

Mock Interpreting in the Classroom

Annette Miner¹, Ann Pattenaude, Liz Donovan, Anita Nelson, Teresa Edwards, Clint Behunin, Teddi vonPingel, Holly Nelson, Samond Bishara, Carolyn Ball

VRS Interpreting Institute

Abstract

Situating the learning of interpreting students in the context of real world experience provides exposure to authentic decision-making opportunities that are more realistic than educators can typically arrange in the classroom. Through the practice of mock interpreting scenarios that are realistic, yet safe, low-risk experiences, students can grapple with decisions, make mistakes, try again, and discuss their experiences with the Deaf and hearing individuals for whom they interpreted, getting the consumers' perspectives and preparing them for their future work as interpreters. Grounded in research in the adult learning field, this paper introduces educators to the theory of experiential and situated learning and then extends theory to practice. Logistics, such as collaboration with the Deaf community for recruitment of actors, scenario development, scheduling and facilitation of mock interpreting experiences for an entire class will be discussed. Scenarios developed by workshop participants are included.

Keywords: mock interpreting, sign language, interpreter training, situated learning, experiential learning, real-world experience, authentic experience, decision-making

¹ Correspondence to: Annette Miner, aminer1@sorenson.com

Mock Interpreting in the Classroom

In the hallway near the interpreting lab, the nurse and interpreting student who is accompanying her pause at a closed door. The nurse and student have a short discussion about what to do, and the nurse finally decides to ring the imaginary doorbell. They wait for someone to answer the door. They are on a mock house call and the nurse is checking in on her Deaf patient, who has just been released from surgery. After a few moments, the Deaf patient's husband answers the door. They enter the dimly lit student-lounge-turned-living-room and find the Deaf woman lying on a couch, clearly not feeling well. Her husband greets the nurse in sign language and thanks her for coming, and the student begins interpreting.

The narrative above describes a mock interpreting experience arranged for an American Sign Language interpreting student to practice interpreting a simulated home healthcare visit. It is not a real medical interpreting experience; indeed, the interpreting lab classroom is just outside the closed door and around the corner. Yet, the environment simulates the living room of a Deaf couple's home, the couple is actually a Deaf husband and wife, and the woman has actually recently recovered from surgery. The nurse is an actual nurse, and asks actual questions that she would ask in that situation. The scenario was realistic, yet provided a safe, low-risk experience, allowing the student to grapple with decisions, make mistakes, and try again. Afterward, he was able to discuss the experience with the Deaf couple and hearing nurse, getting their perspectives.

Situated Learning

Immersion in experiential activity is one way that adults typically learn. It is supported by situated learning theory and includes communities of practice, cognitive apprenticeships, and authentic learning activities. The concept of situated learning was described by Lave (1988) in her study on teaching mathematics. She found that when students applied math in the real-world contexts of the grocery store or in their kitchens measuring food in order to follow their Weight Watcher's diets, they were more successful in solving problems than when they attempted to solve math problems during traditional pencil and paper tasks in the classroom.

Learners do not just learn something in a classroom and then easily transfer it to the contexts where they are supposed to apply their knowledge (Brown, Collins & Duguid, 1989). How many times have you taught a lesson in your classroom, only to see students missing opportunities to apply the lesson during an interpreting activity? It's not that they aren't paying attention. For real learning and understanding to happen, students need to learn with the social interactions, tools, activities and culture of the setting where the knowledge is to be applied (Hansman & Wilson, 1998; Kim & Merriam, 2010).

Since the concept of situated learning emerged in the late 1980's (Lave, 1988; Brown, Collins & Duguid, 1989), it has been incorporated into the curriculum of a wide variety of subjects. It has been used in writing classrooms, art classrooms, computer classes, and also in technology to create virtual realities as a context for learning (Hansman & Wilson, 1998; McLellan, 1996; Kim & Merriam, 2010).

Situated learning can be integrated into learning environments in many forms. Communities of practice are one form of situated learning, in which newcomers to a field join a community of members from their profession, share information and experiences, and thereby develop expertise (Wenger, 2000). This is commonly seen in practicums and internships in American Sign Language interpreting programs. Cognitive apprenticeships (Brown, Collins & Duguid, 1989) occur through the guidance of a master teacher and through modeling and coaching during a real-world task. These may take place in an interpreting classroom or outside the classroom in a real-world interpreting experience. Finally, context-based experiences and authentic activities are seen as central to situated learning (Brown, Collins & Duguid, 1989), and types of activities can vary widely. The mock interpreting experience described in this paper is an example of authentic activity arranged for interpreting students in the classroom.

Role of educators in situated learning

When providing situated learning experiences, the work of the interpreter educator changes from “sage on the stage” or even “guide on the side” (Morrison, 2014) into a role of facilitating and arranging situated learning experiences. In situated learning, the role of the educator is to study interpreted interactions and subsequently design learning environments to replicate them as nearly as possible (Fenwick, 2003). The educator's goal becomes arranging conditions in complex social situations that will help student interpreters practice the skills they need (Fenwick, 2003). In sum, educators study the type of complex social situations that will help students practice the real work of interpreting, then design and arrange similar learning environments. The overarching goal of educators becomes one of facilitating students' involvement in the real-world experience of interpreters in a community of practice.

Types of Mock Interpreting Experiences

At the VRS Interpreting Institute, we provided a variety of mock interpreting experiences for students. Some were located in the interpreting classroom or other rooms nearby, while others took place in real world contexts, in places such as schools, colleges, and social services agencies. This paper describes only the mock interpreting experiences that took place at the VRS Interpreting Institute. A description of the mock interpreting experiences that took place off campus, in the real world, is beyond the scope of this paper.

Students had the opportunity to practice in four types of mock interpreting settings: interactive meetings, ASL presentations, English presentations and video meetings, such as video remote settings or video relay calls. For each type, the goal of educators was to make the setting feel as real as possible, in order to situate student learning in a context that was as similar to the real world as it could be, while still keeping the experience safe and low-risk. To that end, rooms were transformed to simulate each setting. Props were added when appropriate to enhance the real-world experience. Actors were recruited to play both hearing and Deaf consumers in each type of setting. For interactive settings, actors were given pre-written scenarios that described their roles, the context of the scenario they were acting

in, the learning objectives, possible dialogue or questions to be asked, along with information for possible answers. Scenarios also contained weblinks with resources for actors to use to prepare for their roles. Whenever possible, actors were hired that were actual experts in the roles or topics for each scenario, especially for ASL or English presentations. Examples of each type of scenario follow.

Interactive meetings

Interactive settings are valuable learning experiences because of the complexities of conversation management and possible cultural mediation that is involved. These meetings consisted of at least one Deaf participant and at least one hearing participant. Contexts for settings varied greatly. Examples are a meeting between a hearing principal and a Deaf parent, between a ride-share employer and a prospective Deaf driver, a job interview, home health visit, parent-teacher conference, meeting with a travel agent, or employee reprimand. Rooms were arranged to resemble a room where these meetings could actually occur. This included props such as clipboards, pens, desks, computers, and the like.

Actors are often carefully chosen based upon the roles and objectives in the scenario. Over time, a pool of actors was developed who understood the goals of the mock interpreting experience and were flexible enough to play a variety of roles. For specialized roles, we found it helpful to recruit actors who had experience or expertise in the role they were being asked to prepare for. Ideally, hearing actors did not know sign language and depended on the students' interpretations to participate in the interaction. Training actors, when possible, also produced more authentic interactions. The goal for actors was to keep an authentic conversation going for 15-20 minutes. Actors were not given scripts with dialogue; rather, they were given a scenario at least a week in advance that described the context and other details of the scenario. They were responsible for preparing for their scenario by researching resources that we provided, in order to be prepared with questions and answers that are realistic. If they did not know an answer to a question posed by their actor counterpart, they were instructed to simply invent an answer, even if they did not know whether it was true or not.

ASL and English presentations

Presentations in ASL were delivered by Deaf actors, preferably individuals who regularly took the role we asked them to perform. For example, a presentation describing a local organization that assists Deaf women experiencing domestic violence was given by the director of the organization. Likewise, presentations in English were given by hearing actors who had expertise in the subject they were presenting on. For example, a lecture on beekeeping was given by a beekeeper. Elementary classrooms were simulated by recruiting actual elementary school teachers to present a typical lesson, complete with worksheets or other materials they use to teach. For presentations of this type, it is most authentic when there is a live audience for the speaker to address their presentation to, and receive backchannel feedback from. For the elementary school simulation, having real children present for the teacher to work with added to the authenticity of the experience and provided additional decision-making opportunities for the interpreting students. For presentations in ASL, this meant recruiting Deaf audience members who could access the presentation directly, as well as hearing audience members who were dependent on the interpreting students to understand the presentation.

Video Interpreting

Other scenarios were arranged for students that included the technology of video interpreting. Mock video relay stations were available for students to practice interpreting through technology and a two-dimensional medium. Actors participated from a distance, calling in to place phone calls to other actors or to actual businesses. For example, Deaf actors called local hardware stores through the student interpreters to inquire about products or services, called service providers to make appointments, or called travel agents to make travel plans. Sometimes Deaf actors called other hearing actors through the student interpreters to act out a parent teacher meeting or wish the other one a happy birthday. If mock video relay stations are not available, similar technology can be arranged through the use of video conferencing software programs and telephones. Cell phones can be used but land lines that are more similar to the real world of video relay interpreting are preferred.

Identifying Resources for Mock Interpreting

Recruiting actors for mock interpreting experiences is a highly specialized endeavor. Each program that facilitates a situated learning experience will have different needs and different resources available in their communities. Some programs, such as the VRS Interpreting Institute, have funding to pay actors for their time. Other programs rely on reciprocal services between students and Deaf individuals, such as supporting Deaf fundraisers, and service learning activities in exchange for the Deaf actors' time. Some programs provide a meal in conjunction with the mock interpreting experience that can be enjoyed by actors and students either before or afterward. Some programs are located in colleges where acting programs, nursing programs, public speaking programs or police academies are willing to partner with interpreting programs to provide mutual situated learning opportunities. Students can also recruit friends or family members to participate in mock interpreting experiences. Finally, tours of hospitals or art galleries or public city meetings can be arranged for students to interpret as a mock interpreting experience. We also developed a partnership with a local Deaf leader who established an agency for recruiting Deaf actors. When Deaf actors were needed, the network of Deaf individuals in the community could be accessed through the agency. Actors were paid through the agency, which became a benefit to us, as we then only had one entity to submit payment to.

Writing Mock Interpreting Scenarios

As briefly described above, actors for interactive sessions were provided with scenario information at least a week in advance of the mock interpreting experience. Actors were expected to become familiar with the scenario, including researching the resources provided in the scenario. Most scenarios written for mock interpreting experiences contained the context for the interaction, student learning objectives, brief description of the setting, the actors that were needed, props to be included, and demands to be placed on the interpreter. Scenarios were not written as scripts, but rather as guides for the actors to follow. Actors were expected to use their own experiences and research to keep the interactive sessions going.

Context

Scenarios always included the context for the interaction and were often based on real life interpreting experiences of professional interpreters, with confidential and identifying information removed or modified. Examples are a home healthcare visit, meeting with a banker to open a new bank account, meeting with an insurance agent to discuss a claim, meeting with a landlord to complete a rental application, and any other context that an interpreter may interpret in. These were often based on the concepts, settings, language features or vocabulary the students were studying during the week of the mock interpreting experience.

Student learning objectives

Beginning with the end in mind was the key when we developed scenarios for mock interactive meetings. What demands did we want students to face? What challenges were important for them to overcome in this safe environment? What features of language, interactions, personalities and emotions did we want them to grapple with? Including the learning objectives also helped the actors to make sure the goals of the interpreting session were met. For example, if an objective for a specific scenario was for the student to practice interpreting emotionally charged interactions, the actors need to be sure to include strong emotions during the interaction. Similarly, if a learning objective was for students to grapple with medical terminology, actors had to be sure to use jargon and other terms from the medical field. Other demands that can be included are changing the lighting, or paralinguistic demands such as the Deaf person in a reclining position or signing with only one hand. Other examples of learning objectives included practice in cultural mediation, managing turn-taking, and interpreting terminology from specialized settings, numerical information or spatial relationships. Any demands that instructors wanted students to experience and struggle with were included as a learning objective.

Setting

Additional information regarding the context was included in mock interpreting scenarios. This often included a more detailed description of the purpose for the interaction as well as the goals of the actors. For example, further details of a parent-teacher meeting included the parent disclosing that she and her husband were recently separated and that she has had to take on a second job, resulting in her parents taking on a larger role in supervising her son after school. Further details can be included, such as attitude of the teacher or parent: strict, sympathetic, overwhelmed, or angry.

Actors

Scenarios included a list of Deaf and hearing actors needed for each scenario. Sometimes optional actors were included in the list, such as the child or spouse of a Deaf participant.

Props

When props could be added to enhance the authenticity of a scenario, they were listed on the scenario. For example, in the scenario at the beginning of this paper, additional props listed were a clipboard, pen, paper, couch, blanket,

chairs, and ‘front door’. Props were sometimes items and furniture, and sometimes they were a type of clothing such as nurses’ scrubs.

Possible questions and answers

Scenarios listed possible questions that could be asked, often with possible answers. For example, banking scenarios provided questions for the banker to ask about the customer’s account number and provided the bank account number for the customer. To facilitate the interaction, bank account details were provided.

Resources

Whenever possible, scenarios included web links or other resources for the actors to research in preparation for the mock interpreting event. For example, in the home health visit scenario example below, several links to web pages are included about what to expect during a home health visit. A scenario in which an engaged couple meet with a pastor to prepare for marriage contained a link about what to expect in this type of meeting. Other resources were included directly in the scenario description, such as a photo, diagram, graph or online video.

Scenario Samples

Several examples of scenarios are included in this paper. The scenario below is an example of one used at the VRS Interpreting Institute. Other scenarios included in Appendix 1 were developed by participants at the presentation of this paper.

Context: Healthcare Interpreting

Student Learning Objective: Students will successfully produce signed discourse that contains cultural mediations if needed and is most readily understood by a variety of Deaf consumers.

Situation: Home Healthcare Visit

Actors needed: 2 Deaf actors (female patient/family member) and 1 hearing actor (nurse)

Props: Clipboard, pen, paper, couch, blanket, chairs, ‘front door’

Description: A nurse is visiting a female patient receiving home health care services. The patient has asked for a prescription for her leg injury. The nurse must get a medical history and ask her questions about current medications to make sure any new medications will not cause counter-indications. Also, the nurse needs to verify insurance coverage.

The patient has a history of high cholesterol and high blood pressure. The patient’s mother is a breast cancer survivor and the father is diabetic. The patient has a sister that died from a stroke.

Resources for actors to be familiar with prior to mock interpreting:

<http://www.vnsny.org/caregivers/caregiving-basics/what-to-expect-at-your-first-home-care-visit/>

<https://www.medicare.gov/what-medicare-covers/home-health-care/home-health-care-what-is-it-what-to-expect.html>

<http://www.homecarenh.org/consumers-and-families/typesofhomecare/what-should-i-expect-during-a-home-care-visit/>

Possible Nurse's Questions and Patient's Answers (in parentheses):

1. Describe your current health problems and symptoms. (Severe pain in the leg)
2. What are the medicines you are currently taking? (Atorvastatin for cholesterol control and Chlorothiazide for high blood pressure control)
3. Are you taking any current OTC medications? (Vitamin C, Fish Oil, and Calcium and also Motrin)
4. List all prior surgeries including when they happened. (Appendix removed, C-section, etc.).
5. Are you allergic to anything? (Penicillin)
6. Please describe any medical issues in your immediate family. (Patient explains that she is adopted and asks if the nurse wants the adoptive parent's health history? Adopted family history: mother is a breast cancer survivor and father is diabetic. Her sister died from a stroke)
7. Insurance information: What kind of insurance do you have? (The company laid the patient off but she has COBRA program, is she still covered?)
8. Who is your employer? (Not currently employed. Did work at Fresh Market)
9. Member ID number (178453V)
10. According to the insurance coverage, Vicodin is on third tier, which means that you will have to pay \$100 for 30 pills. (Patient asks what the three-tier program means then after explanation asks if generic meds are an option?)

Scheduling Mock Interpreting Experiences

Coordination and scheduling of actors also took some intentional planning. Techniques we used to recruit actors and ensure their attendance are described below.

Actors

Over time, we developed a pool of actors that work with us regularly and are reliable. When we needed actors for a mock interpreting experience, we sent an email to all actors in our pool with the date and time of the event. We asked them to reply if they were interested and available. Of the actors who replied as available, we selected the individuals who we felt were the best fit for the specific mock interpreting type and scenario. Some scenarios required actors of a specific gender, age, language, or background knowledge. Others allowed for a more flexible choice of actors.

Once actors were selected, we sent them another email with all the information they needed, such as place, date, time, and most importantly, the scenario they would need to prepare for the event. Finally, reminders to actors were automated and emailed several days before the event.

Most of the actors in our pool have been provided with some training in what we need from them. Because many actors in our pool bring personal experience to their roles, their training is not in acting techniques but rather, in the importance of researching their topics and understanding the objectives of the mock interpreting experience.

Scheduling Tools

Scheduling was done in two different ways. First, if we had a specific date and time set for a mock interpreting experience that was not flexible, we recruited actors by emailing our pool of actors or contacting a local agency we had developed a partnership with specifically for the purpose of recruiting actors. Second, if times and dates were flexible, or if we wanted to recruit a specific actor, we used online scheduling tools to arrange for actors. Free tools such as Doodle (<http://doodle.com>) and Teamup (<http://www.teamup.com>) are possible choices.

Doodle is designed to allow users to find dates and times that work for multiple people in order to coordinate times to meet. Several date and time options can be offered and sent to the desired participants via a hyperlink. Once participants access the link, they can indicate the dates and times that they are available. Doodle provides a clear visual of times and dates for which everyone is available.

Teamup is similar to Doodle and makes it possible to quickly see many schedules at once, either by day, week or month. The user can create different groups of schedules, such as one for Deaf actors and one for hearing actors. With this tool, it is possible to hide some schedules if the user only wants to see availability for certain participants, allowing you to choose specific actors for specific mock interpreting experiences.

Facilitating Mock Interpreting Experiences

Mock interpreting events at the VRS Interpreting Institute included 12 students, although any number of students can participate, depending on how much faculty or staff support is available. Students usually rotated through several interactive meetings that were held in the interpreting classroom or in other nearby rooms. At other times, a combination of scenario types were arranged, and students rotated from an interactive meeting to an ASL presentation, to another interactive meeting or presentation. Because of the potential complexity of arranging mock interpreting, specific steps were taken to ensure smooth transitions and a successful experience.

Checklist

For each mock interpreting experience, it was helpful to make a list to ensure that no important piece is overlooked. Our checklist included:

- List of roles and responsibilities (determining objectives, recruiting actors, communicating with and scheduling actors)
- Room needs (furniture arrangement, props, materials needed by participants)
- Development of rotation schedule
- Preparatory information to be shared with students in advance, if any
- Objectives for overall mock interpreting event (teaming, soft skills, use of FM systems)

Coordination

Instructors or facilitators for mock interpreting experiences made sure that on the day of the event, all rooms were arranged according to the scenario descriptions and that all props were in place. Rooms were clearly labeled so that actors and interpreting students could easily identify where to go.

A schedule of rotations, prepared in advance, was given to the students. The experience usually began with brief introductions to the actors and an explanation of the rotation schedule (see Appendix 2). Students located their name on the rotation schedule, noting where they were to go for each interpreting session. Times on the rotation schedule were fairly precise, in order to keep rotations going. A typical set of rotations included 20-30 minutes of mock interpreting, 10 minutes for debriefing with participants after the interpretation, 10 minutes to rotate to the next room and discuss the upcoming session with another student team interpreter, then the second interpreting session began. At the conclusion of all mock interpreting and debriefing sessions, all the students and actors returned to the classroom for a full group debriefing session. At this time, both Deaf and hearing actors shared their experiences, especially when they were similar across sessions. Instructors who had observed the sessions also participated and shared their observations. Students asked questions and heard the perspectives of other students about decisions that were made when faced with the demands in each session.

Sample rotation schedules for interactive meetings or combinations of types can be found in Appendix 2. As students rotated through each mock interpreting experience, instructors or mentors were present to observe and take notes for the full group de-brief session at the conclusion. Instructors did not usually intervene at any point; students were given the opportunity to make decisions, test them, and experience the consequences of their decisions. Soliciting the help of a timekeeper was helpful in ensuring that everyone kept to the schedule.

Student Response to Mock Interpreting Experiences

Student response to mock interpreting experiences is overwhelmingly positive. For them, the mock interpreting feels real because there are Deaf and hearing participants who are relying on the interpretation to understand each other. It feels real, yet students know it is a safe environment. No one's fate is at stake. They can take risks, try something new, make mistakes. One student commented that "I was able to make mistakes and still feel safe while getting feedback from both the Deaf and hearing consumers."

Other students found the immediate application of what was just learned to be a benefit: “They (mock interpreting experiences) were a chance to practice specified content nearly immediately after learning about it.” Another student also appreciated the opportunity to practice team interpreting. She said, “I not only got exposure to very real and relevant content and situations, but also got a chance to team with my peers.”

Many students reported an increased feeling of confidence. They had the chance to see how they would handle interpreting in authentic situations and were able to do it.

Conclusions

Mock interpreting is one way to expose students to authentic interpreting experiences in a low-risk and safe environment. In our program, we arranged several mock interpreting experiences every week. The number and type of mock interpreting experiences that each interpreting program can provide will vary by program, depending on the available resources and partnerships in each community. However, providing even one mock interpreting experience can be valuable for students. We encourage the reader to continue building a network of resources and support for mock interpreting experiences. Over time this can increase the number of opportunities that can be provided for students. Start small, but dream big!

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank the participants of this workshop presented at the Conference of Interpreter Trainers 2016 Biennial Conference who developed the scenarios found in the appendix during the workshop. Also, thanks to the many School-to-Work interns, actors and support team members who have made our mock interpreting experiences successful learning opportunities for us as educators.

References

- Brown, J., Collins, A., & Duguid, P. (1989). Situated cognition and the culture of learning. *Educational Researcher*, 18(1), 32–42.
- Fenwick, T. J. (2003). *Learning through experience: Troubling orthodoxies and intersecting questions*. Malabar, FL: Krieger Publishing Company.
- Hansman, C. A., & Wilson, A. L. (1998). Teaching writing in community colleges: A situated view of how adults learn to write in computer-based writing classrooms. *Community College Review*, 26(1), 21–41.
- Kim, Y. S., & Merriam, S. B. (2010). Situated learning and identity development in a Korean older adults’ computer

- classroom. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 60(5), 438–455.
- Lave, J. (1988). *Cognition in practice: Mind, mathematics and culture in everyday life*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- McLellan, H. (1996). *Situated learning perspectives*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Educational Technology Publications.
- Morrison, Charles D. (2014). "From 'Sage on the Stage' to 'Guide on the Side': A Good Start," *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*: Vol. 8: No. 1, Article 4.
Available at: <https://doi.org/10.20429/ijstl.2014.080104>
- Wenger, E. (2000). Communities of practice and social learning systems. *Organization Articles*, 7(2), 225–246.
doi:10.1177/135050840072002

Appendix 1

Mock Interpreting Scenario #1

Context: school visit

Description: hearing parents of Deaf 5 year old child visit residential school for an appointment with Deaf principal. The hearing parents just moved to the area and are unsure about what to do for their Deaf child. The school year is starting soon (scenario would vary if you interpreted for the Deaf child instead, or if both parents and child were present).

Actors:

2 hearing parents

Deaf principal

Optional: 5-year old Deaf child just starting school

Props:

Office computer

Office VP

If child is present, parents bring toys or a coloring book. Alternatively, the principal could have toys or books in the office

Shiny objects on desk that child would be attracted to

Learning objectives:

Students will practice the following experiences:

2016 Biennial Conference – Out of the Gate, Towards the Triple Crown: Research, Learn, & Collaborate

© 2017 Conference of Interpreter Trainers

Page 12 of XX

- Matching meta notation quality: affect, context
- Matching register of professional principal and the parents' register
- Matching personality of parents
- Power of principal vs. parents
- Dealing with distraction of child
- Dealing with any hearing people that know some signs such as parents signing home signs or basic signs to principal and whether or not interpreter should continue to voice interpret

Possible questions from parents:

What does the dorm life look like?

Who monitors the kids?

What are the rules for the kids?

What does the Deaf community look like here?

What does the day program look like?

What are the pros and cons of keeping our child at home and using the day program or living at the school?

Are the teachers Deaf or hearing?

Will our child have interpreters in the classroom or direct instruction from the teacher?

What resources are available for home support?

What are some important school events and dates?

Principal's questions (Primary goal to establish rapport with parents so parents would choose school):

You just moved here? From where?

What do you prefer to do for/with your child?

Do you want speech therapy?

What are your child's educational needs?

Why did you pick this school?

Does your child have allergies?

Do you want a tour?

If parents choose the day program, explain the radius of service area, bus service, etc.

Interruptions/challenges/demands:

Deaf kid playing, distracting parents, principal, or interpreter

Child making noises as she plays

Secretary interrupting with an issue that comes up

VP call

Mom answers her phone while dad talks with the principal

Private conversation between parents

Links for actors:

Website to a residential school

Parents can invent questions based on what they read

Interpreters see what school philosophy is, etc.

Principal can use school link so he can explain the school philosophy, number of students served, school team mascot, day programs, options, and reasons to choose this school

Mock Interpreting Scenario #2

Context: Healthcare Interpreting

Learning Objective: Students will successfully produce signed discourse that contains cultural mediations if needed and is most readily understood by a variety of Deaf consumers.

Situation: Annual Health Checkup (Full physical with panel of testing)

Actors needed: 1 Deaf actor (patient) and 1 hearing actor (nurse)

Props: Clipboard, pen, paper, medical history form, hospital ‘map’, gown (if possible), table, chairs.

Description: A Deaf patient (approximate age 35) is entering a large hospital for a first-time checkup. The patient has no experience with a large medical facility and is unsure of the procedural flow. Prior to this visit, the patient was given instructions to bring 2 stool samples with her and give to the hospital staff, upon arrival. The patient is constipated and was only able to provide 1 sample.

Checkup Components:

Vitals: height, weight, blood pressure, blood test, review of self-reported medical history (document brought to the hospital), urine test, cardio test, pulmonary test.

Additional scenarios and demands:

The patient will be given a liquid to drink (Barium) for a gastro x-ray that will later cause the stool to turn white.

The patient will move to several locations for the testing and each time will be asked for her name, to verify identity prior to testing. The patient will become frustrated when not understanding the reason behind the repeated requests.

The patient will undergo a pulmonary test and there will be a timing issue between the interpreted message and the patient blowing into the pulmonary function tube. Example: The nurse might say, “When I count to 3, go ahead and blow into the tube and hold your breath before inhaling again”.

The patient will undergo an abdominal ultrasound and asked to hold her breath at intervals.

Resources

2016 Biennial Conference – Out of the Gate, Towards the Triple Crown: Research, Learn, & Collaborate

Sample medical history form (self-reported)

<https://secure.hosting.vt.edu/www.sleep.hnfe.vt.edu/HH.pdf>

Cardiology diagnostic tests: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cardiology_diagnostic_tests_and_procedures

Pulmonary tests:

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Spirometry>

Gastro x-ray w/Barium (Upper GI Tract)

<http://www.radiologyinfo.org/en/info.cfm?pg=uppergi>

Abdominal Ultrasound:

http://www.emedicinehealth.com/abdominal_ultrasound-health/article_em.htm

Mock Interpreting Scenario #3

Context: Pre-need funeral planning

Learning objectives:

- Students will learn how to use appropriate technical language for this situation.
- Students will learn how to convey emotions
- Students will learn how to manage technical interactions

Situation:

- Context - Meeting at a funeral home office to discuss funeral and estate planning

Actors:

Hearing – funeral director, hearing child, interpreter, one sibling in another state, not seen

Deaf – husband and wife

Props:

Funeral director's office, contract papers, urn, calculator, pictures of caskets, options to upgrade caskets, list of references to lawyers for other services, desk, chairs, plants

Description: A couple is going to meet with the funeral director to discuss pre-needs arrangements for elderly Deaf couple. The wife has breast cancer. They are on SSDI, but they have managed to save up some money. They do not have any type of will, living will, etc., so will need to be advised where to go for this.

Additional motivations: The hearing child may want her parents to buy the least expensive options so there is more money for her. Alternatively, she may be upset that they are contemplating this now and not want any of the money.

Resources : https://youtu.be/9b5A657_9P4

Questions:

1. Do you have any pre-arranged funeral plans? Living Wills? Power of Attorney? (answer: no, can ask for clarification of terms)

2016 Biennial Conference – Out of the Gate, Towards the Triple Crown: Research, Learn, & Collaborate

© 2017 Conference of Interpreter Trainers

Page 15 of XX

2. What is the specific reason you decided to come in now? (Wife has cancer)
3. Do you have any cash, bank accounts, or insurance policies? If so, how much are they worth approximately? (Family has very little resources – they are not wealthy, but they do have a life insurance policy worth \$30,000)
4. Do you have an executor named for your estate at this time? (Older son who lives in Chicago)
5. Do you have a method of burial you prefer (Wife wants to be buried at her mom's farm, husband wants to be buried in the cemetery where his mom is buried. Child wants them cremated.)
6. How much do you want to spend on your funeral? (How much does a funeral cost?)
7. Who will officiate the service? (pastor of the local Deaf church)

Mock Interpreting Scenario #4

Context: DMV, written driver's test

Actors:

Young Deaf- 1st time license

Hearing DMV worker

Optional-Deaf or hearing parents

2nd irate DMV supervisor

Scenario:

The young deaf person is taking their written driving test at the DMV. The test is taken standing up at a high counter with other people standing next to them. There are small dividers in between each test taker. The written questions have many double negatives that need to be conceptually accurately depicted in ASL without providing extra information that will give away the answer.

An option to add challenges could be to have a supervisor insisting that the interpreter cannot be close to the test taker that would necessitate the student explaining the interpreting process and why they are there.

Props:

A high table, with a close proximity space. And actual written questions that could be taken from any state website that has practice written tests. There are also apps available in the Google Store that have test questions to borrow.

Appendix 2

Sample Rotation Schedules

Rotation Schedules can be tricky. Below are a few examples of schedules for various presentation formats.

This schedule is for six interactive stations.

Pediatrician Consultation (<i>Brooke & Lisa</i>) Classroom 5	Athlete Physical (<i>Mike & Becky</i>) Teddi's Office	Diabetes Education (<i>Suzi & Andrea</i>) Classroom 4	Planned Parenthood (<i>May & Angie</i>) Intern Office	Home Health Nurse (<i>Susie & Cory</i>) Student Room	ER (<i>James & Kim</i>) Mentor Office	
KICK OFF & INTRODUCTIONS						1:00-1:15
SWITCH ROOMS (Interpreter Team Pre-Assignment Discussion)						1:15-1:20
Team 6	Team 5	Team 4	Team 3	Team 2	Team 1	1:20-1:50
Debrief	Debrief	Debrief	Debrief	Debrief	Debrief	1:50-2:00
BREAK & SWITCH ROOMS (Interpreter Team Pre-Assignment Discussion)						2:00-2:10
Team 5	Team 4	Team 6	Team 2	Team 1	Team 3	2:10-2:40
Debrief	Debrief	Debrief	Debrief	Debrief	Debrief	2:40-2:50
SWITCH ROOMS (Interpreter Team Pre-Assignment Discussion)						2:50-2:55
Team 4	Team 6	Team 5	Team 1	Team 3	Team 2	2:55-3:25
Debrief	Debrief	Debrief	Debrief	Debrief	Debrief	3:25-3:35
FULL GROUP DEBRIEF						3:35-4:00

This schedule is for a mixed mock interpreting types. There is a lecture in ASL, one in spoken English, and two interactive stations. The lectures have two student teams each. The interactive stations have one team each and rotate to both interactive rooms during the length of time the lectures go once.

SLCAD Shelter Mtg. Interactive 20 min. Student Room (Joene & Andrea)	AA Sponsor Mtg. Interactive 20 min. Teacher Room (Sari & Cory)	Sermon on Parables <i>English Presentation</i> 40 min. Classroom 5 (Chip)	LGBT Pride Center <i>English Presentation</i> 40 min. Classroom 4 (Brandon)	
KICK OFF & INTRODUCTIONS				1:00-1:20
Team 6 then 5	Team 5 then 6	Teams 3 & 4	Teams 1 & 2	1:20-2:00
Team debrief and short break				2:00-2:10
Team 2 then 1	Team 1 then 2	Teams 5 & 6	Teams 3 & 4	2:10-2:50
Team debrief and short break				2:50-3:00
Team 4 then 3	Team 3 then 4	Teams 1 & 2	Teams 5 & 6	3:00-3:40
FULL GROUP DEBRIEF				3:40-4:00

This schedule is for non-interactive lectures. All the students are spread throughout one large room with the presenter in front.

KICK OFF & INTRODUCTIONS	1:00-1:15
Presenter #1: Holly Nelson “Serial Killers”	1:15-1:55
Team debrief and short break	1:55- 2:05
Presenter #2: Becky Lundberg “Japanese Holidays”	2:05-2:45
Team debrief and short break	2:45-2:55
Presenter #3: Andrea Scott “Party Planning on a Budget”	2:55-3:35
FULL GROUP DEBRIEF	3:35-4:00