Deaf and Hearing Interpreting Team Preparation: A Study Using Conversation Analysis

Brenda Nicodemus and Marty M. Taylor

Conversation is fundamental. We use conversation to act in the world—to order a cup of coffee, to run a meeting, to build friendships, and to work with others. It is precisely because of its crucial role in our personal, political, and professional lives that conversation deserves serious examination. What expectations do individuals bring to their conversations? Why do some conversations create a sense of collaboration while others lead to conflict? Do conversations have predictable structures, and, if so, what are they? Analyzing these and other topics has been an interdisciplinary endeavor with investigations conducted by psychologists, sociologists, and linguists (Taylor & Cameron, 1987).

The answers have critical implications for many types of occupations, and especially so for interpreters who work between speakers of different languages. For interpreters, understanding how conversations are structured is an essential aspect of their professional practice. Interpreters spend their working lives in the thick of conversations, bombarded with talk that must be decoded in order to re-create nuanced meanings in a wide variety of settings, including education, legal, business, and healthcare environments. Recognizing patterns and regularities in discourse strengthens interpreters' ability to accurately render propositions from the source language into the target language (Adamowicz, 1989; Chernov, 1994). For this reason, many interpreter education programs focus heavily on discourse analysis in various forms (e.g., monologues, dyads, groups) and institutional settings (e.g., schools, hospitals, courtrooms) and as shaped by personal attributes (e.g., age, gender, socioeconomic status). There are now both scholarly and popular publications that can inform interpreters' understanding of discourse (see, for example, Stubbs, 1983; Tannen, 1986, 1990, 1994, 2006).

Conversational exchanges are not produced in a random fashion; rather, they are consciously constructed by using a series of fairly

predictable interactional units (Stubbs, 1983). Further, conventional "rules" determine when these interactional units occur, how they are recognized, and how they fit into the overall organization of shared discourse (Sidnell, 2010). These interactional units and rules do not restrict the conversational process; on the contrary, individuals deploy these structures as a reliable means to provide a sense of "orderliness in the social world" (Liddicoat, 2007, p. 11).

In this chapter we examine interpreters and conversational discourse from a novel perspective. Rather than focusing on how interpreters render *other* people's discourse, we examine the internal discourse created by ASL-English interpreters engaged in professional conversation when working as a team. Many people assume that interpreters work in isolation; however, it has been estimated that at least 30% of interpreters' work is performed with other colleagues (Hoza, 2010). Team interpreting involves two or more practitioners working collaboratively to construct a single message. Because individual team members have their own experiences and expectations about how to manage the interpreted interaction, team interpreters typically have one or more preparation sessions before the event to facilitate the process. The interpreters may talk about an array of topics in their preparation session, but Hoza (2010) identifies five items that are typically discussed: (1) who will interpret for which participants, (2) how to produce an equivalent target language message during the event, (3) when and how to relay ("feed") information to one another, (4) how to process information, and (5) how to negotiate the physical setup of the assignment.

The manner in which the preparation session unfolds has social and professional consequences for interpreters; the discussion may enhance the likelihood of a successful team experience, or it may result in feelings of tension—even hostility—between team members. Inevitably, challenges, both linguistic and interpersonal, arise during the interpreting process, and, if the conditions for effective team interpreting have not been established in advance, the interpretation may be negatively affected. The preparation session provides the team members with an opportunity to converse about the content of the upcoming assignment and, perhaps more critically, to build social rapport with one another. Various aspects of the preparation process have received attention, including negotiating the parameters for working in a team (Hoza, 2010), predicting the specific needs in the setting (Cumsky Weiss, 2003; Tinsley, 2003), and developing a sense of team unity (Jones, 2007). To date, however,

authentic conversations during team interpreting preparation sessions have not been well studied.

In this chapter we explore how conversation unfolds in a single preparation session between a Deaf interpreter and a hearing interpreter as they meet to team interpret an academic lecture from spoken English into American Sign Language. Drawing from the framework of conversation analysis (CA), we examine the interactional units and rules that arise during the interpreters' conversation. Although CA was developed for the analysis of the speech of hearing communities and has rarely been applied to signed language research (for an exception, see McIlvenny, 1995), we offer the approach as a useful framework for examining discourse between ASL-English interpreters.

We focus our investigation on five conversational features—openings, turn taking, adjacency pairs, repairs, and closings—and provide samples of each from an authentic conversation between team interpreters. Finally, drawing on Hoza's (2010) model for successful preparation sessions, we speculate on how specific conversational units can enhance—or derail—the sense of collaboration and interdependence between the members of the interpreting team. The aim of this study was to better understand professional conversational structure between team interpreters and, ultimately, to promote practices for productive preparation sessions.

TEAM INTERPRETING AND DEAF INTERPRETERS

Two seminal advancements in the history of professional sign language interpreting are critical to this study: the institutionalization of team interpreting and the growing employment of Deaf interpreters. Both of these developments were made possible through the increased recognition of and appreciation for the complexities inherent in the interpreting process.

The practice of signed language interpreting has undergone dramatic shifts worldwide over the past half century. In the United States, a key turning point occurred in 1964, when a group of stakeholders gathered to form a professional interpreting organization, now called the Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf (RID). In the early years of the profession, interpreters primarily worked alone despite the length or complexity of the assignment. Over time, it become increasingly evident that two or more interpreters were needed for interpreting situations that were long

or complicated, that involved unique needs of the participants, or that had physical or emotional demands beyond the norm (RID, 1997). Further, research suggested that working in teams was necessary to reduce fatigue (Brasel, 1976; Vidal, 1997), to avoid repetitive motion injury (Woodcock & Fischer, 2008), and to decrease errors in the interpretation (Moser-Mercer, Künzli, & Korac, 1998). As stated in a Standard Practices Paper created by the Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf, "through teaming, all consumers can receive optimum communication because each team member can function at their best" (RID, 2007).

A second crucial shift in the profession of signed language interpreting is the growing employment of professional Deaf interpreters (DIs). In the past, Deaf individuals frequently served as interpreters within their community on an ad hoc basis (Adam & Stone, 2011; Boudreault, 2005). Today, professional DIs work alone or with hearing interpreters to provide optimal information access to the interpreted event (Cerney, 2004; Langholtz, 2004; Ressler, 1999). The DI may interpret directly from a signing presenter or translate from a written text or videotext; however, it has been estimated that more than 50% of a DI's work is conducted in collaboration with a hearing interpreter (NCIEC, Beldon, Boudreault, & Cogen, 2008). To transmit spoken source language material, the Deaf interpreter perceives signed input produced by a hearing interpreter (who is listening to the spoken message) and interprets the message into signed language.

In the United States, Deaf interpreters began the professionalization process in the early 1970s. From 1972 to 1988 the Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf awarded the Reverse Skills Certificate (RSC) primarily to Deaf and hard of hearing interpreters. Over time, the RID developed a pool of DI trainers and a list of educational resources, which ultimately led to the creation and awarding of the current Certified Deaf Interpreter (CDI) credential (RID, 1997). A number of interpreting training programs and local RID chapters offer educational opportunities for DIs on topics such as the processes of interpreting, interpreting models, history of the interpreting profession, the RID Code of Professional Conduct, cultural norms, and methods for Deaf and hearing teaming. Attendance at workshops and interpreting training programs prepare individuals to pass both the knowledge and the performance tests necessary to obtain a CDI (Johnston, 2005). Once certified, Deaf interpreters maintain their professional skills by earning continuing educational units, including ongoing training in interpreting skills and ethical issues. In the

United States, 134 interpreters currently hold a CDI (RID personal communication, June 25, 2012). The issue of training requirements and continuing education for CDIs is an ongoing topic that is being addressed primarily by Deaf people within the profession (Forestal, 2005; NCIEC et al., 2008; Peterson, 2004).

Whether a team is made up of two hearing interpreters, two Deaf interpreters, or a Deaf and a hearing interpreter, the team members come to an assignment with the goal of working together to provide an effective interpretation. However, rarely have interpreters had training in how to conduct a preparation session with one another. Currently, there are no standard practices or educational curricula for conducting and teaching team interpreting in ASL-English interpreting programs. Workshops on team interpreting are offered on occasion; however, they rely primarily on simulated scenarios rather than authentic situations. Further, such training is typically not grounded in evidence; rather, it is usually framed by personal experiences and preferences. As a result, many interpreters have not developed techniques that can help cultivate successful conversation when preparing with a colleague.

Anecdotally, signed language interpreters report various degrees of effectiveness when working in a team. While the preparation discussion may result in building team rapport and in determining strategies to use while interpreting, interpreters also report having the opposite experience; that is, preparing together can actually be detrimental to the interpreting process. For example, one interpreter on the team may dominate the discussion or, conversely, choose not to engage in the conversation. In either situation, collaboration cannot be established between the team members. The pair may be unable to resolve differing perspectives about how to function as a team before beginning the work, resulting in a power struggle during the interpretation. Once the interpretation begins, team interpreters typically have limited or no opportunities to discuss and reformulate team protocols, so it is critical to prepare carefully before performing the work.

This study provides insight on communication that occurs during the interpreting preparation session. We utilize the theoretical framework of conversation analysis to examine the interactional units of an authentic team preparation session involving a Deaf and a hearing interpreter. Our goal for this chapter is to inform interpreting practice and education, thereby adding to the evidence-based information about team interpreting.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK: CONVERSATION ANALYSIS

Conversation analysis was first developed in the 1960s and 1970s, primarily through the work of Harvey Sacks, Emanuel Schegloff, and Gail Jefferson (Jefferson & Schegloff, 1992; Sacks, 1972, 1975; Schegloff, 1972, 1987, 1988, 1992, 2007; Schegloff, Jefferson, & Sacks, 1977; Schegloff & Sacks, 1973). Through their pioneering work, a coherent body of knowledge has emerged about the ways in which conversations are structured. Fundamentally, CA attempts to describe the orderliness and sequential patterns of interactions, whether within a formal context or in a casual conversation. Conversation analysis maintains that language is a form of social action and that discovering and describing the organization of interactions reinforces the structures of societal organizations and institutions (Jaworski & Coupland, 1999). The overarching goal of CA is to explicate how participants achieve action by understanding the underlying structural organization of talk in interaction.

One of the critical components of CA is the notion of *recipient design,* which is the idea that individuals design their communication in such a way as to be understood by their conversational partner in terms of the knowledge that the individuals assume they share (Sacks & Schegloff, 1979). This means that conversational contributions are designed with a specific individual in mind and are formulated to be appropriate for that recipient.

Context also plays a crucial role in the structure of conversation. Schegloff (1992) has suggested that context be considered in two different ways: (1) external to the interaction itself, including the influence of social categories, relationships, and institutional and cultural settings; and (2) internal to the specific discussion and created by participants in their conversation. The core issue in thinking about context in these terms is the extent to which aspects of context are relevant to the participants as they interact with each other (Liddicoat, 2007).

Further, conversation is both context shaped and context renewing (Heritage, 1984). It is context shaped in that it is structured for the particular context in which it occurs, and each conversational bit is understood in light of what has preceded it. At the same time, conversation is context renewing because each bit constrains and affects what follows, which influences how the ongoing conversation will be heard and understood. Each turn in a conversation is the response to some previous unit and, by its utterance, provides a context in which the next turn will be

heard (Liddicoat, 2007). Using this perspective, conversation is seen as a dynamic and recursive activity.

Conversation analysis uses a "specimen approach" (Liddicoat, 2007, p. 8) in which each segment of data can be used to develop an account of conversational behaviors at large. Only real-world, situated, and contextualized conversations are examined, based on the belief that naturally occurring conversation can provide the data to account for what occurs during communication. The procedure of conversation analysis is to work with audio and video recordings of the conversational partners, so that the communication can be subjected to multiple examinations in order to discover patterns of interaction that might be missed in a single analysis.

Single-case analysis involves looking at a conversation, or a segment of a conversation, in order to track in detail the various structures and strategies used by participants to accomplish a particular action (Schegloff, 1987, 1988). The analysis of a single case is, in effect, the starting point for any analysis, as single-case examples allow analysts to examine how conversational practices operate in particular instances and allow for a description of these practices. Critically, that a particular social action occurred is evidence that "the machinery for its production is culturally available, involves members' social and linguistic competencies, and is therefore possibly (and probably) reproducible" (Psathas, 1995, p. 50). Any single case of orderly interaction is therefore an indication of the nature of participants' competencies in creating orderly conversation.

When conversational participants talk to one another, they bring a particular orientation to the communication exchange (Heritage, 1988). Regularities in conversation are viewed as normative in that they affect the behavior of participants in the interaction, and participants display an orientation to regular procedures as the "taken for granted orderliness" of the social world (Liddicoat, 2007, p. 11). Individuals can successfully achieve their conversational goals in a number of ways; however, there is evidence of regularities in conversation that are recognizable and can guide our understanding of how to construct conversations. Despite the diversity of ways to communicate, individuals can recognize "well-formed" and "ill-formed" conversations, just as individuals can distinguish between grammatical and ungrammatical sentences. Recognizing "well-formed" conversations is possible because speakers have an implicit knowledge of certain conversational rules or regularities.

We now provide brief descriptions of five features identified as being regular parts of conversation within the framework of CA—openings, turn taking, adjacency pairs, repairs, and closings. These features are framed in the context of conversations that might occur between interpreters.

Openings

How do conversations get started? A number of core sequences for opening a conversation have been identified within the CA framework. In the first sequence, a "summons answer," one individual poses a question or offers a leading statement to begin the conversation. Following this, the other individual answers, demonstrating readiness to hear whatever the other intends to say (Sidnell, 2010). A second opening sequence type is referred to as "how-are-you inquiries." In this sequence type, an individual begins the conversation by inquiring about the health of another person, who, in turn, asks about the first person's health. While this situation provides a means to open a conversation, it often leads to a ritualized social situation in which, according to Sacks (1975), "everyone has to lie" (p. 68).

Interpreters who are working as a team may open their professional conversation in a number of ways. It is common practice within the Deaf community to exchange a hug and inquire about one another's health or family. Some interpreters may choose not to "lie" in the opening social ritual proposed by Sacks (1975); rather, they may take time to talk about how they are feeling on that particular day, with the idea that their state of being may affect their interpretation or that it better fits the social norms of the Deaf community.

Another opening may take place by one team member asking a question about some topic that has previously been a shared topic of conversation. If the interpreters have not previously met, the conversation may begin with questions that will allow each interpreter to gauge the extent of the team member's knowledge about the interpreting assignment. If time is short or the interpreters work together frequently, the team members may also forego the social rituals and launch into a conversation about preparing for the assignment. Critically, an opening must take place for the conversational interaction to begin, and how the individuals adhere to the anticipated interactional rules is the first step in shaping the collaboration that will follow.

Turn Taking

At the heart of CA is the examination of how turn taking unfolds in conversation. Individuals observe a number of conventionalized principles to facilitate turn taking. They follow well-established scripts in which speakers' roles are delineated; they fill in appropriate "slots" in discourse structure; and they anticipate the completion of an utterance on the basis of a perceived completion of the topic (Jaworski & Coupland, 1999). A key notion in CA is that the turns are serially ordered; that is, one speaker follows another in taking turns.

It is often assumed that there exists a set of predetermined rules for determining who will take the floor, who will give up the floor, and who will continue talking. Despite what most people think, pauses and silences are often not the cue for a change in speaker. Rather, linguistic and metalinguistic features provide a physical cue for the end of a turn (Coates & Sutton-Spence, 2001; McCleary & Leite, 2013). Sometimes a turn is marked by a single word or sign; at other times it might be a long sentence or a series of utterances that last for several minutes; and at other times prosodic cues signal a turn (Nicodemus, 2009).

When team interpreters conduct their preparation session, they may be making both conscious and unconscious decisions about how turn taking should take place, depending on factors such as seniority, who is more familiar with the assignment, or who best knows the individuals involved in the interaction. Taking turns serves to reassure each conversational partner that together they are creating shared meanings about the topics being discussed and that different perspectives can be questioned and reconsidered until both team members are satisfied with the outcome. However, if one interpreter is perceived as dominating the conversation, the other team member may feel that his or her ideas are not valued. Different styles and cultural norms for taking turns can also lead to misunderstandings or stress; one team member may feel the preparation dialogue is tedious and slow, while another may feel that taking and holding the floor is more like a competition. Differences may also exist between Deaf and hearing team members based on the norms of their native languages (Coates & Sutton-Spence, 2001). Thus, it can be argued that turn taking is the most crucial component of the successful team preparation session.

Adjacency Pairs

One of the most noticeable things about conversation is that certain classes of utterances conventionally come in pairs, for instance, questions and answers, greetings and return greetings, and invitations and acceptances/declinations. Adjacency pairs are pairs of utterances that are ordered; that is, there is a recognizable difference between the first part and the second part of the pair. The first part of the "pair" requires a particular second part (Sacks, 1972, 1975). Participants then can use the adjacency-pair mechanism to display to one another their ongoing understanding of the other person's talk.

Adjacency pairs are not always immediately adjacent; rather, sometimes insertions occur between the expected pair. The initiator monitors the utterance that follows the first part of the pair for whether and how the insertion works as a relevant second part. Inferences can be drawn about the nonappearance of a second pair part: for instance, not returning a greeting may lead the first greeter to infer that she or he is being snubbed. Thus, for adjacency pairs, the sequence can be evaluated when what is normally expected to occur does not (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998).

When team interpreters are preparing for an assignment, they frequently have limited time to conduct the session, often meeting immediately before the assignment and with many topics to resolve. The logistics discussion between the team members requires a variety of decisions, including who will interpret for which communication participants, establishing "feeding" protocols, agreeing upon signals for the team, considering the use of note-taking, and determining how to shift roles during the interpretation. In addition, interpreters use this preparatory time for gathering written materials, considering source and target vocabulary, assessing and arranging the physical setup of the room, and introducing themselves to the individuals involved in the interaction. Given these circumstances, team interpreters must negotiate the terms of the assignment rapidly, and this may be accomplished through the use of adjacency pairs in which one team member advances a proposal and the other team member agrees or provides an alternative. This sense of adjacency in conversation is essential for determining how the team will function, and quick negotiation often leads to the next conversation feature, repairs.

Repairs

The organization of repairs refers to how individuals in conversation deal with challenges in speaking, hearing, or understanding. Repair segments are classified by who initiates repair, by who resolves the problem, and how the repair unfolds within a turn or a sequence of turns. The organization of repair is also a self-righting mechanism in social interaction (Schegloff, Jefferson, & Sacks, 1977). Participants in conversation seek to correct the problem by initiating self-repair and prefer this to other types of repair. Typically the "problem" is disfluent language production, which may be corrected by the speaker or the conversant. But at times a repair may occur about the content of the discourse in which the speaker's face may be threatened.

For team interpreters, repairs can be a sensitive point in the preparation conversation. Both members may have ideas that they want to advance, and a repair may be taken as a rejection of the proposal. When team interpreters have developed a sense of "social capital" with one another, repairs might be easily mitigated, but it is a worthy endeavor to examine how these repairs unfold during conversation between working interpreters.

Closings

According to Schegloff and Sacks (1973), conversation "does not simply end, but is brought to a close" (p. 290). Closing a conversation provides a type of interactional problem, that is, how to disengage from the conversation in a way that does not jeopardize the relationship between the participants. To accomplish this, individuals need to employ practices that will not result in further talk but will give the sense that they have had an opportunity to talk about all of the things that needed to be discussed (Liddicoat, 2007). Schegloff and Sacks (1973) suggest that closings are a special kind of adjacency pair—the "terminal exchange" (p. 295). This type of exchange requires one speaker to directly or indirectly propose an end to the conversation, which the other speaker can accept or not. If the proposal to end the conversation is accepted, then the effect is to suspend the transitions that occur in the turn-taking phase and in the general adjacency pairs of conversation and thus to lead to a final adjacency pair.

As with everything in conversation, however, what sounds like a natural activity is a socially constructed event. First, Schegloff and Sacks

(1973) point out that the terminal exchange must take place after the satisfactory conclusion of turn-taking exchanges. It would, for instance, sound very rude if an interpreter stated, "I'd like to take a few more minutes to talk more about how we will handle questions from the audience," and the other replied, "No, we should wrap it up now." As this example illustrates, the second interpreter's attempt to end the conversation will probably not foster a collaborative and interdependent working relationship.

Another problem of closings given by Schegloff and Sacks (1973) is that of recognition that the closing has taken place. Closing a conversation can be a problem if both individuals do not understand the signals in the same way. For example, one interpreter might sign OK as an indicator to close a conversation, but the recipient might not recognize the signal and continue to talk. One way to close a conversation is to use "preclosings" (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973), which establish a signal for ending the discussion—based on the belief that neither participant has anything further to talk about (Sidnell, 2010). Frequently, an "okay" or "alright" comes before the production of terminal items such as "bye" or "see you later" as a cue that the conversation is moving toward closure.

Interpreters may close a conversation when one person announces a need for closure, typically citing an external circumstance that warrants ending the conversation. One might provide a specific rationale such as "It looks like she's ready to begin her lecture, so we'd better wrap it up." Another type of closing may occur when making arrangements to help link the current conversation to future conversations. For example, one interpreter may say, "Let me text the office to find out about the length of the assignment," and the other replies, "Okay, perfect. Fill me in at the break." Another strategy for closing is to formulate a summary of the talk (Garfinkel & Sacks, 1970) or refer to some material that has already been covered (Liddicoat, 2007). Closings may also come in the form of giving appreciation (e.g., "OK, thanks for preparing with me"), providing a solicitous remark (e.g., "I'm so pleased to be working with you on this assignment"), or reintroducing the reason for the conversation (e.g., "I'm glad we took time to discuss a few things before we worked together"). Closings mark the ending of the preparation session for interpreters and signal the beginning of the interpreting assignment. Once actively engaged in the act of interpreting, it is difficult for team members to have further conversation. Thus, the closing of the conversation in the preparation

session marks the point at which the team will see whether their collaborative plans work out.

It should now be clear that each conversation is a structured, yet delicate, communicative event achieved by individuals deploying regular sets of interactional behaviors. Our aim here is not to provide an exhaustive review of CA; rather, we strive to summarize critical conversation features that are typical to interpreter talk during team preparation sessions.

METHODOLOGY

The data for this analysis are drawn from a larger video project in which multiple ASL interpretations of a single English source text were filmed. As part of that project, an interpreting team consisting of a Deaf and a hearing interpreter was filmed rendering the text. Both practitioners held RID certification, and each had more than 20 years of professional experience as an interpreter. At the time of the filming, the interpreters were working as full-time staff interpreters and had worked together for approximately 15 years.

The team was asked to interpret a source text of a 15-minute video of a spoken English lecture titled "The Life of the Ant." The task was to prepare for the lecture, provide an interpretation, and debrief in a manner that exemplified their team process. The interpreters were each given a written copy of an outline for the lecture at the time of the recording (see appendix A), and each segment (preparation, interpretation, and debriefing) was filmed in a television studio. In this chapter we examine only the conversation conducted during the preparation session, a 9½-minute conversation that was conducted in American Sign Language.

ANALYSIS

For the purpose of analysis, we created both an ASL transcription and an English translation of the conversation. Conversation analysis regards transcriptions as a representation of data, while the video of the conversation is viewed as a "reproduction" of a type of social event (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998). Transcription is acknowledged to be a selective process in which the theoretical goals and definitions of the approach are reflected (Ochs, 1979) and is more difficult in signed languages because transcription conventions vary among researchers. For clarity and readability, we

elected to present the data in the form of an English translation. We created the translation in a four-step process using the video of the preparation session: (1) we jointly created a translation of the preparation session, (2) a research assistant who is an experienced ASL-English interpreter created a second translation, and (3) the two translations were combined, reviewed, and revised, and (4) the interpreters who participated in this study reviewed the translated data samples in this chapter, made revisions as they deemed appropriate, and approved the samples for use in this chapter.

In CA, both the linguistic content of the conversation as well as the prosodic aspects of dialogue are considered to be critical to the understanding of the conversational exchange. Although the transcription symbols used in CA were designed for the analysis of speech, we selected key transcription conventions to illustrate the prosodic and timing cues that occurred in the preparation session (see table 1). The numbering to the left of the sample utterances indicates the sequencing of the turn taking,

TABLE 1. *Conversation Analysis Transcription Symbols Used in Samples*

Item	Symbol	Definition	Transcription Sample
held segment	:	A colon indicates that the individual has held or "stretched" a sign. The more colons, the longer the hold.	yes:::
pause	(.)	A dot enclosed in parentheses indicates a pause in the conversation of less than two-tenths of a second.	pace (.)
Emphasis	___	Underlining indicates an animated or emphatic segment.	must
Latching	=	An equal sign indicates latching between utterances in the conversation.	"ants"?= =like…
overlapping talk	[ ]	Brackets indicate overlapping talk between the individuals.	[like, um] [English order?]
nonverbal activity	(( ))	Double parentheses indicate prosodic or nonverbal activity.	((nodding))

and the abbreviations "DI" and "HI" refer to the Deaf interpreter and the hearing interpreter, respectively.

RESULTS

Opening

The team interpreters' preparation session opens with immediate reference to the work of preparing to interpret the text. It should be noted that prior to the filming of their presession, the interpreters arrived at the studio and briefly greeted each other; this greeting was not captured on video. The transcription provided here occurred after the filming began.

01 DI: Well (.), after reading through the outline [(.) nodding]
02 HI: [((nodding))]
03 DI: about the lecture on ants [(.) nodding],
04 HI: [((nodding))]
05 DI: and looking over the list of vocabulary items [(.) nodding],
06 HI: [((nodding))]
07 DI: I'm feeling comfortable with the terms.
08 So I feel that you can fingerspell those terms at a regular pace.
09 You don't <u>have to</u> emphasize: the words ((negative head shake)).
10 HI: OK (.). The lecture opens by talking about "ants" (.), not "insects"(.)
11 How do you want me to sign "ants"? =
12 =like (HI signs a two-handed classifier for a small crawling thing)? (.)
13 or what sign would [you prefer]?
14 DI: [((nodding))] Good question.

Total time: 25 seconds

In their conversational opening, the DI and HI immediately begin discussing the upcoming work by referring to the information in the lecture outline. The DI opens the conversation by stating his preference for how the HI should feed him technical vocabulary items contained in the talk. During his opening remarks, the DI pauses and glances at his team interpreter several times, presumably to gauge his partner's comprehension of his comments and to receive confirmation of the understanding. The HI responds to the DI's eye gaze and nods in

response, providing a parallel behavior that indicates she understands the DI's remarks.

The DI also engages in similar nonverbal confirmation behaviors by nodding as the HI is asking a question about the best way to sign "ants." One may surmise that the interpreters are engaging in conversational signals that have been well established through their prior working experience, thus bypassing a need to more carefully negotiate their conversational cues. Further, the team members are affirming and confirming one another's comments by nodding to indicate both attention and understanding and by providing supportive comments (e.g., "Good question"). This conversational style is expedient and goal oriented with quick resolutions to real-world challenges in coconstructing an interpretation.

Turn Taking

The team interpreters had a number of turn-taking exchanges in their 9½-minute preparation session. Two sample segments from their conversation are provided here.

Sample 1

01	HI:	What I'm planning is to give more of (.) a signed English translation,
02		which you will elaborate with the use of classifiers, right? [((nodding))]
03	DI:	[((nodding))] =
04	HI:	[((nodding))]
05	DI:	= [Yes:::::](.) so you can give it to me in English.
06		More [like, um] =
07	HI:	[English order?]
08	DI:	[((nodding))] = English order ((nodding)).
09		Not <u>exact English</u>, but still English ((nodding)).
10	HI :	OK [((nodding))].
11	DI:	I tend to incorporate <u>a lot</u> of classifiers and change the word order in the
12		interpretation (.)
13		For this lecture, I assume I will need to incorporate <u>a lot</u> of classifiers
14		to convey the concepts that may not be conveyed the same way in the

15 English.
16 When you relay the information to me, go ahead and sign in English word
17 order ((nodding)).

Total time: 30 seconds

In this segment, the team members engage in multiple exchanges and employ consecutive nodding to one another, which appears to be reinforcing their points of agreement and bringing completion to a particular point. Also notable is how the DI and HI filled in the empty slot, "English order," and then used the term again in the short segment. The DI also emphasized twice that he would use "a lot" of classifiers in his interpretation. This redundancy helps to both advance the discussion and reiterate critical information. One may surmise that these repetitive turn-taking behaviors serve to reassure each conversational partner of their shared understanding of the topics being discussed, while simultaneously indicating that both individuals are ready to move on to the next topic.

Sample 2

01 HI: That makes me think of pace:, if it seems slow ((nod)), that means I can hold
02 the information in memory while you finish your interpretation.
03 I will hold::: the incoming message, then ((nod)) when you're ready,
04 deliver the next part ((nodding)).
05 That way you have more time to develop your interpretation, right?
06 [((nodding))]
07 DI: [((nodding))] Yes (.), you can fingerspell (.) ((nodding)),
08 at a slow pace (.) ((nodding)) and be holding the information in memory (.).
09 Then feed it to me in little chunks throughout the lecture ((nodding)).
10 That will give me time to stay close to the source text.
11 He seems to have pausing built into his presentation ((nodding)).
12 He is not going to go full steam ahead. It should be fairly relaxed,

13 so we can use that pace to our advantage to catch up and slow down::

Total time: 39 seconds

This second sample segment of turn taking consists of only one turn exchange. In this segment, the HI informs the DI of how she plans to deliver the message. She states—and reiterates—that she will hold the incoming source message in memory to provide time for the DI to construct his interpretation. The information is then repeated by the DI, who appears to signal agreement about how the coconstructed interpretation will be performed. As with the first sample, this process of redundancy can serve as an effective method for the team interpreters to show understanding and create agreement.

Adjacency Pairs

The team interpreters used question-response adjacency pairs in order to negotiate their working conditions:

Sample 1

01 HI: I'm wondering if I can use an abbreviation for "pheromones" —perhaps P-H?
02 Then you can expand it, right? [((nod))]
03 DI: [((nod))] Yes, [P-H will help]. =
04 HI: [((nodding))]
05 DI: = When I see P-H, I'll know what that abbreviation stands for.

Total time: 7 seconds

In this adjacency pair, the DI and the HI negotiate a sign for the concept of "pheromones." The negotiation is made more expedient because of the affirmative nodding on the part of both interpreters, as well as the repetition of the agreed-upon term by the DI.

Sample 2

01 HI: OK, one more thought. If, like (.), maybe I notice that you're copying my
02 feeds. How should I let you know that's [what I'm observing]?
03 DI: [I will feel supported] if you sign
04 something to indicate that I need to do my own interpretation.

Total time: 10 seconds

In this question-response adjacency pair, a more sensitive topic is broached; that is, the HI asks the DI how to signal him if his interpretation is too closely adhering to the English syntactic form that she will be feeding to him. This topic is somewhat delicate in that it involves judgment on the part of one of the team members, and the DI might feel he is being "corrected" for his work. The DI responds by sharing his own internal process and reassuring the HI that he will not be offended by a reminder; in fact, he will feel supported. The team members successfully use the adjacency pair to display to one another their ongoing understanding of one another's talk.

Repairs

The video shows only one instance of what may be regarded as a "repair" between the team interpreters:

01 HI: And the same with the word "castes." How should I sign that? (HI provides a few examples and fingerspells "castes.")
02 DI: (DI then models a sign for "castes" in a different way.)

Total time: 5 seconds

In this segment the interpreting team is seeking to resolve the question of selecting the correct sign for the concept of "castes." The HI poses several sample signs, and the DI "repairs" the signs offered by offering a different selection. This type of repair can also be a sensitive point in the preparation session if the participants feel they disagree about the correctness of sign choices. Here the HI immediately defers to the DI, perhaps in recognition of his native fluency in ASL. Repairs serve as a means to "right" the information in the social interaction, and, in this sample, the repair was made without incident.

Closings

After approximately 9 minutes the interpreters' preparation conversation began slowing down. To initiate the close of the conversation, the Deaf interpreter made an initial preclosing statement:

01 DI: Well, I think that's it. Anything more we should discuss?
02 HI: ((nodding))
03 DI: ((nodding))

04 HI: I think we're [ready].
05 DI: [OK] Ready to go!
06 HI: ((nodding and smiling))
07 DI: ((nodding and smiling))

Total time: 9 seconds

This brief closing exchange seems to indicate that both interpreters agree that they have had enough time to talk about all of the things they needed to discuss. This is accomplished when the DI directly proposes to end the conversation, and the HI responds affirmatively. In turn, the DI provides a final closing statement, "Ready to go!" which is supported by nodding behaviors on the part of both participants.

CONCLUSION

We have provided samples of features identified in conversation analysis in order to examine the interactional structure used by a Deaf interpreter and a hearing interpreter as they prepared to interpret a spoken English lecture. As anticipated, we found that their conversation utilized the interactional units that have been identified in spoken language conversational structure. In this case, we saw how this team's pattern of interaction fostered a collaborative team-building approach to the work. The interpreters provided ample time for communication, with little overlap in turn taking and adjacency pairs that raised and responded to topics important to the successful cocreating of the interpretation. Throughout their conversation, the interpreters were able to achieve their designated course of action by conveying and responding to an underlying structural organization of talk in interaction.

Earlier in the chapter we referred to the concept of *recipient design,* in which the team members design their communication to be understood by one another. This particular team's long history of working together illustrated that they understood each other's conversational style and needs and could create orderliness in their conversation. The conversation between the interpreters also revealed how they included context—externally, through their mutual understanding of the social categories, relationships, and institutional settings in which they were working and, internally, by the specific details in their discussion about preparation for the assignment. The interpreters shaped their conversation by

referring to the context in which it was created and in light of what had preceded it.

We suggest that this single-case study of an interpreting team comprising both a Deaf and a hearing interpreter represents a positive model for communication during preparation. The interpreters had minimal overlapping talk, so both had time to finish their thoughts, they did not stray from the point in adjacency pairs, the single repair was made collaboratively, and they opened and closed the conversation in an expedient manner in which both individuals appeared satisfied.

This study is based on one sample and is specific to this particular Deaf and hearing team. Some topics typical to team interpreting were not addressed in this sample: for example, who will explain the roles and operations of the team and how the team members will be positioned. In addition, the relationship of the two participants certainly reflected the length of time they had worked together, their prior work experiences, and the communication patterns they had developed over time. Keeping in mind these factors, we conclude that the single-case analysis reflects an authentic and well-formed sample of conversation in preparing for a teamed interpretation. Through the use of CA, we are thus able, as Psathas (1995) suggests, to examine a reproducible form of a social activity that may serve to guide the training of team interpreters' conversations.

Conversation analysis serves as a paradigm by which team interpreters can assess their own discourse. With the knowledge that conversations are structured in predictable ways, interpreters may be better able to analyze their preparation discussion in terms of typical behaviors for opening conversations, taking turns, repairing one another's comments, creating adjacency talk, and closing conversations. In this way the attitudes and emotions that arise, especially after an unsatisfying preparation session, may be examined in terms of what took place in the structures of the discourse. Was one interpreter expecting a long conversational opening, while the other tried to get to the point? Did one of the interpreters not respond as expected in the adjacency pair? Were both parties ready to close the conversation, and, if so, how was it negotiated? Conversation analysis provides a tangible means by which interpreters can analyze and talk about the success of their teamwork.

This study has examined the discourse of a Deaf and hearing interpreting team as they prepared to interpret a spoken English lecture into ASL. The results of the study show that team interpreters utilize the

interactional units and rules as identified in the conversation analysis framework. Further, this chapter provides a framework that practitioners and educators can use to examine conversational practices during teaming. This examination of conversation between two highly skilled interpreters with much experience in working together provides a starting point for interpreters to use in their own preparation sessions. Critically, it provides a structure that may foster greater collaboration and interdependence on every teamed assignment.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We express our sincere gratitude to the following individuals for their invaluable contributions to this chapter: Dianne Oberg, Carolyn Ressler, Derek Roff, Cynthia Roy, Steve Walker, and Leandra Williams.

REFERENCES

Adam, R., & Stone, C. (2011). Through a historical lens: Contextualizing interpreting research. In B. Nicodemus & L. Swabey (Eds.), *Advances in interpreting research* (pp. 225–240). Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Adamowicz, A. (1989). The role of anticipation in discourse: Text processing in simultaneous interpreting. *Polish Psychological Bulletin, 20*(2), 133–160.

Boudreault, P. (2005). Deaf interpreters. In T. Janzen (Ed.), *Topics in signed language interpreting* (pp. 323–356). Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Brasel, B. (1976). The effects of fatigue on the competence of interpreters for the deaf. In H. Murphy (Ed.), *Selected readings in the integration of deaf students at CSUN* (pp. 19–22). Northridge: California State University.

Cerney, B. (2004). *Relayed interpretation from English to American Sign Language via a hearing and deaf interpreter.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Union Institute and University, Cincinnati, OH.

Chernov, G. V. (1994). Message redundancy and message anticipation in simultaneous interpretation. In S. Lambert & B. Moser-Mercer (Eds.), *Bridging the gap: Empirical research in simultaneous interpreting* (pp. 139–153). Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Coates, J., & Sutton-Spence, R. (2001). Turn-taking patterns in deaf conversation. *Journal of Sociolinguistics, 5*(4), 507–529. doi:10.1111/1467-9481.00162.

Cumsky Weiss, A. (2003). Childbirth: A case for team interpreting. *RID Views, 20*(4), 6–7.

Forestal, E. (2005). The emerging professionals: Deaf interpreters and their views and experiences on training. In M. Marschark, R. Peterson, & E. A. Winston (Eds.), *Sign language interpreting and interpreter education: Directions for research and practice* (pp. 235–259). New York: Oxford University Press.

Garfinkel, H., & Sacks, H. (1970). On formal structures of practical actions. In J. C. McKinney & E. A. Tiryakian (Eds.), *Theoretical sociology* (pp. 337–366). New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Heritage, J. (1984). *Garfinkel and ethnomethodology.* Cambridge, UK: Polity.

Heritage, J. (1988). Explanations as accounts: A conversation analytic perspective. In C. Antaki (Ed.), *Analyzing everyday explanations: A casebook of methods* (pp. 127–144). London: Sage.

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

Hutchby, I., & Wooffitt, R. (1998). *Conversation analysis: Principles, practices, and applications* (2nd ed.). Malden, MA: Polity.

Jaworski, A., & Coupland, N. (1999). *The discourse reader* (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge.

Jefferson, G., & Schegloff, E. A. (Eds.). (1992). *Harvey Sacks: Lectures on conversation.* Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Johnston, E. (2005). The field of certified deaf interpreting. *CIT News, 25*(2), 8–9.

Jones, A. (2007). Team interpreting: The good teammate. In *Innovative practices in team interpreting: Proceedings from 2006 EFSLI conference* (pp. 36–40). Prague: EFSLI.

Langholtz, D. (2004). Deaf interpreters today: A growing profession. *WFD News, 17*(1), 17.

Liddicoat, A. J. (2007). *An introduction to conversational analysis.* New York: Continuum.

McCleary, L., & Leite, T. (2013). Turn taking in Brazilian Sign Language: Evidence from overlap. *Journal of Interactional Research in Communication Disorders, 4*(1), 123–156. doi : 10.1558/jircd.v4i1.123

McIlvenny, P. (1995). Seeing conversations: Analyzing sign language talk. In P. ten Have & G. Psathas (Eds.), *Studies in ethnomethodology and conversation analysis* (pp. 129–150). Washington, DC: International Institute for Ethnomethodology and Conversation Analysis and University Press of America.

Moser-Mercer, B., Künzli, A., & Korac, M. (1998). Prolonged turns in interpreting: Effects on quality, physiological, and psychological stress (pilot study). *Interpreting, 3*(1), 47–64.

NCIEC, Beldon, J., Boudreault, P., Cogen, C., Forestal, E., Garcia, L., Lazorisak, C., Moyers, P., Napier, C., & Peterson, D. (2008). Laying the foundation for deaf interpreters' education: Deaf interpreting as a career choice within the realm of the deaf studies curriculum. In *Deaf studies today! Conference proceedings of 2008*.

Nicodemus, B. (2009). *Prosodic markers and utterance boundaries in American Sign Language interpretation.* Washington, DC: Gallaudet University Press.

Ochs, E. (1979). Transcription as theory. In E. Ochs & B. Schieffelin (Eds.), *Developmental pragmatics* (pp. 43–72). New York: Academic Press.

Peterson, D. (2004). Who monitors deaf interpreters? *RID Views, 21*(10), 17.

Psathas, G. (1995). *Conversation analysis: The study of talk-in-interaction.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Ressler, C. (1999). A comparative analysis of a direct interpretation and an intermediary interpretation in American Sign Language. *Journal of Interpretation,* 71–102.

RID. (1997). *Use of a certified deaf interpreter.* Retrieved June 20, 2012, from http://www.rid.org/UserFiles/File/pdfs/Standard_Practice_Papers/CDISPP.pdf.

RID. (2007). *Team interpreting.* Retrieved June 20, 2012, from http://www.rid.org/UserFiles/File/pdfs/Standard_Practice_Papers/Drafts_June_2006/Team_Interpreting_SPP.pdf.

Sacks, H. (1972). An initial investigation of the usability of conversational data for doing sociology. In D. Sudnow (Ed.), *Studies in social interaction* (pp. 31–74). New York: Free Press.

Sacks, H. (1975). Everyone has to lie. In M. Sanchez & B. G. Blount (Eds.), *Sociocultural dimensions of language use* (pp. 57–80). New York: Academic Press.

Sacks, H., & Schegloff, E. A. (1979). Two preferences in the organization of reference to persons and their interactions. In G. Psathas (Ed.), *Everyday language: Studies in ethnomethodology* (pp. 15–21). New York: Irvington.

Schegloff, E. A. (1972). Notes on a conversational practice: Formulating place. In D. N. Sudnow (Ed.), *Studies in social interaction* (pp. 75–119). New York: Free Press/Macmillan.

Schegloff, E. A. (1987). Analysing single episodes of interaction: An exercise in conversation analysis. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 50*(2), 101–114.

Schegloff, E. A. (1988). On an actual virtual servo-mechanism for guessing bad news: A single-case conjecture. *Social Problems, 35*(4), 442–457.

Schegloff, E. A. (1992). In another context. In A. Duranti & C. Goodwin (Eds.), *Rethinking context: Language as an interactive phenomenon* (pp. 191–228). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schegloff, E. A. (2007). *Sequence organization in interaction: A primer in conversation analysis, Vol. 1.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schegloff, E. A., Jefferson, G., & Sacks, H. (1977). The preference for self-correction in the organisation of repair in conversation. *Language, 53,* 361–382.

Schegloff, E. A., & Sacks, H. (1973). Opening up closings. *Semiotica, 8,* 289–327.

Sidnell, J. (2010). *Conversational analysis.* Oxford, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.

Stubbs, M. (1983). *Discourse analysis: The sociolinguistic analysis of natural language.* Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Tannen, D. (1986). *That's not what I meant!: How conversational style makes or breaks relationships*. New York: Morrow.

Tannen, D. (1990). *You just don't understand: Women and men in conversation*. New York: Morrow.

Tannen, D. (1994). *Talking from 9 to 5: Women and men at work*. New York: Morrow.

Tannen, D. (2006). *You're wearing that? Understanding mothers and daughters in conversation*. New York: Random House.

Taylor, T. J., & Cameron, D. (1987). *Analysing conversation: Rules and units in the structure of talk*. Oxford: Pergamon.

Ten Have, P. (1999). *Doing conversational analysis: A practical guide*. London: Sage.

Tinsley, K. A. (2003). Teaming in the public schools. *RID Views, 20*(1), 10–11.

Vidal, M. (1997). New study on fatigue confirms need for working in teams. *Proteus, 6*(1), 1–7.

Woodcock, K., & Fischer, S. L. (2008). *Occupational health and safety for sign language interpreters*. (Workplace Safety and Insurance Board Research Advisory Council Grant #0523). Toronto: Ryerson University. www.ryersohn.ca/woodcock/ohsforsli.

Appendix A

Lecture Outline: "The Life of the Ant"

Note: This written outline was created by the speaker and was provided to the interpreters for preparation purposes.

I. What is an ant?
   A. A type of insect
   B. An individual
   C. A member of a colony

II. What is the world of an ant?
   A. The colony
   B. Outside
   C. Senses

III. How do ants differ?
   A. Between species
      1. Way of life
      2. Size
   B. Within a colony
      1. Castes
      2. Age

IV. How do ants communicate?
   A. By posture
   B. By touch
   C. By pheromones

V. What effects do ants have on their surroundings?
   A. Positive effects for other insects
   B. Positive effects for plants
   C. Negative effects for humans
   D. Positive effects for humans

SPECIAL VOCABULARY

Aphids
castes (occupational divisions within an ant colony)
gaster (the large end segment of an ant)
pheromones (signaling chemicals)