

ROLE OF THE LINGUIST-INTERPRETER AS EXPERT WITNESS

Nancy Frishberg¹

INTRODUCTION

In this paper I offer a taxonomy of situations in which a linguist-interpreter might be called upon to offer expert assessments, judgments or testimony where sign language or a deaf person is involved in court or related activities. The paper further attempts to distinguish the role of the interpreter from the role of the linguistic expert in the bilingual, bimodal courtroom. Both make judgments about sign language competency, sign language varieties and literacy as well as spoken language skills in the delivery of interpreting services to deaf individuals involved in the judicial system. The interpreter acts on the judgments; the expert describes, explains and recommends.

In the six cases below, I'll be describing my own experiences, putting them in the context of current practice in interpreting in the US. I am not a legal scholar or an attorney, so my comments on the contrast in roles between expert witness and interpreter reflect my opinion, not the law. I firmly expect practice to change, so that with increasingly stratified educational opportunities within interpreting, the role of professional interpreter will also change. Interpreters with specialized legal education will function as they do

now—as interpreters, while others with knowledge of both interpreting and linguistic assessment may take on additional expert roles.

THE CASES

Let's consider the range of settings that are encompassed by 'court interpreting'. The examples below are drawn from the courtroom, the district attorney's office, an administrative hearing room, the visiting room of the state women's correctional facility, and an attorney's office. The D/deaf participants in these events are bringing suit or have been accused or convicted of civil or criminal offenses, or are victim of or witness to events being tried in the court system. (That these examples include several with deaf attorneys, but none with D/deaf jury members, or D/deaf judges, is an accident of where I happened to have memorable encounters.)²

1. *Evaluation of interpreter skills to determine*

a. *language or interpreting skills competence*

We will ignore the interesting and problematic cases of interpreters' language fluencies and interpreting skills. National certification of interpreters functions as an institutional mechanism, supplemented by state qualifying criteria in some jurisdictions. Still, we generally make an interpreter's self-evaluation the primary screening device in particular situations. We educate our students and our colleagues that it is never too late to step down from an assignment where one's skills do not match the requirements of the job.³ McIntire and Sanderson (this volume) give current numbers of individuals who hold special certificates indicating training and competence in legal settings.

Court settings are interestingly different from some other situations, because the D/deaf individual (in most roles other than attorney or judge) may not have the option of requesting a particular interpreter or team.⁴ The interpreter is generally hired by the court to act on behalf of the court. The court clerk's office may be more or less knowledgeable about judging the competence (in both language and interpreting) of the people on the court interpreter roster, or may rely on a local agency for these judgments; many times, the clerk is more concerned about who will reliably appear. In a few states, the laws require interpreters working in the courts to hold specific certification or some other qualification. (Also, see comments in Case 2 below.) I'll leave these intriguing situations for another occasion.

1. *Evaluation of interpreter skills to determine*

b. *match with d/Deaf individual's linguistic competence(s)*

Case 1: Two interpreters (one hearing, one Deaf) called to work with an immigrant being arraigned in criminal court.

The local agency called me to interpret with another interpreter for an arraignment in criminal court of a deaf person who was known to be an immigrant. The other interpreter is Deaf, with multilingual abilities (two or three countries' sign languages among them). The two of us were not permitted to meet the accused man until the public defender escorted us to the holding cells behind the arraignment chambers. We spent 30-45 minutes with limited success in two areas: asking questions about the incident prompted by the attorney, and interacting on our own to get an idea of the sort of gestural and linguistic strategies that would lead to communicative success in the courtroom. We concluded that our client did not know ASL, nor any standard sign language, but was able to use some gestures. He also communicated to us his familiarity with at least some written Arabic, showing his tattoo and using paper and pencil.

This individual was unschooled from our cultural perspectives, although he may have had a religious education. We recommended to the attorney that a third interpreter be added to the team: someone who knew written Arabic. (In fact, I imagined that if this third person was able to communicate, it was possible that neither of the signing interpreters would be required.) My partner correctly predicted the next stage in the proceedings: that the client, released on his own recognizance, would not appear at the postponement of the arraignment, because of actual or dissembled lack of understanding ("a week from Wednesday, here").

2. *Evaluation of d/Deaf plaintiff/witness/defendant/
inmate for linguistic competence*

a. *sufficient linguistic capacity to understand the
interpreter and the administrative or court process*

Many times it is standard procedure (or even state regulation) to get a psychologist's evaluation before authorizing rehabilitation funds for training courses for disabled individuals. That is, the state wants some expert opinion that the individual has the mental functioning to benefit from training. The analogy in this case is that the court wanted confirmation that the deaf person who was giving crucial testimony in a particular case was linguistically competent to understand the interpreter and to give reliable testimony.

Case 2: A witness using Puerto Rican Sign Language examined for linguistic competence.

I was asked to come to court in my linguist capacity to render a judgment about a deaf witness's capacity to testify in court and to understand the interpreter. Apparently the case was already in progress: there were two interpreters (both hearing) involved, both familiar to me (one a native signer and the other very experienced). The judge called a brief recess to allow me to interact with the witness. I had a conversation (10 minutes or less) with a young woman of Puerto Rican origin then living in New York. We talked about her background, my background, her vacation plans, and so

on: nothing related to the particulars of the case. I then testified that she was linguistically competent to the extent that I could judge from the brief conversation. I added that she would need an interpreter familiar with Puerto Rican varieties of American Sign Language.

It's possible that the court was concerned about the witness's ability to understand because one of the interpreters was in fact not competent in Puerto Rican varieties of ASL. Here's a situation where I was asked a limited question "Is this witness linguistically competent, able to understand and participate in the proceedings". I was not at liberty to offer opinions about why some (unrevealed, but easily imagined) linguistic confusions might have arisen. For reasons I don't understand, the less competent interpreter chose to remain with the case, rather than resign and let the fully competent interpreter handle it.

In what sense is having a conversation a linguistic evaluation? A conversation is generally not a formal evaluation, but there are many elements of a conversation that reveal one's competence. How you introduce yourself, how you refer to your school, your hometown, your usual activities, how you ask questions of your interlocutor—all of these give evidence of linguistic and cultural habits. In this case, my own familiarity with both ASL and with the sign language situation in Puerto Rico gave me a privileged window for viewing the young woman's conversational signing skills (Frishberg 1986).

There are more formal linguistic evaluations which are structured to appear to be conversations, e.g., the Foreign Service Institute Interview. A trained interviewer, fluent in the target language, engages a candidate in conversation. Under the interviewer's direction, the conversation requires increasing competence with complex linguistic structures, such as talking about objects and events remote in time or space, or discussing hypothetical situations. One goal is to promote a comfortable non-test feeling to the interview, to guide the conversation back to language structures over which the candidate has confident control. It's possible to achieve this goal, since—even in a language testing situation—people are generally paying attention to the topics under discussion, rather than the structure of the language used to address those topics. The ho-

listic scoring system ranks candidates from no knowledge of the language (novice) through survivor, intermediate, advanced and superior (indistinguishable from a native speaker). While I have not been formally trained or evaluated in ASL versions of this test (Woodford 1980), I have emulated this method at times (see Case 4).

2. *Evaluation of d/Deaf client/witness/defendant/inmate for linguistic competence*

a. *sufficient linguistic capacity to understand the interpreter and the administrative or court process*

In another situation, however, the process was not so simple, the roles were different, and the outcome not at all satisfying.

Case 3: Two interpreters (one deaf, one hearing) asked to prepare a deaf witness (rape victim) to give testimony before the grand jury.

I was asked to come to the district attorney's office in my interpreter capacity to work with a deaf rape victim. She was to testify as a witness in order to have the accused rapist (a deaf man) indicted by the grand jury. I found a young Hispanic woman in her late teens with extremely limited gestural skills. I learned she had been attending a sheltered workshop, her first educational experience. I had limited success in communicating. I asked for a Deaf interpreter to join me in this case.

On the second occasion with the Deaf interpreter present, the district attorney gave us the range of questions that would be posed at the grand jury hearing and left us to prepare the witness. Even questions such as "where did he rape you?" or "when did this happen?" were problematic. Incorporating the use of a calendar, public transportation maps of the area where the attack took place, and having the three of us (two interpreters and witness) visit the neighborhood under discussion escorted by a police officer yielded no reliable communicative results. We two interpreters felt unready to have the witness make a court appearance. We agreed with the district attorney that the case could not be pursued.

Initially the young woman's sister had been functioning as her interpreter, but the district attorney was not willing to let a family member interpret in court. Her sheltered workshop instructor was a certified interpreter, but felt a conflict of interest at taking on the role of interpreter in this case. No one doubted that the woman was attacked; in fact, part of the problem was that we were trying to get her to be specific about only one incident, when there had been a prior attack by the same individual, but in a different jurisdiction. The witness-victim had difficulty giving a coherent account isolating the second incident.

I remain dissatisfied with the outcome of this case even now, some 10 years later, but have no better solution to offer. The court situation requires that the account of the incident conform to the question-answer protocols defined by the attorneys, rather than a free retelling with the usual conversational digressions.

2. *Evaluation of d/Deaf plaintiff/witness/defendant/inmate for linguistic competence*

b. *production and reception of sign language(s)*

There are cases where the expertise needs to be spelled out in full, and the whole array of linguistic techniques and tools available will be useful. While a microanalysis is required, the report presented to the attorneys or testimony in court needs to be addressed to the educated lay reader, not other technical experts. The comments below are an abbreviated and re-worked version of a report prepared for the Legal Aid Society attorneys (Frishberg 1991).

Case 4: Legal Aid Society brings law suit against department of corrections on behalf of a female Deaf inmate who has had no services delivered in sign language during her incarceration.

I was asked to evaluate a deaf woman in her late 30s or early 40s, who had been incarcerated for several years with no communication mediation in the prison. She had been sent to workshops and classes in prison on a regular basis, but no interpreter was provided, nor did the staff know more than a few signs. The questions

posed by her attorneys in support of the law suit were whether she knew enough English to get along without any sign language communication, and whether her sign language needs would be met by ASL signers and interpreters. My answers after examination were no (about her English) and yes, with qualifications (about her ASL).

My evaluation of language skills in brief showed that the woman's sign language was normal for a deaf person from a hearing family with an eighth grade education at deaf schools. Her ASL was strongly influenced by ethnic (African-American) and regional (New York City, PS 47) factors. (I would expect her hearing siblings or neighbors to show similar ethnic and regional identifiers in their speech.) Her English abilities were minimal: very limited speech production and lip-reading; reading was restricted to recognition of only very common words, but no sense of the meaning of idiomatic English phrases nor ability to decode sentence-length messages; writing indicated only by the production of her name. These are indicators of neither spoken nor written language competence.

The techniques I used to evaluate the sign language included observation of conversation between her and her attorney (who, despite long hearing impairment, had learned to sign only recently, and used a strongly English-influenced variety), my own direct conversation with the inmate, and use of a book with wordless picture stories designed for English as a Second Language instruction for adults (Anon 1981). The two types of conversation differed in several important ways: with her attorney, the conversational outcomes had real consequences. Misunderstandings genuinely needed repair. In contrast, I was a one-time visitor with no consequential information to impart or exchange, as far as she was concerned. (The notion that I had something to do with the law suit that would make interpreters or other signing adults available to her was not part of our discussion.) I was a curiosity for sure, something out of the ordinary, and in that respect interesting to engage with.

For her English abilities, again, the observation of the conversation with the attorney gave indications of some speech and speech-reading strategies, as well as her ability to handle English word order, and utterances produced without spatial and non-manual signals in the signing stream. Evaluation of reading and writing relied

on excerpts from two printed sources: a questionnaire used by the prison to screen inmates for drug or alcohol problems, and a popular magazine article aimed at a Deaf audience. These materials matched the level of reading that the prison expected of inmates.

The evaluation was less than ideal in two respects. While I would have preferred to use video both as stimulus (similar to the wordless stories for ESL students) and as record of the whole evaluation for more detailed analysis (or in case of later dispute from possible experts called by the state), the correctional authority would permit us neither to use their equipment nor bring our own equipment into the facility. Secondly, the person whom I had engaged as co-evaluator (a Deaf native signer, who is experienced at sign language instruction and evaluation) took ill on the morning of the evaluation, and thus was unable to participate. Since both time and permission for non-attorneys to enter the facility were issues, we went ahead with the evaluation despite the difficulties.

As a trained evaluator of interpreters, sign language students and sign language instructors, I came to my conversation with a mental checklist of linguistic features to look for and get responses to. I took the change in modality of communication as evidence that this woman accepted me as a signer: she stopped using her voice and lips to convey English language meanings (as she had done in conversation with the attorney). Instead she used ASL mechanisms including increased reliance on space and on non-manual grammatical and discourse signaling. The interaction of eye gaze with strings of signs, the use of mouth, head and body movements in coordination with signing, and the roles of the two hands in conveying syntactic and discourse information all contributed to my report of normal ASL competence.

Indicators that this was a fluent but not sophisticated or well-educated ASL signer came from two sorts of evidence. First, she assumed more shared context than was warranted (especially with me, given that I had never met her before); the refinements of discourse cohesion were not present. Second, she exhibited very restricted use of fingerspelling. She spelled her own name slowly and deliberately, read my spelling only when produced in a similar manner, and spontaneously included few fingerspelled items in her own utterances, albeit appropriately (e.g., clay to refer to her arts

and crafts class, store in the pictures-to-signs task, where the word "clothes" but not "store" appeared as a written word in the picture).

When presented with printed English materials, her first response was "I can't read". This self-evaluation was confirmed by her failure to comprehend the first paragraph of an article from Deaf Life where terms such as "employees", "interpreter", "face-to-face" prompted requests for translation. In the "alcohol screening questionnaire" we looked at only one or two questions of the twenty. Question 4 reads, "Can you stop drinking without a struggle after 1 or 2 drinks?" She asked the meaning of the word "struggle" and I offered a single sign translation. Her rendition of this question in ASL might be paraphrased as "Does your drinking make you start fighting?" Such a translation indicates to me her awareness of meanings of some English words, but little or no contribution from an understanding of English syntax. When presented with the question translated into ASL, her response was immediate and sincere: "I would only take one drink." She had no recollection of having read or filled in the form. Responses to this questionnaire are the basis for assigning inmates to alcohol dependency treatment. The answer "no" was selected uniformly as the answer to each question on the form in her file. Four of the questions expect the answer "yes" for people without an alcohol problem, thus she has a score of 8 (2 points for each of 4 questions) on this form. If the answer "yes" had instead been the default response, this woman would likely have been in treatment for alcohol dependency when the issue was literacy and communication.

The report I prepared also gave an explanation of the phenomenon of contact signing to explain why prison staff might have felt they were communicating with this inmate, when they were not. Simply substituting signs for words will not communicate intended meaning to her, nor will simply substituting English words for the signs she produces reveal her meaning. My recommendations included using either (Deaf) bilingual aides or interpreters for communication of the meaning of printed materials, classroom instruction, and for face-to-face interaction in administrative procedures. I indicated that there are additional benefits (of role modeling and

demythologizing English achievement as a solely hearing accomplishment, inter alia) to engaging Deaf interpreters or Deaf communication aides.

Compare then the next case, where the linguistic expertise is indeed involved, but this time it is the knowledge of the Deaf community (both here in the US and the situation of immigrant deaf people) that needs to be explained to the court.

2. *Evaluation of d/Deaf plaintiff/witness/defendant/inmate for linguistic competence*

c. *sociolinguistic and psycholinguistic factors*

The role of linguistic expert in this next case was to offer, in the academic jargon that the court would accept, explanations of phenomena that are familiar to Deaf people and the community around them. The lay interpreter involved also was looking for help in finding a non-punitive solution to an immigrant family's situation.

Case 5: Eastern European immigrants in family court (hearing interpreter, lay Deaf interpreter, deaf attorney, hearing administrative officer).

I was contacted by a deaf attorney to come before the administrative judge in family court. A deaf immigrant family (with hearing children) had been accused of child abuse. The attorney defending them claimed that they were unfamiliar with child-rearing practices in the US and were at the same time isolated from various resources available to their hearing counterparts because of their lack of knowledge of ASL.

I appeared with the attorney, a hearing interpreter and another Deaf adult from the community. This Deaf adult fills a familiar role in the community, which I call lay interpreter. While he holds a full-time job, he also takes the responsibility of caretaker of the illiterate, the newly arrived or newly discovered deaf person. It was he (rather than the attorney) who gave me the most instructions about what to say and he who had had the most extensive dealings with the immigrant family.

I was not questioned narrowly, but was given quite an open opportunity to speak about the circumstances of deaf people who are immigrants to the US, differences in sign languages and opportunities for education by deaf people in other countries. I suggested that if the family could be provided some videotape support as well as ASL classes, they might absorb more American culture and mores, and find constructive ways of communicating with their children and their new community. The judge ordered the public library to purchase the educational videotapes I had mentioned, and to make the videotapes and video replay equipment available to the family on loan. The ruling seems quite rational and likely to result in a good outcome, in my judgment. I have no direct knowledge, however, on the follow-through or the success of this solution.

While I testified on topics such as language learning, institutionalized education, and hearing children with deaf parents, in this appearance at family court, I never met the deaf people about whose circumstances I was commenting.

2. *Evaluation of d/Deaf plaintiff/witness/defendant/ inmate for linguistic competence*

d. *speech, speechreading, literacy in spoken/written language*

Case 4 details an evaluation of some kinds of English skills. The following case required knowledge of specialized English usage by d/Deaf people. Most Deaf people—and many hearing people as well—would be able to talk about what adjustments to English are used on telecommunication devices by Deaf people. An expert witness here provided some evaluation of the evidence against the analytic tools available.

Case 6: A Deaf investor bringing professional misconduct charges against a Deaf stockbroker.

The evidence in this case was photocopies of printer tapes of parts of TTY conversations between two Deaf individuals (the investor and the stockbroker), and TTY answering machine messages allegedly from client to broker. The hearing attorney for the investor asked me as the linguist expert witness to determine if her client's side of these TTY conversations or messages had been fabricated by the stockbroker. I found limited evidence, but some tentative support for the hypothesis of fabrication in the use of customary abbreviations by each party ("u" versus "you", "pls" versus "plse", etc.). There were not enough examples of anything to test with quantitative tools, and the fact that nearly every conversation was partial made the analysis problematic.

More evidence (especially whole, unedited conversations) would have been helpful or even decisive in confirming or refuting the hypothesis of fabrication. For instance, actual recordings of conversations would have provided evidence related to each party's typing speed, rhythm, and self-correction mechanisms (using the backspace key versus typing XXX); even printer tapes of full conversations would have provided examples of customary openings and closings, variation in length of utterance, mechanisms for change of topic and so forth.

COMPARISON OF ROLES

Nearly fifteen years ago, Dennis Cokely (1980) defined "sign language professions." His predictions have not all come true, but discussion of who is called upon to make language evaluations deserves elaboration.⁵ Both linguists and professional interpreters may make judgments about the language competencies of deaf individuals and those communicating with them. The judgments concern specific sign language competencies, literacy, spoken and written language skills, sign language varieties, and additional communicative skills (competence in conventional graphic devices such as map reading, specialized gestural repertoires).

The individual functioning as a linguistic expert can offer at least three sorts of services to courtrooms, judicial and administrative proceedings. The linguistic expert can offer formal and informal evaluation procedures in determining the linguistic (but not mental) competence and literacy skills (construed in the most broad way) of individuals. Related to this, the expert can bring analytic tools to bear on available external evidence and can lend authority to the views of the Deaf community, putting these views in a larger context. The linguist may appropriately be asked to describe or explain her methods and findings for the court, and may offer recommendations for action. The process of recommending action may in fact generate further opportunities for evaluation of competence, and define further programs of action.

The individual functioning as an interpreter likewise has several ways to contribute expertise. Firstly, the interpreter with a sign language as one of her languages can render an opinion about her own ability to interpret for or interact with D/deaf and hearing individuals. Where appropriate, she can recommend the engagement of persons with additional or alternative competencies as interpreters. She may use some of the same tools or procedures as the linguistic expert to make a private assessment of the linguistic competencies and literacy skills necessary to render an appropriate and adequate interpretation. Finally, she may appropriately choose the variety of signing and other communicative tools to use with the D/deaf individual(s). One important distinction is that the individual in the role of interpreter does not make her comments public (about the results of those investigations into communicative competence and evaluation of readiness for the interpreting situation). On the other hand, of course, the interpreter is at liberty to describe and explain the role and function of the interpreter to one and all.⁶

In most situations, we expect that the linguistic expert will have an advanced degree (masters or beyond) in linguistics, applied linguistics or a related field. The lack of standardized or normed test instruments for adult signers limits the evaluators to those who have confidence in their creative adaptation of existing tools. That is, I would expect that administering even the informal sorts of testing (as outlined for the Deaf inmate in Case 4 above) on a second occasion or by a different evaluator would yield similar evi-

dence and similar judgments. At the risk of offending or surprising some readers, I will say that preparation in deaf education, communication disorders, audiology or speech therapy does not usually prepare one to give linguistic expert testimony on most of these cases. Most educational programs in these fields prepare graduates with a good notion of what testing can do and what makes a standard or replicable test instrument, but little in the parameters of a sign language evaluation. Those with degrees in interpreting at this writing have working knowledge of the variations encountered among a signing population, but are unlikely to have sufficient preparation either in the creation and use of tools for making linguistic competence decisions, or in the methods of communicating the results of their assessment.

Today, a large number of interpreters in the United States are prepared within community college programs. Interpreter educators as well as employers and program graduates recognize that graduates of such two year programs are immediately prepared for some roles, but by no means for all interpreting roles. Specialized training in terminology, behavior and roles in the legal setting presumes several years of work experience.

Changes in these educational programs are addressing the gap between graduation and readiness to work. Several interpreter preparation programs are now requiring that candidates demonstrate both English and American Sign Language competence prior to acceptance into the interpreting curriculum. In other instances, two year programs are articulating with colleges and universities in order to provide a full four year undergraduate degree program with an interpreting specialization. Several master's level interpreting programs exist, as well as the advanced degree program preparing interpreter trainers and sign language instructors (originally housed at Western Maryland College). Interpreters with master's degrees are equipped with a different and indeed greater repertoire of skills than interpreters with two year degrees. What is more, these graduate programs are positively disposed toward Deaf individuals who undertake advanced degrees. In this way, the intelligence of the Deaf community mixes with the analytic techniques of the academy to the advantage of all.

I submit that as this formal stratification of education in interpreting spreads, more individuals who are competent to conduct language evaluations on ordinary and extraordinary deaf and Deaf individuals will be trained. Baker-Shenk (1990) includes components on techniques of language evaluation and on terminology for discussion of language competence in the graduate training curriculum referred to above.

This paper has offered a perspective on the legal situations that will require linguistic assessment in the bilingual, bimodal courtroom. Some of these assessments will be made privately by an interpreter or interpreting team in order to deliver appropriate services; other assessments will be offered overtly to the court by experts with appropriate knowledge and training. Assessment may involve determination of the linguistic competence of the D/deaf person in a sign language or a written language. It may also check that the D/deaf person understands how to use an interpreter, and whether a particular interpreter or interpreting team is suitable for the task at hand. Finally, the expert may educate the court about the social and cultural factors that are intricately tied up with a minority community's use of a visual-gestural language.

References

- Anon. (1981). *Picture It! Sequences for Conversation*. New York NY: Regents Publishing.
- Baker-Shenk, C. (ed.) (1990). *A model curriculum for teachers of American Sign Language and teachers of ASL/English interpreting*. Silver Spring MD: RID Publications.
- Cokely, D. (1980). Sign Language Professions. In C. Baker and R. Battison (eds.), *Sign Language and the Deaf Community*. Silver Spring MD: NAD. 137—158.
- Frishberg, N. (1986). Puerto Rican Sign Language. In J. van Cleve (ed.), *The Encyclopedia of Deafness and Deaf People Vol. 3*. New York NY: McGraw-Hill. 104—105.
- Frishberg, N. (1991). Evaluation of D—C—. (Report prepared for the New York Legal Aid Society, April.)

Woodford, P. (1980). FSI Interview. *Proceedings of the NSSLRT (Boston)*. Silver Spring MD: NAD.

Notes

1. Nancy Frishberg holds a Ph.D. in linguistics from UCSD and has been a certified sign language interpreter and instructor. A former academic, Frishberg has been involved in technology work for nearly a decade and is currently with Apple's Personal Interactive Electronics division. She serves on the Educational Standards Committee of the Conference of Interpreter Trainers.
2. Most often, an interpreter with sign language as one of his or her working languages is called to court when someone has been identified as deaf or hard of hearing. Following generally accepted notation, I use Deaf to refer to people with impaired hearing who use a sign language and participate in the culture and community of deaf people. In contrast deaf refers to the audiological condition of severe or profound hearing impairment without implying preferred community or culture. For the court system, this distinction has not yet made its full impact. One place it may play out is in Deaf people's attitudes toward jury duty ("let me participate as a full citizen by sitting on a jury, using an interpreter as my communication access to the proceedings"), in contrast with some deaf people's attitudes toward the same activity ("I'm willing to serve only if you can make sure that each speaker will use the microphone that will amplify their speech for this wireless receiver I'm wearing; otherwise, I can't serve if I must depend on lipreading people who are moving around"). The Deaf juror will probably be able to serve, although there are many instances of Deaf people needing to convince individual judges or court systems that they can take on this responsibility, and that including the interpreter in the jury room, e.g., does not violate the rule that no one other than the jury will be present for their deliberations. The deaf citizen, who expresses the view described above, will probably be excused, but these decisions are still made on a case-by-case basis.
3. I can think of several situations where I wish someone had asked a qualified person to comment on an interpreter's competence for a particular court situation or for court in general.

4. If individuals are prepared to pay the interpreting costs, they can hire their own team. However, the court will still hire an interpreter to act on its behalf.
5. In particular, educators of deaf children have not embraced being a sign language profession as thoroughly as his other two categories, sign language instructors and sign language interpreters.
6. I have mentioned here several situations in which I took on the role of linguistic expert or interpreter. I would be remiss if I did not emphasize that in each situation I claimed only one role, and that I urge others to similarly restrict themselves.

Similarly, the sheltered workshop instructor who was also a certified interpreter in Case 3 declined to take on the role of interpreter with her student. She had an on-going relationship to the student, and the interpreter stance would not be easy to explain or keep distinct from the teacher relationship.