of RID were certified who were unable to sign using the language of the Community, but who could sign using English-like signs. The early RID testing system tried to capture this dichotomy by establishing two certificates, one a certificate of interpretation and one a certificate of translation (later renamed transliteration) but in many overt and subtle ways seemed to place greater value on the latter. The directions given to candidates taking the certification test are revealing: before being given the testing materials for the certificate of interpretation, individuals were often instructed to "sign like you would for deaf children or deaf people with limited language skills" but before being given the testing materials for the certificate of translation, individuals were instructed to "sign like you would for the deaf people on this panel". The difference is non-trivial – ASL, the "other language" used in interpretation, was thus characterized by the organization of interpreters as infantile, fit only for children and those without language; use of more English-like signing would be the behavior appropriate for those who were adults, those "without language problems" and those sitting in judgment of a candidate's skills.

However, while individuals could be certified for using English –like signing only, prevailing hiring and referral practices of the day were largely insensitive to the differences that mattered to the Community. Thus, for example, referral agencies often failed to solicit the

interpreting or transliterating needs and preferences from members of the Community who were requesting services. This situation was exacerbated by the failure of RID and its members to be explicit in their use of terminology in order to differentiate between the tasks of interpreting and transliteration. In addition the widespread use of the terms "interpreter" and "interpreting" as generic terms to refer to any facilitation of communication involving a d/Deaf person did not serve the Community well (Cokely, 1982). The unwillingness or reluctance to be precise in this area is rather ironic given that the work of interpreters is fundamentally concerned with precision of meaning and intent. Partially as a result of this lack of clarity around the type of services that an "interpreter" could provide, the number of Community complaints regarding interpreter/transliterator incompetence began to increase. It is true that as the sheer volume of interpreting services being provided increased, one would expect an increase in the number of complaints. However, one has only to read the Community publications of the day and the issues raised by d/Deaf members of the RID at it conventions to realize that the type and volume of complaints cannot be accounted for solely by an increase in volume. Not only was there a lack of a solid research foundation upon which to base practice, including such critical questions as Community need and Community satisfaction, but the general reluctance to at least communicate with precision about distinctions in the work would prove problematic. The lack of a solid research foundation on interpretation and transliteration that would serve to enlighten and frame the issues loomed large and, in fact, this lack remains largely unaddressed to this day (see Marschark et al., this volume; Napier, this volume).

Ironically, 1972 also marked the year of the first instructional text designed to teach ASL, Lou Fant's *Ameslan*. This text, which was a marked departure from previous picture books of signs, represented the first attempt to popularize learning the syntactic structure of the language

of the Community. Even though Bill Stokoe's pioneering work in American Sign Language was published in 1965, d/Deaf people, particularly at Gallaudet, who were the classic victims of prevailing hegemonic views on language and signing, initially resisted his work.[x] Until the late 1970s and early 1980s it would be safe to say that Stokoe's work was viewed largely as the province of researchers. In another ironic twist, 1972 would also mark the first year of publication of *Sign Language Studies*, a publication intended to disseminate research on the Community and its language. That year also marked the first year that colleges and universities accepted ASL in fulfillment of their language requirements.[xi]

Thus during this period there was movement on several fronts toward recognition of the language of the Community and acknowledgment of the status of the Community as a linguistic and cultural minority.[xii] However, the popular appeal of Manual Codes for English served to reinforce for those unacquainted with the Community the historic pathological views of the Community and its language as deficient, deviant and defective. This popular appeal was, in large measure, based on the perception that these codes were easier to learn than the language of the Community. In a very real sense, philosophical camps were drawn at this time and the general inability or unwillingness to be clear and definitive in this area would create further divisions between interpreters/transliterators and the Community, divisions that continue to this day.[xiii] This issue, perhaps more than any other, symbolizes the divide that had begun and would widen over the next decade or so – would interpreters/transliterators accept the Community by embracing its language or would they inadvertently further oppress the Community by rejecting its language?

Interpretation by Legislative Fiat

This period of time between 1972 and 1975 also marked the beginning of legislative institutionalization of interpretation and transliteration. Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act Amendments of 1973 would prove to have far-reaching implications for the Community and for interpreters/transliterators. Although it was not immediately implemented,[xiv] this piece of legislation provided "handicapped individual[s]" with access to any "…program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance." For members of the Community this meant increased access to aspects of society in general that had previously been denied or unavailable to them. For example, attending public colleges and universities was now possible to a far greater extent than ever before. Importantly, such access could only be made possible if these colleges and universities employed interpreters/transliterators. While this piece of access legislation was generally seen by the Community as a positive step forward, another piece of legislation passed during this period would not be so positively viewed.

The Education of all Handicapped Children's Act (P.L. 94-142) was passed in 1975 and was viewed by many in the Community (and continues to be, even in its present iteration as the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act) as a piece of oppressive, normalization legislation. The effects on the Community – oppression by separation, communicative insensitivity, and the slow decline of residential schools for Deaf students - have been discussed elsewhere (e.g., Quigley, 2002; Lane 1992). While promoted by society in general as educational access legislation, many in the Community have concluded that in reality only the illusion of access and equality has been created. Given the value of community and group cohesion to the Community,[xv] this view of illusionary access should not be surprising. For interpreters/transliterators this legislation would further alter their relationship with the Community. Interpreters and transliterators had now, albeit unwittingly, become the very

instruments used to oppress the Community by creating and fostering this illusion of educational access and equality.

The passage of P.L. 94-142 and, to a lesser extent, Section 504 of the 1973 Rehabilitation Act also meant that for the first time on a wide scale, national level control over who would be employed and retained in the position of interpreter/transliterator no longer rested in the hands of the Community. Prior to the passage of these pieces of legislation, the norm was that members of the Community would arrange for interpreters/transliterators for activities or events. During the era of "interpretation/transliteration as my contribution", the Community had some control over who would be asked to interpret or transliterate, given the restrictions of individuals' availability. The Community also had control of whether and when it would accept a would-be interpreter or transliterator. However, that vetting process would change with the era of "interpretation/transliteration as legislative fiat". In this new era, people who were not members of the Community (and who were not aware of reasonable skill-sets to expect of practitioners) were responsible for the hiring and supervision of interpreters and transliterators. One striking consequence of "interpretation/transliteration by legislative fiat" was that the demand for interpreters and transliterators quickly outpaced the supply. Nowhere was this more striking than in K-12 educational settings where "interpreters" were and often continue to be hired and "supervised" by individuals who know nothing about the Community and its language and where d/Deaf children are often isolated from the Community.

The explosion in the number of individuals claiming the title of interpreter or transliterator was nothing short of staggering. In 1974 RID had approximately 500 members; six years later well over four times that number held one or more forms of certification (Rudner, et. al. 1981). It must be borne in mind that the RID membership numbers do not include the many

so-called "interpreters" who were hired by K-12 schools but who had no form of certification. This almost five-fold increase in the number of interpreters and transliterators could only come as a result of significant changes in the Community's relation to interpreters and transliterators. First, the era of "interpretation/transliteration as legislative fiat" brought with it full-time employment opportunities that had not previously existed. Slightly more than ten years after the founding of the RID and the prevailing view of "interpretation/transliteration as my contribution" to the Community for which no monetary compensation was expected, it was now possible for individuals to earn a living by interpreting or transliterating. Not only was monetary compensation possible, but it was also becoming the norm. Ironically, legislation would begin to bring about the very result that founding members of RID sought to avoid when they changed the organization's name – interpreters and transliterators were moving toward becoming "professional." While practitioners viewed this shift positively, members of the Community were considerably less enthusiastic. One has only to read the national and local Community publications (e.g., *The Deaf American*) and the RID newsletters of the time to gain an appreciation of the differences in how various issues were viewed – e.g., rates of payment, ethical conduct, diminished sense of loyalty to the Community and deteriorating quality control in certifying interpreters and transliterators.

Academic Institutionalization

Another change that began during this era was a dramatic increase in the academic institutionalization of the language of the Community. The instruction of "sign language"[xvi] had begun to shift from churches and community centers, where it had been largely situated, to colleges and universities. This was brought about partially by changes in the prevailing

educational methodologies of the time. An increasing number of schools and programs for d/Deaf children began to encourage and expect that "sign language" would be used in classrooms. Schools and programs began to expect that teachers would use "simultaneous communication" and a number of schools and programs adopted "Total Communication." (Holcomb, 1973). As a result, teacher preparation programs began to revise their curricula to include "sign language" classes. That led to an increase in the number of colleges and universities offering "sign language".

In many colleges and universities instructors who were not d/Deaf were hired to teach because d/Deaf people often lacked the necessary academic credentials. Academic institutionalization was a significant change in how people who were not members of the community could gain access to the language of the Community. Up until this era access to language of the Community had generally been by legacy or reward (Cokely, 2000). Individuals came to the language because of blood ties (parents or siblings who were Deaf) or because they had learned the language directly from members of the Community (in non-academic settings). The academic institutionalization of the language of the Community, while positive in many respects, brought with it another level of loss of Community control. The Community attempted to exert some measure of control in this regard by the 1974 founding of the Sign Instructors Guidance Network (S.I.G.N.) organization that is now called the American Sign Language Teachers Association (ASLTA). In an interesting case of history repeating itself, SIGN/ASLTA, like the RID before it, was closely linked with the National Association of the Deaf; SIGN/ASLTA established itself as the certifying body for sign language teachers; SIGN/ASLTA has disaffiliated with the NAD and is seeking recognition on its own as an independent professional organization of sign language teachers.

Given the precedent of academic institutionalization of language access, it is not difficult to understand how academic institutionalization would be seen by society at large as a viable response to the widespread increase in demand for interpreters/transliterators. Sensing the growing demand for interpreters and transliterators, the Rehabilitation Services Administration created and funded the National Interpreter Training Consortium (NITC) in 1974. This consortium, which was made up of six colleges and universities[xvii] was created to address the shortage of interpreters and transliterators. Among the goals of the consortium was the development and implementation of three-month training courses for individuals without prior interpreting experience. It is again noteworthy that, as was the case with development of the RID certification test, there was no meaningful research base upon which to properly understand the linguistic, cognitive and sociolinguistic demands of interpretation and transliteration. Thus, not only the initial instructional premise, but also the curricula that were developed by the NITC lacked the level of rigor that would be needed to replace or even to approximate the results produced by the experiential education that a prospective practitioner received from within the Community.

By 1980 the number of colleges or universities with "Interpreter Training Programs" throughout the country had grown to over fifty, including the six original NITC members (Schein, 1984). Most of these were housed in community colleges and had grown in response to non-deaf students who wanted more advanced sign language courses. Since there was a growing demand for interpreters and transliterators and since existing extensive language curricula were non-existent, sign language programs responded by adding "interpreting" courses. These Interpreter Training Programs often were based on the only material available – the 1965 report

of a Workshop on Interpreting published by the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare (Fant, 1990).

Partially in response to the need to gain information about prevailing practices, the National Academy of Gallaudet College convened a 1979 meeting of individuals with "experience and expertise in interpreter training" (Yoken 1979). At the conference participants identified topics related to interpreting/transliterating as well as pertinent publications. Sixty-three publications or initiatives were listed. An indication of the lack of basic research that existed at the time is that fewer than six of the listings directly related to the tasks of interpreting or transliterating. Following the 1979 "state of the art conference", a second conference was held about a year later. At that conference participants (again individuals with "experience and expertise in interpreter training") identified over one hundred very specific topics for research that they felt were critical in order to inform training and education programs as well as certification and testing procedures. The primary recommendation was that the federal government fund coordinated, focused research in interpreting and transliterating. In 1980 the federal government had announced that it would replace the NITC with ten federally funded programs and would greatly increase the funding level. Conference participants recommended that one of the newly authorized ten federally funded programs be devoted to research. Nothing came of the recommendation and to this day there continues to be a lack of coordinated, basic research that can inform the practice of interpreting and transliterating and the preparation of interpreters and transliterators. It is unfortunate that current funding agencies fail to realize the critical need for basic research in order to effectively execute the very activities that their funding supports. Indeed some of the available funding for interpreting and transliterating (e.g., the current RSA grants) expressly forbids research in grant activities.

The lack of a research base to shape training and education programs and to inform assessment meant that the Community was becoming functionally marginalized as a locus of quality control in terms of the competencies of those who would interpret and transliterate. This marginalization was further increased by the fact that few members of the Community held faculty positions within training and education programs.

With implementation of the legislation of this era, it was now increasingly possible in the eyes of society at large for individuals to earn a living by interpreting or transliterating without having been involved with or vetted by the Community. This meant that students with no prior contact with d/Deaf people could undertake a course of study to become an interpreter or transliterator. Prior to this time, as a result of one's interactional footing in the Community "interpretation/transliteration as my contribution" was the orientation to the task. During this era, however, the collective relationship continued to change from one based on communal obligation to one based on economic opportunity; from one based on personal relations to one based on business relations.

A gap had formed between the Community and interpreters and transliterators that can perhaps best be characterized as an emergent crisis of identity. By beginning to forge an identity that was distinct from the Community and one viewed by many as independent of the Community, it became increasingly easy for society and the Community to view interpreters and transliterators as "for the Community" but not "of the Community." In the now burgeoning era of academic footing, "interpretation/transliteration as compensated service" was becoming the primary orientation to the task. Prospective students were recruited into training and education programs because of growing demands in the "job market". As a result, members of the Community were no longer friends for whom one interpreted or transliterated; they were now

"consumers" or "clients". In short, interpreters/transliterators had become service providers *for* the Community instead of service agents *of* the Community. Certainly this change in orientation contributed to the shift in prevailing "models" of the task– i.e., from helper to machine. Since many interpreters and transliterators were no longer from the Community, the Community sought protection in urging ersatz interpreters/transliterators to function in more of a mechanistic manner because they had not yet proven that they were trustworthy.

As "interpretation/transliteration as compensated service" became the norm, issues of compensation became yet another facet of the "love/hate" relationship between the Community and interpreters and transliterators. Members of the Community resented the fact that interpreters and transliterators now routinely expected to be compensated for their services even though members of the Community were unemployed or underemployed. The Community also feared that rising hourly fees demanded by interpreters and transliterators would result in a denial of access and services because agencies and service providers would resist paying these fees.

The academic institutionalization of the Community's language as well as a shift in the process by which interpreters and transliterators would be trained and employed marked a significant loss of control for the Community. Certainly there were, and continue to be, significant advantages to the academic acceptance of the language of the Community but those advantages carry with them a significant cost to the Community. Legislation had appropriately mandated societal access for Deaf people, but the gate-keeping function that the Community had long held in shaping the pool of individuals who would interpret or transliterate no longer resided within the Community. Employment opportunities for interpreters and transliterators were increasing dramatically. In yet another significant shift and loss of control, it was no longer the Community that was requesting interpretation and transliteration services. In fact, by 1980,

most interpreters and transliterators were being requested by and employed by non-deaf people (LaVor, 1980), further underscoring the view of interpreters and transliterators as being *for* the Community. A survey of 160 certified interpreters and transliterators at the 1980 RID convention (Cokely, 1981) revealed the extent of this shift. 98% of the respondents reported that they interpreted regularly on a paid basis, those with d/Deaf parents for an average of 9.5 years (i.e., since 1970) and those whose parents were not d/Deaf for an average of 4.5 years (i.e., since 1975) with educational/classroom work being the most frequent setting by a margin of five to one.

Given the increase in academic footing as an entrée to interpretation and transliteration and the fact that would-be practitioners often have no requisite connections to the Community, the responsibility for ensuring that the Community is not merely an object of study and theoretical curiosity rests with those responsible for the Education or Training Program. Programs bear the burden of seeking out a variety of ways in which their students can become actively involved with the Community. Activities that provide avenues of Community connectedness are quite varied, but as Monikowski and Peterson (this volume) point out, there is a critical issue that must be considered with any such activity. The critical issue is that the Community must perceive that it is being served by the activity rather than being taken advantage of by the activity. That is, the activity must be such that it directly benefits the Community; benefits to the students should be viewed as by-products of the activity. This is particularly crucial given the shift in positionality of would-be practitioners. If would-be practitioners are no longer perceived as “of the Community”, then it is essential that Programs begin to be perceived as “of the Community”. If would-be practitioners no longer view “interpretation/transliteration as my contribution”, then it is essential that Program begin to seek

ways that they and their students can contribute to the Community. Programs unable or unwilling to be "of the Community" and unable or unwilling to contribute to the Community should examine their raison d'être.

Activity qua Accomplishment?

As one reviews the events during the pivotal period 1972-1975 and the consequences of those events, it seems clear that activity was mistaken for accomplishment. When one examines the initiatives of the era, one is struck by the virtual absence of research upon which to base those initiatives. Clearly there is value in the anecdotal experiences of practitioners of the day and the received wisdom of the Community in shaping interpreter and transliterator assessment and training programs. Clearly there is value in federal legislative and programmatic initiatives that increase societal access for the Community. However without the prerequisite research base, necessarily rooted in the Community, it is unclear whether such initiatives can truly be effective.

Unfortunately, it seems clear that this pattern of mistaking movement as a measure of success continues. It is now forty years after the founding of the RID and the rejection of calls for conducting research before implementing a certification process. It is almost twenty-five years after leading practitioners of the day were ignored in their request for significant federal funding for research into interpreting and transliterating. Nevertheless, legislative and programmatic initiatives continue without the necessary research base upon which those initiatives should be based and upon which they must be based in order to be successful.

One need only consider the early RID evaluations to realize the shortcomings of well-intentioned activities that were uninformed by research. Consider, for example, that among the rating criteria used in RID evaluation process from 1972 until 1983 was "Speed/Time lag"

(Rudner, et. al. 1981). This rating category meant that candidates were penalized if, in rendering their interpretations or transliterations, they lagged behind the stimulus test material. This directly influenced Interpreter Training Programs and resulted in notions of accuracy that were quantitative, not qualitative. In fact, early Interpreter Training Programs, such as the Gallaudet College ITP, developed and purchased materials that were "speed graded" and individuals were judged competent if they could "interpret" audio taped material at speeds approaching 120 words per minute. As one practitioner put it "I was brainwashed to believe that accuracy was in volume of information and if it took seven hundred and fifty words to say this then it should take seven hundred and fifty words to sign it and if it didn't then somehow I was jeopardizing accuracy" (*Interpreters on Interpreting*, 1989). As a result, synchrony of interpretation and source message became highly valued and candidates were marked down if their performance did not maintain temporal synchrony with the original message. This meant that evaluation candidates were penalized if they did the very thing that subsequent research would show was necessary for more accurate work (Cokely, 1986).

Another, more recent movement that poses interesting questions for the relation between interpreters/transliterators and the Community is the emergence of Certified Deaf Interpreters (CDI). As Forestal has noted in this volume, Deaf people were originally certified by the RID in order to function as evaluators in the RID testing system. Within the past two decades, however, there has been a growing demand for and presence of Deaf individuals working in a team with non-deaf interpreters/transliterators in a range of dialogic interactions (e.g., mental health and medical settings) and at a limited number of conferences. In a clear case of history repeating itself, the RID has recently implemented a national certification test for these Deaf individuals

and yet there is virtually no research that investigates what it is Deaf people actually do when they work with a non-deaf colleague in facilitating communication.

On the surface it appears that the cognitive, linguistic and communicative processes that are at work in such interactions are fundamentally different for Deaf people and for their non-deaf teammates. Anecdotal evidence for this comes from a series of meetings that occurred during the 2001-2002 academic year. During that year I was fortunate enough to meet one day a month with a dozen Deaf people from all over New England, all of whom worked as CDIs. During the course of these meetings it became clear that excepting those rare platform opportunities, their regular work as CDIs occurred whenever there was a perceived "language problem" such as an immigrant Deaf person or a deaf person with minimal communication skills. None of the Deaf persons ever recalled working in a situation in which there was no perceived language or communication "problem". This reality also conditions how the Community perceives CDIs. A perfect example of how the Community perceives CDIs is an incident related by one of the Deaf people in the group who was sent to work at a Deaf child's IEP meeting. When the CDI entered the meeting room, the Deaf child's mother, who was herself Deaf, turned to the CDI and signed "We don't need you here. My child doesn't have any communication problems".

During the yearlong series of meetings with this group of Deaf people, it also became clear that the linguistic and communicative strategies that CDIs commonly employ are markedly different from what has become expected, conventional practice among non-deaf interpreters and transliterators. These observations suggest that there is much about the work of our Deaf colleagues that we do not yet understand and that they may not be able to fully articulate. One wonders then how it is possible to assess and certify competence in the absence of such

fundamental research. Our history of presuming we know what to do despite the lack of research has not been positive.

Another interesting question that emerged from this series of meetings with CDIs is the wisdom of using the job title "Certified Deaf Interpreter". The job title "CDI" attempts to frame the communicative work of Deaf people by linking it to the communicative work of non-deaf interpreters and transliterators. However, Deaf people reported repeatedly that it was often difficult to convince employers or clients of the need for two "interpreters", particularly when one of them is Deaf. This is made doubly difficult since the view of the general non-deaf public is that interpreters are "for" d/Deaf people. The group of Deaf colleagues also reported significant resistance from non-deaf interpreters and transliterators who felt that the presence of a Deaf teammate called into question their own skills and ability to do the task at hand. If, however, as I believe to be the case, the tasks are different, then framing the task differently can bring a greater level of respect for the task and an increase in the job market for Deaf colleagues. A differently framed and more precise job title, such as "Visual Language Specialist" automatically creates new expectations within which differentiated tasks can be more readily understood and accepted by society in general. This "frame differentiation by title" might also assist non-deaf interpreters and transliterators who feel that the presence of or need for a Deaf colleague is somehow an affront or challenge to their own competence. Job market cultivation is essential but can only occur with a clear notion of what it is Deaf team members actually do. Ultimately, however, the value in more accurately reflecting the communicative work of our Deaf colleagues can only happen in a meaningful way if it is rooted in descriptive and empirical research. Ultimately, in the absence of descriptive and empirical research on the communicative tasks performed by CDIs, we are unable to address successfully the economic objections of

employers who see the presence of a second interpreter as unnecessary and the presence of a CDI as impractical or inconceivable. Unfortunately, as Forestal notes in this volume, there is presently little support for developing careers for Deaf people in this area.

Perhaps nowhere have the consequences of mistaking activity for accomplishment and proceeding without a sufficient research base been more glaring and more devastating than the decades old movement to mainstream d/Deaf students begun with passage of P.L. 94-142. Not only did this movement alter the relation between the Community and interpreter and transliterators but also it radically altered the social and cultural nature of the Community. From the perspective of the Community, P.L. 94-142 (and its later incarnations) is a prime example of the legislated consequences of hegemony and the implementation of views proffered almost a century earlier. Mainstreaming legislation, which passed by appealing to the values of democratic inclusivity and maximizing one's potential, failed to consider properly and fully the linguistic and communicative demands of interpreted/transliterated education as well as the social and psychological costs of mainstreaming d/Deaf students. Ironically, while the integrationist rhetoric of the day obscured the social and psychological costs, the very presence of an organization of interpreters and transliterators and growing national certification of its members served to minimize concerns about linguistic and communicative demands of mainstreaming d/Deaf students.

In a relatively short time K-12 settings became, and remain, the most frequent employment opportunities for interpreters and transliterators. The fact that interpreters and transliterators, as a group, did not take a strong stand against this disabling legislation may have been seen by some in the Community as self-serving, because of the very increase in employment opportunities. The employment impact on practitioners can be better understood

when one considers the fact that at the present time it has been estimated that 60% of interpreters and transliterators work in K-12 settings.[xviii] Mainstreaming legislation which was, and is, viewed as a symbol of destruction for many in the Community (e.g., Jankowski, 1997), had co-opted interpreters and transliterators into enabling this destruction and thus further distancing them as a group from the Community.

Once again activity, absent fundamental research, was taken as the measure of success. The illusion of access had been created and the symbol of that illusion for many was, and remains, interpreters and transliterators. RID, acting on the premise that the organization should adhere to the same expectations of neutrality and impartiality it expected of practitioners, took no significant stand. School districts and individual schools, compelled by force of law (and little desire to or knowledge with which to fight for meaningful changes in the law), coupled with a rapidly shrinking supply of "qualified" interpreters and transliterators, had no choice but to hire anyone that they felt could function as an interpreter or transliterator, including those that the Community felt were "signers" but clearly not interpreters or transliterators. To the uninformed and uneducated educational establishment these were "prima facie interpreters" but they often had no affiliation with the RID and thus were neither vetted by the organization nor compelled to abide by its Code of Ethics.

Beginning in the mid-seventies the number of d/Deaf students who were thrust into mainstreamed educational programs began to increase exponentially. This "legislatively forced d/Deaf diaspora" yielded nothing short of catastrophic consequences for residential schools for d/Deaf students and, as a result, the Community, its language and its culture (see, e.g., Wrigley, 2002; Lane, 1992; Lane, et. al. 1996). In a relatively short period of time there appeared a sizeable number of individuals employed as interpreters and transliterators in K-12 settings and

who were even further removed from being vetted to any degree by the Community. That the majority of these individuals lacked RID certification or any other competency credentials led to a perception that those working in K-12 settings represent the least competent among us. This perception is only strengthened by surveys that reveal that a large number of individuals view working in K-12 settings as a "stepping stone" until they become state screened or nationally certified and thus are able to work in other venues. For example, a 2002 survey of K-12 interpreters/transliterators working in Massachusetts revealed that fully two-thirds envision themselves working in the K-12 setting for five years or less with almost one-third envisioning their K-12 careers lasting three years or less.[xix] Another significant finding is that fully one-third of those surveyed had been working as interpreters/transliterators for two years or less. If these data are generalizable nationwide, then not only is a significant portion of the K-12 interpreter/transliterator population rather inexperienced, but the K-12 establishment confronts a significant work force turnover and an extremely high level of instability on an annual basis. If these data are indeed generalizable, then they reveal that the least experienced among us and, to the extent that there is a correlation, the least competent among us are working in settings that have significant consequences for the future of d/Deaf students and the Community.

Given that the educational lives of so many d/Deaf students were, and are, determined by what in some cases can best be described as "ersatz practitioners", it is astounding that we continue to have such little research on the work of those who function as K-12 interpreters and transliterators. Consider, for example, that in a review of almost sixty refereed research articles dealing with interpretation and transliteration from 1986 – 1996 only five studies are focused on the actual working of interpreters and transliterators in K-12 settings.[xx] Beginning with the passage of P.L. 94-142 we have been witness to a legislative initiative based on a series of

presumptions, none of which has been empirically supported. Three decades later not only do we still lack empirical research that can address essential questions regarding mainstreaming of d/Deaf students and the work of interpreters and transliterators working in K-12 settings, but we lack any concerted and coordinated effort that can address these questions.

The explicit and implicit research questions in this volume stand not only as a chronicle of what we do not know about interpreting and transliterating in general and about interpreting and transliterating in K-12 settings in particular, but they also serve as suggestions that might guide a research agenda. Clearly a systematic, coordinated program of research, properly involving members of the Community and other stakeholders, would reveal additional areas of critical inquiry. Unfortunately, the reality is that we have not had a nationally coordinated, properly supported and sustained research initiative that can inform practice in these critical areas. Undeterred by our lack of knowledge, society continues to place d/Deaf students in mainstream settings often in isolation from other d/Deaf peers. A cynic would hold that this educational "integration by separation" of d/Deaf people has been a deliberate maneuver to further marginalize d/Deaf people and foster the dissipation of the Community. The same cynic would also hold that the hegemonic "powers that be" see little value in seeking answers to necessary and fundamental research questions because the answers would only challenge the status quo and upset the illusion that access has been created. Finally, the same cynic would hold that schools and school districts faced with legal mandates and yet realizing the true cost of integrating d/Deaf students into their programs, have responded by spending the minimum amount necessary to create the illusion of access and compliance.

As a society we invest far greater resources in researching initiatives that are hardly as valuable to our future as the educational lives of children of the Community. It is certainly

perplexing and troubling that, given the educational and life-trajectory stakes for d/Deaf children, there has not been more of an outcry for such bedrock research from the Community, parents, practitioners, administrators, legislators, interpreters and transliterators, interpreter educators and those who have been the victims of the illusion of educational access. Individual practitioners surely bear some responsibility for challenging the historic pattern of practice that has used the mere physical presence of an interpreter or transliterator as an indication of the likely success of an interaction. Ultimately, however, the decisions surrounding educational placement for d/Deaf students rest with parents. It is they who, in their desire to seek the best for their children, need to make the best-informed decisions possible. Their quest to make these decisions must necessarily seek to address the questions of whether an interpreted education is an equivalent and appropriate education, whether the choice of an interpreted education is more a parent-centered or a child-centered option and, of utmost importance, whether the interpreters and transliterators provided by the school have been independently qualified and credentialed. The lack of fundamental research in this area should be of paramount concern to parents and the demand for such research should be spearheaded by parents.

Programs designed to train and educate interpreters and transliterators also bear significant responsibility in this regard. Clearly both Programs and practitioners have an obligation to question activities within the field that are not supported by solid empirical and theoretical research. But Programs bear a heavier responsibility since it is they whose perspectives and actions will shape the future interpreters and transliterators. Just as Programs should seek to be "of the Community" and should seek opportunities to create Community connectedness for their students, they also have an obligation to demand a greater theoretical and empirical research foundation within the profession and within education and training Programs.

In short, Programs bear the responsibility for challenging the historic pattern of practice that has valued action over evidence and has viewed activity as accomplishment.

Summary and Conclusions

This chapter has examined the relationship between interpreters/transliterators and the Community and the forces that altered that relationship. Although the 1964 creation of an organization of interpreters/transliterators might be seen as a pivotal event, this chapter suggests that a series of events between 1972 and 1975 would irrevocably alter the position of interpreters/transliterators vis-à-vis the Community. What began as a relationship largely evolved from personal connections with members of the Community became a relationship based on commerce often rooted in detachment. The shifted positionality was heightened by the exponential growth of employment opportunities brought about by federal legislation. The most significant consequence of this shift was a loss of Community control over who would be viewed as interpreters and transliterators. Ironically, the presence of the organization of interpreters and transliterators and its certification system served as evidence to society at large that competent interpreters and transliterators existed in sufficient number to implement legislation passed during this period.

During the period between 1972 and 1975 interpretation and transliteration as an occupation clearly moved from an activity in which the time-tested imprimatur of the Community was of paramount importance for practitioners to an activity in which legislatively mandated employment for practitioners required little or no involvement from the Community. Of particular significance was the large-scale employment opportunity for interpreters and transliterators created by P.L. 94-142, the very legislation that would bring about a forced d/Deaf diaspora. From the Community's perspective, the relationship was altered even more by the

academic institutionalization of its language and the subsequent institutionalization of Programs designed to train and educate interpreters and transliterators. The academic institutionalization has further exacerbated the shifted relation in large measure because most members of the Community lack the academic qualifications required to work at academic institutions.

Underscoring and enabling each of these position-altering events has been a persistent lack of empirical research; fundamental research necessary to inform practitioners and the Programs that seek to train or educate them. While individual practitioners bear some responsibility for questioning practices that are not rooted in research, Programs bear a much heavier burden of responsibility. The greater burden arises from the position that Programs now occupy as the primary source of Community connectedness for would-be interpreters and transliterators. As the gate keeping for interpretation and transliteration becomes more rooted in academia and further removed from the crucible of Community interaction, Programs have the responsibility to be "of the Community" rather than "for the Community". In large measure discharging this responsibility requires that Programs not only demand a greater level of research to guide their educational activities, but that they also question practices not substantiated by research. Ultimately it means that action absent empirical evidence can no longer taken as accomplishment.

Notes

[i] I have chosen to use "interpreter/transliterator" and "interpreting/transliterating" throughout this chapter. While this may be slightly more cumbersome than the generic "interpreter" and "interpreting" I believe that the generic terms not only fail to capture accurately differing skill-sets required of practitioners but also fail to capture the competencies required by different members of the Deaf Community.

[ii] I am keenly aware that dealing with issues of positionality and identity relations is incredibly complex and prone to overgeneralizations. These issues are made even more complex when one of the groups involved, the Deaf Community, is a historically oppressed minority. Clearly I make no claim to speak for the Deaf Community in offering these observations and I also fully recognize that it is often difficult to distinguish "speaking about" from "speaking for". My "knowledge claims" in this

arena stem from my own experience of almost four decades of interactions with Deaf people and interpreters at local, regional, national and international levels.

[iii] I use the term "the Community" in the full knowledge that the Deaf Community is not, by its very nature, monolithic and that there is wonderful linguistic, social, ethic, socio-economic and other diversity within the Community.

[iv] The notion of an organization of interpreters did not occur in a vacuum; in 1963 the Texas Society of Interpreters for the Deaf (TSID) was established. TSID would become the first local affiliate chapter of the RID.

[v] The actual organizational meeting took place the evening of June 16, 1964.

[vi] Interestingly Fant (1990) notes that in January of 1965 at a Follow-Up Workshop on Interpreting, the vice-president of The Psychological Corporation, a company specializing in the development of certification programs made a presentation to the participants. According to Fant, "He made it abundantly clear that much research must precede any attempt to construct an instrument for certifying competence." (Fant, 1990, pg. 44)

[vii] A growing body of literature not only revealed linguistic and performance problems with these Manual Codes for English (e.g., Cokely and Gawlik, 1973 and Marmor and Petitto, 1979), but has also failed to substantiate causal claims of improved academic performance of students using these codes (see for example Lederberg, 2003 and Schick, 2003)

[viii] Most notable among this research was Meadow (1968) and Schlesinger and Meadow(1972). The latter work was quite prominent in the proceedings of the 1972 Special Study Institute on "Psycholinguistics and Total Communication" held at Lewis and Clark College, Oregon.

[ix] In fact several of the authors made clear in their advertising their belief that learning their system was far easier than learning ASL and this was used as a primary selling point.

[x] see, for example, Maher, 1996 and Baker and Battison, 1980

[xi] Among the first were American University, New York University and the University of Minnesota.

[xii] It is worth remembering that this positive movement toward acceptance of the language and recognition of the Community occurred within a wider social context in which traditionally oppressed groups were beginning to claim recognition and empowerment.

[xiii] I firmly believe that the pervasive notion that RID and its members have to be "all things to all people" has negatively impacted testing, certification and licensure issues, access legislation issues, the efficacy of referral agencies, and the curricula of Interpreter Training and Education Programs.

[xiv] It would take two years and several protests, culminating in a sit-in at the offices of the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare in 1975 before implementation rules and regulations were finally released by the federal government.

[xv] Mindess (1999) discusses the idea of the Community as a collectivist culture in which the group and the received wisdom of the group is held in high regard.

[xvi] The term "sign language" was, and still is, often used in academic settings to refer to any means of manual communication, including American Sign Language or one of the Manual Codes for English.

[xvii] New York University, Gallaudet College, the University of Tennessee, the California State University at Northridge, the University of Arizona, and St. Paul Technical Vocational Institute.

[xviii] Burch, 2002.

[xix] This survey was done under the auspices of the Interpreter Education Project at Northeastern on behalf of the Massachusetts Commission for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing and the Massachusetts Department of Education.

[xx] See Seal, 2004 for full details; of the sixty articles, 21 focus on the need for and characteristics of K-12 interpreters/transliterators, 15 focus on the work of interpreters/transliterators (but only five are in the K-12 setting), 18 focus on interpreters/transliterators working in postsecondary settings, and 7 focused on miscellaneous aspects of interpreters/transliterators.

References

_____. (1989) *Interpreters on Interpreting: Identity*. Burtonsville, MD: Sign Media, Inc.

Anthony, D (1971). *Seeing Essential English Manual*. Educational Services Division, Anaheim, CA: Union High School District.

Baker, C. and Battison, R. (1980) *Sign Language and the Deaf Community*. Silver Spring, MD: National Association of the Deaf.

Burch, D. (2002) Essential Education for sign Language Interpreters in Pre-College Educational Settings. *Journal of Interpretation*.

Cokely, D. (1981) Sign language Interpreters: A Demographic Survey. In: *Sign Language Studies 10: 32*. 261-286.

Cokely, D. (1982). Editor's Comments. *The Reflector*, vol. 2 Winter, 3-5.

Cokely, D. (1986). Effects of Lag Time on Interpreter Errors. *Sign Language Studies* 53. 341-375.

Cokely, D. (2000). Exploring Ethics: A Case for Revising the Code of Ethics. *Journal of Interpretation*. 25-60.

Cokely, D. and Gawlick, R. (1976). Options: A Position Paper on the relation Between Manual English and Sign. *The Deaf American*, 25 No. 9: 7-11.

Fant, L. (1972). *Ameslan: An Introduction to American Sign Language*. Los Angeles, CA: Joyce Media, Inc.

Fant, L. (1990). *Silver Threads*. Silver Spring, MD: RID Publications.

Gustason, G. and Zawolkow, E. (1972) *Signing Exact English*. Los Alimitos, CA: Modern signs Press.

Holcomb, R. (1973) Total Communication is a Must. In *Proceedings of the 46th CAID Meeting*.

Jankowski, K. (1997). *Deaf Empowerment*, Washington, DC: Gallaudet University Press.

Karttunen, F. (1994). *Between Worlds: Interpreters, Guides and Survivors*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Lane, H., (1992). *The Mask of Benevolence: Disabling the Deaf Community*. New York: Knopf

Lane, H., Bahan, B. and Hoffmeister, B. (1996). *Journey into the Deaf-World*. San Diego: Dawn Sign Press.

LaVor, M. (1985). Interpreters: the Economic Impact. In *Journal of Interpretation*, 27-37.

Lederberg, A. (2003) *Expressing meaning: From Communicative Intent to Building a Lexicon*. In Marschark, M. and Spencer, P. (Eds.), *Deaf Studies, Language, and Education*. New York: Oxford Press.

Maher, J. (1996). *Seeing Language in Sign: The Work of William C. Stokoe*, Washington, DC: Gallaudet University Press.

Marschark. M. and Spencer, P. (Eds.). (2003). *Deaf Studies, Language, and Education*. New York: Oxford Press.

Marmor, G. and Petitto, L. (1979) Simultaneous communication in the Classroom: how well is English grammar represented? *Sign Language Studies, 23*: 99-136.

Meadow, K. (1968). Early manual communication in relation to the deaf child's intellectual, social, and communicative functioning. *American Annals of the Deaf, 113, No. 1*: 29-41.

Mindess, A. (1999). *Reading Between the Signs*. Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.

Quigley, S. and Youngs, J. (1965). *Interpreting for Deaf People*. Washington, DC: US Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

Quigley, S., Basel, B. and Wilbur, R. (1973). A Survey of Interpreters for Deaf People in the State of Illinois. *Journal of Rehabilitation of the Deaf* 6.1: 7-11.

Rudner, L., Getson, P. and Dirst, R. (1981). Interpreter Competence, *RID Interpreting Journal* Vol. 1, No. 1 10-18.

Schein, J. (1984). *Speaking the Language of Sign*. New York: Doubleday.

Schick, B. (2003) The Development of American Sign Language and Manually Coded English Systems. In *Deaf Studies, Language, and Education*. Marschark, M. and Spencer, P. (Eds.) New York: Oxford Press.

Schlesinger, H. and Meadow, K. (1972) *Sound and sign: Childhood Deafness and Mental Health*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Seal, B. (2004) *Best Practices in Educational Interpreting*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Smith, T. (1983) What Goes Around Comes Around: Reciprocity and Interpreters. *The Reflector* Vol. 5, winter 5-7.

Stewart, D., Schein, J. and Cartwright, B. (2004) *Sign Language Interpreting: Exploring its Art and Science*, Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Stokoe, W. Casterline, D., & Croneberg, C. (1965). *A Dictionary of American Sign Language on Linguistic Principles*. Washington, DC: Gallaudet University Press.

Valdes, G. (2003). *Expanding Definitions of Giftedness*. New Jersey: Lawrence Earlbaum Associates.

Wrigley, O. (2002) *The Politics of Deafness*, Washington, DC: Gallaudet University Press.

Yoken, C., (1979). *Interpreter Training: the State of the Art*, National Academy, Gallaudet College.